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ABSTRACT

SOFT POWER STRATEGIES IN US FOREIGN POLICY: ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF CITIZEN DIPLOMACY ON FOREIGN STATES’ BEHAVIOR

Stephen Macharia Magu 
Old Dominion University, 2013 
Chair: Dr. David C. Earnest

This dissertation empirically demonstrates that the isolated effects of citizen diplomacy correlate positively with foreign policy behavior as a non-military, foreign policy strategic option. The dissertation also finds that soft power, of which citizen diplomacy is a key component, is a viable foreign policy strategy. The findings are important to the academy and to the foreign policy-making process for states in search of effective, non-military strategies that leverage foreign state needs and attributes to achieve their foreign policy goals. Using a mixed methods approach, the dissertation investigates the correlation between Peace Corps Volunteers (citizen diplomat) placement and congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly. The question of interest is, do citizen diplomat recipient countries vote more with the US at the UN General Assembly? Is there a difference in countries’ voting patterns on key votes than on all votes, and what are the implications of congruent voting behavior for US foreign policy?

I develop several hypotheses and test for the effects of citizen diplomacy through four models: the omnibus, factors of bilateral attraction, host country variables and temporal and regional effects models. Using data from two sources, first, Voeten and Strehnev and second, Dreher, Strum and Vreeland, I find that in twelve of the sixteen models, citizen diplomacy is positively correlated with congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly. Countries vote more with the US at the UN on key votes than
they do on all UN General Assembly votes (observed in seven of eight models). The level of democracy is positively correlated with congruent voting in four of eight models and also positively signed. The level of globalization, GDP per capita and region are important explanans for voting in congruence with the US at the UN General Assembly. As expected, failed states vote less in congruence with the US at the UN.

These findings are augmented by case studies based on three qualitative models. The issue linkages model finds that the US links citizen diplomacy to its national security interests. The interpersonal model finds that citizen diplomats affect foreign policy through individuals and elites. The foreign policy approach finds that citizen diplomats have contributed to building and changing national infrastructure and development and thereby countries' foreign policy trajectory. The dissertation concludes that citizen diplomacy matters: there is a positive and strong correlation between citizen diplomacy and foreign policy behavior of recipient states towards the US. As a soft-power strategy, citizen diplomacy is a viable foreign policy option.
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<thead>
<tr>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSV</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPA</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI</td>
<td>Human Development Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRI</td>
<td>International Republican Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAM</td>
<td>Non-Aligned Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCIV</td>
<td>National Council of International Visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDI</td>
<td>National Democratic Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCED</td>
<td>Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCV</td>
<td>Peace Corps Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNGA</td>
<td>United Nations General Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS</td>
<td>Voeten-Strezhnev (data)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Chapter overview

This chapter begins by situating the specific research in the overall international relations scholarship. It begins by setting out the research question, explaining the puzzle and looks at the theoretical and political developments in international relations. It then defines the major concepts that will occur throughout the chapter.

The purpose of this dissertation is to determine how, and to what extent citizen diplomats’ international volunteer activities affect the foreign policy behavior of foreign states towards the US. By zeroing-in on the case of the US Peace Corps, the research hypothesizes that unlike civil society groups, citizen diplomats like the Peace Corps depend upon the state for funding, training, deployment. Such groups include, for example, the United Kingdom’s Volunteer Service Overseas (VSO), and the United States Peace Corps, whose second goal is to “help promote a better understanding of Americans on the part of the peoples served.” This goal can be classified as a foreign policy strategy, and evaluated to determine whether its accomplishment has strategic benefits for the US in terms of advancing US Foreign Policy and the national interest.

The research isolates the effects of citizen diplomacy, given all other possible explanans of states’ foreign policy behavior. It evaluates how these effects, if any, can be measured and correlated with empirical measures of foreign policy behavior, especially congruent voting with the United States at the United Nations General Assembly. It provides the first empirical measurement of the effect of citizen diplomacy as a foreign policy strategy. The research provides a better understanding of how aspects of non-
traditional, non-military aspects of statecraft can change states influence other states’
behavior, and how the successes or failures citizen diplomacy can be applied to foreign
policy strategies. Specifically, the research answers a number of questions. Among these:
to what extent does citizen diplomacy, through international volunteering, influence
recipient states’ foreign policy preferences? Does citizen diplomacy correlate with
alignment of foreign countries preferences with those of the US as measured by voting on
key votes at the United Nations General Assembly?

This research derives its focus from the events of the past sixty years, when
citizen diplomacy in the form of US Peace Corps Volunteers was proposed by the
presidential candidate John F. Kennedy in 1961, as a foreign policy strategy to counter
Soviet expansion and influence through provision of technical assistance to newly
independent countries in Africa and the Third World. The "Peace Corps" comprised of
groups of young men and women who would serve in the newly independent and
developing countries, assisting those countries meet their need for trained manpower,
among other developmental goals.

The Peace Corps was formally established on March 1, 1961, through Executive
Order 10924\(^1\) and authorized by Congress on September 22, 1961, with the passage of the
Peace Corps Act (Public Law 87-293)\(^2\). With a total of more than 200,000 volunteers and
trainees in placed in 139 countries since the program’s inception in 1961, the Peace
Corps reports that of these volunteers, 95 percent have at least an undergraduate degree


\(^{2}\) Ibid.
while 11 percent have graduate studies or graduate degrees. The volunteers work in various fields, such as Education (36 percent), Health & HIV/AIDS (21 percent), Business (15 percent), Environment (14 percent), Youth (6 percent), Agriculture (5 percent) and other (4 percent). On average, the Peace Corps volunteer time since inception was spent in the LDCs and developing countries (35 percent of the countries served were in Africa), representing 49 of the 53 countries. The role and function of the volunteer varies. In the development field, the Peace Corps views the volunteer as a combination of a Learner, a Change Agent, a Co-Trainer, a Co-Facilitator, a Project Co-Planner, and a Mentor.

**Study background**

For much of the earlier part of 20th century, conflict was an enduring part of interstate relations. During a period covering about 30 years, interstate wars killed over 100 million and unleashed the Cold War, which pitted two diametrically opposed ideological, economic and political systems. Around the middle of the 20th century, the attractiveness of wars in Europe began diminishing economically, militarily, ideologically and morally and a new world, characterized by increasing integration, cooperation, military and economic alliances and internationalism began emerging. The US simultaneously shared this new, post-World War II Cold War order with the Soviet Union, and set the stage was set for an ideological struggle; this provides the grounding for this research.

This nascent post-World War II order changed with the fall of the Berlin Wall beginning November 1989, followed by the collapse of communism and the sudden rise

---

and preponderance of the United States after 1991. Old foes and known threats were
gone, diminished or reinvented; new challenges to world order arose. The field of
international relations theory, previously grounded on studies centered on the East-West
ideological divide, security dilemmas, military alliances and how countries dealt with
them, scrambled to characterize and understand the new world order.

Amid the flux in the global geopolitical and geostrategic realities especially
during and after the Cold War period, states continued to use traditional tools of power –
mainly hard power – such as military capabilities, military alliances, traditional bilateral
and multilateral diplomatic relations, investments and foreign trade—often interspersed
with protectionism—to cultivate influence with other countries. Because of the bipolar
distribution of power in the international system, United States and Soviet Union’s
influence and patronage was valued by different client states. The two superpowers
utilized traditional and non-traditional tools of statecraft, including culture, music, food,
education, technical assistance, economic assistance and religion, among others to
maintain power and influence.

The events of the late 1980’s to early 1990’s left the world dominated by a single
hegemon, a world characterized as more unstable, experiencing rapid globalization and
resurgence of competing ideologies—for example, the Chinese communist growth
model. Russia’s sovereign democracy and rise of international terrorism. The latter was
especially facilitated by the rise in the number and incapacity of fragile, failing and failed
states, rise and diversification in actors in the international system.

To successfully navigate changes in the international system, states today utilize
traditional and emergent tools and approaches to advance their positions in the world,
relative to themselves and to others. Economic and military capabilities, limited territorial conquest, technological advancement, ideology and cultural tools, among others, have been critical in advancing states’ national interest, their citizens’ welfare and in assuring their national security and preponderance over others. Countries often look to and beyond their own borders, secure them militarily and economically, form alliances, balance other powers and use diplomatic and other means to extend their influence.

While there is no discernible point at which emphasis on military power as the sole determinant of a country’s predominance in the world system gained preference or inevitability, more nations have turned to non-military tools and strategies, in addition to traditional tools to extend their influence. This incorporation of traditional "hard power" and newer, alternative tools and approaches occurred gradually since the late 1940’s.

The genesis of these alternative approaches can be seen in the Marshall Plan, the Berlin Airlift, in Truman’s Doctrine, Germany’s 1949 reunification, the gradual founding of the European Economic Community, provision of Soviet technical assistance and the formation of the US Peace Corps. By retaining military capability as one of the tools of foreign policy and leveraging other approaches such as trade, technology, diplomacy and culture to buttress this supremacy, nations began to move towards alternative approaches in supplementing the hard power in the toolbox of their foreign policy. These alternative approaches that have seen increasing importance will be defined as soft power.  

According to the text of its mission statement, the three objectives of the Peace Corps is to change foreigners’ perception of the US, change Americans’ perception of the world and provide recipient countries with trained manpower. Fifty years after its

---

4 The term “Soft Power” was first used by Joseph S. Nye in 1990 to articulate the alignment of one country’s preferences with a second country’s preferences. For a more expanded definition of soft power, see section the definitions section of this chapter.
inception, this altruistic undertaking which also served as a foreign policy strategy to counter Soviet activities in the-then Third World has neither been sufficiently studied in terms of its outcomes, nor empirically evaluated for its effectiveness, especially its outcome in changing foreigners' perception of the United States.

Increasingly, soft power core tenets such as citizen diplomacy and peer-to-peer exchanges are growing in importance as an augmentative pillar to traditional US foreign policy. Over the past fifty years, the US spent billions of dollars to send more than 200,000 citizen diplomats to 139 countries around the globe. Also, where support for – and spending on other foreign policy strategies such as foreign aid – is diminishing, the Peace Corps continues to attract significant public, executive and congressional support even among fiscal conservatives.

The puzzle of the Peace Corps, its continuing public support, consistent budgetary allocation and its very existence is one of great interest in the context of its founding and its dual role as a foreign policy and international development agency. Congressional appropriations for the Peace Corps have continued to increase year after year, topping $375 million in 2011. Its support is largely bipartisan in the US congress and mostly escapes the calls for restructuring or starvation of funding unlike most of the rest of foreign assistance. Neither are there sustained efforts to tie its budget, outcomes and allocation of citizen diplomats made contingent to the foreign policy behavior of recipient countries. Its funding and support is evident for example in the 111th Congress (2009 - 2010); the Senate Bill S.1382 (Peace Corps Improvement and Expansion Act of 2009) by

---

Senator Chris Dodd, with 18 cosponsors, was designed to "improve and expand the Peace Corps for the 21st century, and for other purposes."\(^6\)

The Peace Corps is often ridiculed as anything from a "government-subsidized vacation for well-to-do white kids."\(^7\) However, most of the self-reported evidence points to its effectiveness and ability to accomplish its stated goals. During its 50th anniversary celebrations, more than 82 percent of returned volunteers from a sample of 11,138 volunteers articulated that the organization was effective in its goals, especially goal 2.\(^8\)

In theoretical and policy debates alike, civilian, cultural and person-to-person and peer exchanges form one of the key pillars of the soft power approach. Yet, for all its overwhelming public support domestically, the number of citizen diplomats placed, economic resources spent and perceived utility to US foreign policy, few empirical studies measure the impact of citizen diplomacy on the recipient communities especially when such citizen diplomacy is characterized as a foreign strategy option.

Even more puzzling is how such impact, if any, translates into recipient countries’ support for US foreign policy preferences in multilateral forums. Questions abound, of how citizen diplomacy—sometimes derided as "social work"—can change foreigners’

---


perceptions of the US, given PCVs’ target population. Neither has scholarship studied the extent to which such favorable opinion translated to pro-US state behavior in matters of its Foreign Policy. This research will undertake to resolve these issues.

The quantitative research part of this dissertation finds that citizen diplomacy is positively correlated with congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly, in twelve of the sixteen models. Countries that receive more foreign investment, military aid, wealthier countries and more industrialized countries vote more with the US at the UN General Assembly. Countries vote more often in congruence with the US at the UN General Assembly on key votes – votes of national interest to the United States as tracked and reported by the US State Department – than they do on all other votes. The three case studies highlighted in chapter six support these findings and demonstrate that as expected, citizen diplomacy is a viable foreign policy strategy.

**Research focus**

The primary aim of this research is test whether citizen diplomacy is a predictor of foreign policy behavior towards the US; i.e. the extent to which countries that receive citizen diplomats align their foreign policy preferences with those of the United States. Do citizen diplomat-recipient countries, as a result of these bilateral exchanges, alter their foreign policy strategies and preferences to favor those of the United States?

To date, the most comprehensive conceptualization of the non-governmental conduct of inter-state diplomatic relations can be found not in the academy *per se*, but in the practical applications of citizen diplomacy as outlined in the occasional papers of the Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy (IMTD). IMTD identifies nine tracks of diplomacy;
these include government, professional – including trained personnel, business, such as
direct and indirect investment, multi-nationals, private citizens, research, training and
education, activism, religious, funding, and public opinion/communication. Although
the formal and traditional government-to-government practice of diplomacy remains the
most widely acknowledged avenue of diplomatic engagement, the other eight tracks are
attracting considerable attention, application and even government funding.

This research concentrates evaluating the impact of private citizens (track four),
activism (track six) and funding (track eight). Track five (research, training and
education) is often inextricably intertwined with the other three tracks: through education
and training, individuals become more activist, often source funds – even as citizen
diplomats – and serve in foreign countries where they provide training and education
such as in maternal health or on reducing HIV/AIDS transmission. This research bundles
the activities of tracks five, six and eight as essential to what track 4 diplomacy is –
citizen diplomats carrying out some social activity beneficial to a target community.

By studying the place of citizen diplomacy rather than the traditional, bilateral,
official government-to-government, ambassador-embassy and special-envoy variant of
formal diplomacy, this research evaluates the contributions of citizen diplomats to
advancing the foreign policy interests of the sending country. The research narrows the
focus to only those individuals who act in a private capacity but with the full backing of
the sending government, such as Peace Corps Volunteers. Effectively, these are non-
traditional diplomats. The research omits other international volunteers such as
missionaries, tourists and international philanthropists.

---

The research also seeks to determine how target recipient countries respond to these non-coercive, non-traditional avenues of international interaction, and whether they change their public behavior towards the citizen-diplomat sending country. This approach addresses questions of practical application and also builds scholarship in the area of diplomacy and statecraft, of which Steiner asserts, "no area of world politics has reflected a greater gap between experience and theory than diplomatic statecraft".10

Focus on citizen diplomacy

The US continues to utilize bilateral, multilateral and institutional approaches and strategies to maintain and expand its power and influence. One of the most enduring approaches to US bilateral relations is the Peace Corps, a government-funded program that sends thousands of volunteers abroad each year to countries in need of training manpower in several areas, including education, health, HIV/AIDS, among others.

The cost of the Peace Corps Volunteer program is approximately $400 million dollars a year but the actual value of the volunteer time and friendships is probably much higher. Person-to-person exchanges of a diplomatic nature are often referred to as citizen diplomacy. For the past 50 years that this program has been running and attracting a lot of public support, there has been little research on the extent to which it serves as a foreign policy strategy, and whether the program actually achieves its foreign policy objectives. Assuming that one of the US and program goals is to create friendships with the receiving country, the most public expression of "mutual attraction" towards the US ought to be congruence in voting with the US at the UN. This research therefore proposes

to interrogate the correlation between citizen diplomacy and foreign policy behavior of countries in dyadic relationships with the US.

**Research problem**

The second Peace Corps goal is "helping promote a better understanding of Americans on the part of the peoples served." The Peace Corps began as a foreign policy strategy to counter Soviet influence and provision of technical and skilled labor to newly independent countries. The extent to which the citizen diplomats of the Peace Corps have achieved the second goal remains unknown. Secondly, there has been no study on the import of "promoting a better understanding of Americans" – the intended outcome of this goal of citizen diplomacy. As a social work activity, citizen diplomacy is legitimately a desirable activity that allows volunteers to teach children English, teach baseball, educate youth on dangers of HIV and AIDS, teach mothers proper nutrition, small business skills and assist communities to build wells.

As a strategy to increase other countries’ favorability view of the US, the “so what” remains unanswered. Is the premise that by sending citizen diplomats to a foreign country ostensibly to improve foreigners’ views of the United States and Americans ill-advised, an overreach, ambitious or simply naïve? Is there merit in achieving this goal – that is, if foreigners like Americans and America, so what? How does "liking America and Americans" translate into some tangible benefit for the United States?

The implied assumption is that there is a) some benefit that the United States accrues by sending citizen diplomats to a second country, and b) that there exists some

---

way to measure the benefit which is hypothesized beneficial to the United States and its foreign policy. The logical path of "getting others to align their interests with ours" suggests that there should be a way of measuring the extent to which the interests are aligned with those of the sending country, in this case the United States.

Such measures can be quantitative, for example, voting with the US at the UN on key votes (which are recorded, analyzed by the United States State Department and reported to Congress on an annual basis), increased trade opportunities, military cooperation or more tourism. The "mutual attraction" factor can also be qualitative and expressed, for example, through trade, cooperation, support of US positions on a range of international issues and expression of solidarity for US-preferred positions in bilateral forums. Still, given the prior discussion on the role of signaling, a more visible way of evaluating the impact of soft power, of which citizen diplomacy is a key variable, would include categorical actions, such as voting with the US at the UN General Assembly.

This research does not assert causation: citizen diplomacy does not necessarily lead to citizen diplomat-recipient states voting more in congruence with the United States. A finding of no correlation between citizen diplomats' placement and the recipient country's alignment of foreign policy preferences with those of the US is significant since citizen diplomacy has been a US foreign policy strategy since 1961. A finding of some correlation, controlling for all other rival explanations, is of equal significance. It indicates that recipient countries are likely to align their foreign policy choices with the US conditional upon receiving citizen diplomats. It is important to point out that this research concentrates on the narrow goal of investigating the relationship between citizen diplomacy and congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly.
**Problem statement**

To what extent does citizen diplomacy influence the foreign policy behavior of states? Does citizen diplomacy influence foreign policy behavior of states or is there a spurious correlation? What other variables can affect the behavior of states towards other states? What does qualitative evidence show regarding the effect of citizen diplomacy?

**Approaches and data**

This research uses a mixed methods approach to determine how citizen diplomacy affects foreign policy behavior of states. It examines data on citizen diplomacy and its correlation with state behavior especially towards the US. The research also looks at how other variables of bilateral and multilateral interactions influence foreign policy behavior. The research examines whether host-country attributes – such as democracy, state cohesion or fragility and wealth – affect how countries conceptualize their foreign policy options. It also examines how regional and temporal variables affect how countries behave towards the US. It examines and explains correlations between citizen diplomacy and other potential explanans.

The research data is drawn from several sources. The data on congruence in voting with the US, the key indicator of country voting affinity, comes from Voeten and Strehnev and from Dreher, Strum and Vreeland. Data on citizen diplomacy is drawn from the US Peace Corps through the agency’s annual congressional budget justification. Other data sources include the State Department, the Center for Systemic Peace, the United Nations and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID).
Citizen diplomacy

One of the major aims of this research to conceptualize ‘citizen diplomacy’, which to date has not sufficiently defined by scholarship. Much of the current citizen diplomacy scholarship constructs the concept as one of three options: citizen's diplomacy, citizen diplomacy, and public diplomacy. This research briefly discusses the major differences, differentiating between citizen diplomacy and public diplomacy, and specifies a definition that closely mirrors the definitions provided by the US State Department, NCIV and the United States Center for Citizen Diplomacy.

Public Diplomacy is defined as an “an instrument that governments use to mobilize these resources to communicate with and attract the publics of other countries, rather than merely their governments.”¹² Nye further specifies that public diplomacy is of two kinds: “slow media of cultural diplomacy” such as art, books and exchanges, and the “fast information media” which include(d) radio, movies, and newsreels” and no doubt includes modern methods of communication.¹³

The intersection of individuals, groups and governments to influence foreign publics is at the heart of Delaney's definition of public diplomacy. Delaney argues that public diplomacy is "the way in which both government and private individuals and groups influence directly or indirectly those public attitudes and opinions which bear directly on another government’s foreign policy decisions."¹⁴ Cowan and Arsenault’s definition approximates Delaney’s; their definition of public diplomacy drawing from US


¹³ Ibid. 98.

Information Agency's three layers of public diplomacy which includes "monologue, dialogue and collaboration" but is based on government-agency involvement.\textsuperscript{15}

The United States Center for Citizen Diplomacy (USCCD) defines citizen diplomacy as the concept that ordinary individuals, such as students, teachers, athletes, artists, business people, humanitarians, adventurers or tourists have "the right, even the responsibility, to help shape US foreign relations 'one handshake at a time.'"\textsuperscript{16} The USCCD includes "a broad range of programs and activities" that the citizens support as partial definition of citizen diplomacy.

The "Citizen Diplomats" website defines citizen diplomats as individuals doing work in "promoting international understanding and cross-cultural friendship"\textsuperscript{17} The National Council for International Volunteers (NCIV)'s definition of citizen diplomacy mirrors that of the Center for Citizen Diplomacy. These definitions have been adopted from the US State Department's definition of "citizen diplomat."\textsuperscript{18} Second track or "citizens" diplomacy may be broadly defined as the bringing together of professionals.


\textsuperscript{18} The State Department further holds that individuals who "work on an issue of international importance; travel on an international service project; host people from other countries in your home, workplace, school or community or have a passport..." are citizen diplomats. See: http://diplomacy.state.gov/discoverdiplomacy/references/169794.htm (Web). Accessed 11/4/2012.
opinion leaders or other currently or potentially influential individuals."\(^{19}\) Davies and Kaufman argue that citizen diplomacy "complements...official diplomacy, opening up opportunities for communication, cross cultural understanding."\(^{20}\) The research does not find significant differences between "citizen's diplomacy" and "citizen diplomacy" but clarifies that citizen diplomacy as a predictor of states' foreign policy behavior towards the US is the key variable.

Apart from social, economic and cultural development, the service of citizen diplomats is often associated with peace-keeping activities. Bernards defines citizen diplomacy based on the actions of the individual and acting in the area of peace-making. Bernards further writes that "citizens play a major role in transforming the perceptions, understandings and solutions accepto nations in conflict." Citizens either assign themselves the duty of intervening for peace where the government will not, or have utilitarian reasons for seeking peace and the ability to bridge differences based on common interests.

This provides for citizen diplomats to meet "the needs of both communities...for example, in South Africa, the citizen 'peace committees' played a crucial role in preparing the population for the tremendous changes that took place in ending apartheid."\(^{21}\) Formation of the Wisconsin Council for Coordinating for Nicaragua

---

\(^{19}\) Ibid.


\(^{21}\) Reena Bernards. "Women as Citizen-Diplomats." *Women's Studies Quarterly*, 26, No. 3/4, Internationalizing the Curriculum (Fall-Winter, 1998): 51. Bernards notes citizens' effectiveness in diplomacy, acting as "an unofficial, informal interaction between members of adversary groups or nations that aims to develop strategies, influence public opinion, and organize human and material resources in ways that might help resolve their conflict."
(WCCN) in the 1980's at the height of the Nicaragua civil war was based on the view that "diplomacy is essentially the art of helping the world...and WCCN took responsibility for furthering citizen diplomacy while formally separating from the official US state department policy."\(^{22}\)

Broome affirms this view of citizen diplomats as peace-makers, discussing Interactive Management as an approach to "to citizen peace-building groups"\(^{23}\) and an effort to "support citizen-based activities that seek to foster greater contact among individuals and groups from the two sides of the conflict place."\(^{24}\) Gopin offers a "conflict-solving" approach to citizen diplomacy. He defines citizen diplomacy as "an activity that is much larger than merely religion and conflict resolution...it refers to a whole variety of ways in which individual citizens across the planet are engaged in efforts to reach out to civilizations and countries that may be in conflict with their own."\(^{25}\) These scholars therefore view citizen diplomacy more as a peace-making and peace building activity that targets local populations than as a state endeavor.

Williams and Goose articulate the non-state actor or private institutional view, discussing the role of the citizen diplomacy in the context of the Ottawa Process to ban land-mines. They write that "when six non-governmental organizations came together in October 1992...the process that evolved in those years and brought about the...Ottawa


\[^{24}\text{Ibid.}\]

Process—gave the promise of a new dimension in diplomacy, of 'citizen diplomacy' and generated hope for its wider applicability." Other attempts at citizen diplomacy concentrate on lower-level concerns such as sister-city initiatives or student exchanges.

Leviton highlights such diplomacy (citizen participation) by GZPP (Ground Zero Pairing Project), "one of the largest suppliers of educational materials concerning US – Soviet Relationships to schools, its goal is to promote friendships between children of the two countries" with the clear objective that held that "having knowledge and contact with 'enemies' helps people come to see each other as individuals rather than in terms of stereotypes and labels." 

Malek defines citizen diplomacy as "unofficial, state-funded contacts between people of different nations, as opposed to official contacts between governmental representatives; it can include direct contacts in joint programs or situations mediated or facilitated by unofficial (non-government) third parties – NGOs, private peacemakers, scholars, or any other unofficial ‘bridge builder.’"

So far definitionally, citizen diplomats are for the most part individuals, acting in individually or in a small group, without the access to extensive government machinery and support or public means of outreach to the public such as radio stations, embassies

---


28 See: Cate Malek, "Citizen Diplomacy", accessed on 4/2/1011. (Web). See also Chigas, Diana. "Track II (Citizen) Diplomacy. August, 2003. Accessed on 4/2/2011 (Web). This view of Track Two (Citizen Diplomacy), however, is more focused on post-conflict and conflict resolution intervention by third-party, non-invested persons and/or organizations. A more positivistic view of Track II (Citizen Diplomacy) provides for pro-active actions to influence a positive view of a country, people, or entity as an ideological preference.
and key government officials and other resources that public diplomacy employs. The limited in-country support for Peace Corps Volunteers therefore qualifies them to be citizen diplomats, even where their work might eventually support non-governmental or citizen organizations in the countries where they work.

This research excludes public diplomacy in its analysis. Gopin defines citizen diplomacy as "a whole variety of ways in which individual citizens across the planet are engaged in efforts to reach out to civilizations and countries," often to complement the efforts of government leaders who "can do surprisingly little to promote positive change, given the confines of their mandate" by individuals whose mandate in "citizen diplomacy and peace building is steady, positive change." The view of public diplomacy being influenced or driven by some aspect of government is well established. Tuch, for example, defined this form of diplomacy as "a government's process of communication with foreign publics in an attempt to bring about understanding for its nation's ideas and ideals, its institutions and culture, as well as its national goals and policies" while Frederick argues that public diplomacy includes "activities, directed abroad in the fields of information, education, and culture, whose objective is to influence a foreign government, by influencing its citizens." To these operational definitions, Gilboa added "the interactivity between states and non-state actors; utilization of 'soft power,' two-way communication. strategic public diplomacy,

29 Gopin, To Make the Earth...: 93.

30 Ibid., 96.


media framing, information management, public relations, nation branding, self-presentation, and e-image; domestication of foreign policy; and addressing both short- and long-term issues."

Citizen diplomacy is often confused with other forms of interaction with foreign publics – at home or abroad. Most scholars conceptualize and measure citizen diplomacy through the lens of "propaganda, public relations (PR), international public relations (IPR), psychological warfare, and public affairs" – with the most common measuring tools derived from and through public opinion polls and media coverage.

The premise of citizen diplomacy exceeds international volunteering (service), service learning, Gap Year Abroad, missionary work, tourism, scholarly exchanges, business investment conferences and foreign direct investment abroad, or retirement abroad by American citizens. It is also outside the scope of armed intervention, because to the extent possible, citizen diplomacy is essentially counter to armed intervention: it brooks mutual attraction. Mutual attraction can be assumed to portend some level of commonality such as language, ideology, culture or other variables.

Diplomacy of the medieval to modern times seems to have provided a major legacy to modern-day citizen diplomacy; that "statesmanship was based on the fair and open principle of sincerity, and indeed, such a policy will be found in all cases where it


has been adopted to have been eminently successful."35 This openness is leveraged by citizen diplomats when they interact with individuals in the target country.

Citizen diplomacy is one of the central, constituent elements of soft power, a strategic approach that continues to gain wider acceptance in interstate relations as the primacy of the use of force and relevance of interstate wars among Great Powers continues to diminish. But what is citizen diplomacy? Is citizen diplomacy a new concept? How does citizen diplomacy differ from the traditional diplomacy, that is, state to state or formal diplomacy?

Citizens as diplomats

If citizen diplomacy encompasses the work of individuals who volunteer to work in foreign countries, supported by government through training, placement, remuneration and extraction, citizen diplomats can be defined simply as the individuals who perform this volunteer work. Sharp discusses citizen diplomacy based on who is represented and to whom they are represented. He writes that "citizen diplomats claim[ing] to represent themselves, collectivities such as sub-state, supra-state, and trans-state communities, sovereign states on occasion, single person enterprises and ideas or policies".36

The second group of citizen diplomats consists of individuals who attempt to influence the international community, states and non-state actors. Sharp identifies four types of citizen diplomats; the first is a go-between, interacting with countries otherwise


difficult to access useful for deniability and access. Secondly, the citizen diplomat can be seen as representative for a sectoral, regional, or local economic interest, for example city-sponsored business investors.

The third type of citizen diplomat is the citizen diplomat as a lobbyist or advocate for a particular cause. A recent example of this kind of advocacy for a particular cause was George Clooney's involvement in the peace process in the Sudan (2010/2011). This type of involvement can range across different interests, and reach across different actors, domestic and international. The fourth type of citizen diplomat is the "subverter and transformer of existing policies and/or political arrangements, domestic and/or international." It can be assumed that since the citizen diplomat of the Peace Corps is less of these definitions and is truly altruistic.

Perhaps the idea of citizen diplomacy was derived from the belief that if we "bring ordinary people together from the different sides of their respective political divides and they will discover the common humanity which they share. If this is done with sufficient numbers of people, then it will become impossible for their respective governments to maintain hostile relations." It is this idea that regular citizens can impact a nation’s international relations that is captured in Leonard and Alakeson’s *Going Public*, report acknowledging the British governments need to involve all its

---

37 Ibid.

38 Ibid., 138.

39 Ibid., 139.

40 Ibid., 140.

citizenry, in which they argue that "building links with overseas publics will matter as much to foreign policy as talking to governments; influencing people abroad must be central to our strategy. The Foreign Office must unleash the energy of 60 million budding ambassadors in Britain's schools, businesses, local authorities, political parties and communities to build deeper links across the world."42

Lee and Hudson discuss the paradigmatic change in the conduct of foreign policy, pointing to the rethinking of the function of inter-governmental relations. They suggest that increasingly, governments are integrating commercial activities with diplomacy, and are restructuring their diplomatic institutions to better serve 'commercial diplomacy' e.g. mergers of trade and foreign ministries as has been the case in Canada, Australia, Belgium, thereby instituting formal business-government partnerships.43 Other governments may not combine their ministries or their functions, yet in the case of the Peace Corps, the US embassy in the destination country has coordinating functions such as administering oaths of service and coordination with the destination country.

The objective of rethinking citizen diplomacy is to dispel the notion that volunteering is simply "helping others with no expectation for reward." While the motivation of volunteers may be benign and altruistic, the choice of a government agency as the avenue through which volunteers serve inadvertently imparts governmental structure to the selection, training, deployment, interactional terms, extraction, indoctrination and outcomes that such state-funded volunteers provide in their volunteer service. Government agencies may support altruistic motives, but in the case of the US


State Department and the US Peace Corps, their objectives for bilateral outcomes trump.
but leverage citizen diplomats' altruistic motivations. Government agencies too have
institutional functions and existential preferences that are served by the citizen diplomats.
The involvement of the government therefore leverages altruism for altruism's purposes,
and for purposes of influencing foreign governments.

This reconceptualization of citizen diplomacy argues that state-funded volunteers
fulfill a mandate of supporting government objectives and ideals. It further suggests that
citizen diplomats impart specific values to the communities and countries where they
serve. They interact with citizens and elites in the receiving countries and are therefore
volunteer citizen diplomats, serving the interests of their countries. This redefines the
concept of state-supported international volunteering into a concept of citizen diplomacy.

Citizen diplomacy actualizes the promise and practice of foreign policy through
international volunteer service and person-to-person exchanges. Since volunteering
within a country has no conceptual outcomes for foreign policy, the research concentrates
on international volunteering and excludes domestic volunteering. Within international
volunteering, the research concentrates on state-funded, or state-supported international
volunteering which it conceptualizes as citizen diplomacy. The difference is that while an
individual may volunteer for their church and thereby travel abroad for example in the
2010 Haiti earthquake, the lack of government support excludes such volunteering.

Citizen diplomacy, the state-sponsored international volunteering, encompasses
programs such as the United Nations Volunteers, the "technical experts" that the Soviet
Union placed during the Cold War in third world countries, to other overtly-run
government programs that aim to increase one country's unofficial presence in and
interaction with the citizens and elites of another. There are many examples of state-funded volunteer programs; the best-known of these is the United States Peace Corps Volunteers (PCVs). The Volunteer Service Overseas, with a vision of "a world without poverty" is the United Kingdom’s premier volunteer agency, and perhaps the world’s oldest, government-funded citizen diplomacy program.

*Importance of international volunteering*

The practice of international volunteering is occurring in a rapidly changing international landscape, one that features increasing globalization, which facilitates greater interpersonal connections. Globalization, on average, has facilitated quick movement, instant communication and travel, and allows individuals to become more involved in the affairs - whether to improve or otherwise - of foreign places. Citizen diplomacy has benefitted from increased globalization. It is, however, important to think of globalization and its relationship with citizen diplomacy.

Scholte defines globalization in terms of "multiple and overlapping geographical scales", and as "the growth of social spaces of transplanetary proportions" that create, and involve "global social relations involve direct exchanges and significant interdependencies among persons located anywhere across the earth, hence their 'transplanetary' quality." Khan defines globalization as:


corporations (businesses that see they functioning in a global marketplace). The international institutions that oversee world trade and finance play an increasingly important role in this era of globalization. Globalization is a comprehensive term for the emergence of a global society in which economic, political, environmental, and cultural events in one part of the world quickly come to have significance for people in other parts of the world. Globalization is the result of advances in communication, transportation, and information technologies.\textsuperscript{46}

The interpersonal exchanges that are the central tenet of international volunteering are a constituent characteristic of globalization, and include business and cultural exchanges, person-to-person contacts and interactions, cultural information sessions, humanitarian activities, international volunteering. Thus, globalization has the potential to create knowledge and inspire international volunteers to participate in international volunteering for altruistic purposes. The volunteering and other contacts with foreign countries through different forms of exchange, translated into political and foreign policy strategies, are non-traditional strategies and are increasingly becoming more important. The importance of these strategies—specifically the state-sanctioned international volunteering—is the focus of this analysis.

The new conceptualization of international volunteering as citizen diplomacy is supported by global geo-political changes. Not only are there changes in the diplomatic nature of the interactions of nations, traditional concerns for states have been in flux since 1945, accelerating in 1990 with the collapse of the Soviet Union and the communist ideology. Joseph Nye points out that, "while military force remains the ultimate form of power in a self-help system, the use of force has become more costly for modern great powers than it was in earlier centuries."

\textsuperscript{46} Himayatullah Khan. "Globalization - Challenges And Debates." COMSATS Institute of Information
Other instruments such as culture, instant communication, organizational and building of institutional skills, and manipulation of interdependence have become quite important. The implications of these changes are captured by Lancaster who, in asserting the new priorities for foreign aid, writes that the traditional purposes of aid - promoting US security and supporting development in poor countries - are no longer pressing in the post-Cold War world of American dominance and new emerging markets. These changes...have also raised new challenges and opportunities for US leadership...to help preserve peace, address the challenges of globalization, and improve the quality of life.

There has been little evidence that citizen diplomacy was influenced by either the failure of the primary thinking about foreign aid, or a search for an alternative means of delivering foreign aid. Indeed, while the UK VSO was inaugurated in 1958, the US Peace Corps' genesis was then Senator John F. Kennedy's speech at the University of Michigan in 1960 before he was elected president in part emphasizing service and serving a foreign policy function of countering Soviet influence.

Traditional diplomacy and humanitarian approaches to foreign aid have been long plagued by inefficiencies in distribution, use, being prone to corruption, poor impact and perceived short and long-term benefits to countries and their populations, but especially to donors. Indeed, Collier and Dollar contend that "evidence suggested that donors had little control over how a recipient government used the finance for a particular project", unless of course it was given as materials. Naturally, scholars contend these findings:


some scholars believe that, correlated with economic development, foreign aid has, without qualification, promoted economic growth.51

Programs that directly place citizen diplomats and provide on-site skills, training and other forms of expertise are more difficult to misappropriate. The investment and focus in such programs is in human and technical capacity, mostly provided directly by the sending nation. This approach recognizes that most of the studies evaluating the impact of foreign aid have based their evaluation on direct correlation between direct foreign aid (economic development assistance, direct and indirect foreign investment and military assistance) with the change in GDP per capita.

Citizen diplomats: functions
Existing literature on citizen diplomats and diplomacy focuses on the role of citizens in taking action locally especially in the area of peace-making. Pratt writes that "the citizen diplomat today is more sensitive to the needs of visiting leaders and has more expertise in receiving them."52 Pratt further writes that, "these guests include students, doctors, businessmen, judges, diplomats, engineers, social workers, [and] writers; short-term visitors are here for a period of weeks or months."53

The citizen diplomat label can be applied to the millions of American citizens who visit foreign countries as tourists, conduct business or are stationed in near and far-

---


53 Ibid., 98.
abroad in military capacities. Their duties, objectives, intentions, interactions with locals and length of stay depend on their roles; however, apart from tourists, these citizens serve limited US foreign policy goals. This is where the international volunteers are located.

While this definition emphasizes unofficial contacts as the defining factor in the interaction, the definition I propose to use bridges these unofficial contacts with 'public diplomacy', where the 'unofficial contacts' are often state-sanctioned (for example, humanitarian assistance, social and economic development and volunteer programs (US Peace Corps) where public diplomacy is conducted by 'private individuals' partly in support of official foreign policy goals. This study holds that "citizen diplomacy" is semi-official or official contacts between individuals and non-governmental entities within different nations, carried out by private individuals on altruistic basis, in which aspects of formal and public diplomacy are transmitted.

Citizen diplomats are instrumental in furthering the humanitarian and foreign policy paradigms of source countries. In the farewell address to the first Peace Corps Volunteer group, President Kennedy intimated as much: "and if you can impress them with your commitment, to freedom, to the advancement of the interests of people everywhere, to your pride in your country and its best traditions, and what it stands for, the influence may be far-reaching."\textsuperscript{54}

International volunteers serve in different capacities in the countries where they serve: they work as educators, with youth and community development, health, business and information and communication technology, agriculture, environment, HIV/AIDS.

food security and different occasions. They operate within frameworks often proposed and implemented by recipient countries and in line with national social and economic development goals. The extent of their involvement or efficacy of volunteers' actions towards their presumed goals have not been measured and are sometimes contra to the recipient country or the sending country's goals. However, I assume that their actions support the goal of poverty eradication and that at some level, their work is successful.

This volunteerism abroad is inextricably interwoven with national narratives, with the concept of what a nation is. The United States has a high rate of volunteering, with an average of 20 per cent of its residents volunteering local in any given year. The support for international volunteering for example the expansion of the Peace Corps is often linked with volunteerism within the United States. For example, on 1st April, 2011, President Obama signed The Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act, which reauthorized and reformed the national service laws.

This act, passed with bipartisan congressional support, demonstrated support for public diplomacy programs, especially the AmeriCorps program with the creation of five new service programs including the Clean Energy, Education, Healthy Futures, Veterans Service and Opportunity Corps. The other significance of this legislation is the formal recognition of September 11, 2001, the then-tenth anniversary of the attacks in Washington DC, Pennsylvania and New York as the "National Service and Remembrance Day", illustrating the connection between non-traditional public diplomacy and the national consciousness.

---


Projects undertaken by citizen diplomats abroad support a range of functions, from poverty eradication to education, health, agriculture, small business development, social and technical capacity building. As relates to international development, in his discussion on causes and strategies for escaping the trap of poverty, economist Jeffery Sachs attributes poverty’s existence to the idea that "poor people do not save enough, so that physical capital accumulation fails to keep up with depreciation and population growth". The lack of savings is also, according to Sachs, evident in human capital. This view has been prevalent since 1940's, and has suggested that foreign assistance is one of the most viable ways of breaking this trap.\footnote{William Easterly. “Reliving the 1950s: The Big Push, Poverty Traps, and Takeoffs in Economic Development.” \textit{Journal of Economic Growth}, 11, No. 4 (Dec., 2006): 294.} International volunteering provides especially the technical capacity and volunteers who work in critical areas whose improvement could significantly reduce poverty.

Citizen diplomats often they bring special skills gained through academic training, political activism and civic participation in their countries of origin. These skills include community organizing, participating in, and encouraging democratic processes for example in the selection of a village development project. Citizen diplomacy also takes the form of peace-making, resolving conflicts and bridging cultural barriers on taboo subjects and long-entrenched practices, thereby causing shifts in paradigms. This approach is supported by literature on the role citizen diplomats, either as direct practitioners or as facilitators. Bernards, for example, writes that 

with support from the (US-based) Center for Strategic Initiatives of Women, women in the Horn of Africa have received training in conflict-resolution skills, learning from South African trainers in particular. Peace centers in villages in
Sudan and Somalia are staffed by trusted indigenous women leaders who help to resolve intertribal conflicts before they become violent confrontations.\textsuperscript{58}

Citizen diplomacy as a third arm of foreign assistance is often removed from formal channels of diplomacy. It is difficult to perceive a citizen diplomat promising a sixth grade English student in a Cameroonian classroom some benefit if they are supportive of their US foreign policy. On the other hand, Kuziemko and Werker write that rent-seeking within formal diplomacy, particularly in decision-making bodies such as the UN Security Council, is rife. "Indeed, the United States reported issued 'promises of rich rewards' to rotating members of the UN Security Council in exchange for their support during the run-up to the 2003 invasion of Iraq."\textsuperscript{59} The average increase in the amounts of foreign aid benefits for UN Security Council rotating membership includes fifty nine percent increase in aid from the US and an eight percent increase from the UN.\textsuperscript{60}

It is important to restate the aim of this research: the dissertation evaluates the impact of the citizen diplomacy on host countries' alignment of preferences with those of the United States, as measured by the frequency of voting in congruence with the US at the United Nations General Assembly. The selected indicator for citizen diplomacy is the US Peace Corps Volunteers (PCVs). PCVs, with the financial and logistical backing of the US government through the State Department and embassies abroad, serve in a number of foreign countries in social and economic development capacity. This research


\textsuperscript{60} Ibid., 907.
is informed by the limited empirical evidence that the volunteers are promoting a better understanding of Americans among the people around the world the volunteers serve.

Concluding thoughts on citizen diplomacy

The foregoing discussion structured the debate on citizen diplomacy through international volunteering, especially where a state applies its resources to advancing national interests through individual cultural exchanges between its citizens and foreign nation(al)s. The research expanded the definition of citizen diplomacy through careful synthesis of tracks four, six, seven and eight of Multi-Track Diplomacy (MTD). This section recast citizen diplomacy by studying the definitions, practices, logistics, and some citizen diplomats’ outcomes, and their effect on foreign citizens and inter-state relations.

Citizen diplomacy is heavily influenced by social and economic development functions carried out by altruistic individuals, in foreign countries. However, this research has demonstrated that, while volunteers may volunteer to fulfill an altruistic desire to do good, one can hypothesize their service has other unintended outcomes that nevertheless serve national interests. Also, that a different class of volunteers exists, whose motivations and funding is directly supported by serving the national interest, for example spreading democracy. Finally, many states—not just the United States—actively pursue non-traditional strategies of diplomacy, which include international volunteering with state backing and funding.

The section further challenged the idea that citizen diplomacy is limited to actions where Americans host foreign nationals visiting the United States. The section redefines citizen diplomacy as any official and/or unofficial contacts between individuals acting on
behalf of, or with support and funding from a foreign government in support of specific and strategic foreign policy options. This expanded definition allows us to apply known concepts (diplomacy) to an expanding corps of individuals and activities undertaken with support of the government, and which differs from the traditional conduct of diplomacy by consular officials. This is the definition this chapter and the rest of the study use.

**Definition of terms**

*Soft power*

An amorphous, non-specific concept, the modern, widely applied definition of soft power was first cast in the present terms of the debate by Joseph Nye, in the 1990's. Nye defined soft power in terms of “mutual attraction”, and “shaping others preferences to align with one's own.” Nye's definition of soft power is further discussed in this section; however, it is important to think of soft power and its origins, and whether soft power is a new concept or one that is as old as society itself.

**Soft power: new wine in old wineskins?**

While the term “soft power” was first used in 1990 by Nye, questions remain over whether or not soft power is a new concept or whether it has only been recently defined in these explicit terms. This section interrogates this question, and finds consensus that the practice of soft power is not a new phenomenon, but the term itself is. Some scholars insist that soft power and its practice is new; for example, in discussing Russia's soft power in the Brookings Brief "Moscow Discovers Soft Power". Hill argues that since 2000, Russia’s greatest contribution to the security and stability of its vulnerable southern tier has not been through its military presence on bases, its
troop deployments, or security pacts and arms sales. Rather, it has been through absorbing the surplus labor of regional states, providing markets for their goods, and transferring funds in the form of remittances (rather than foreign aid). Migration to Russia has become the region’s safety valve.\(^{61}\)

Hill implies that Russia's soft power may have begun in 2001, arguing that "after 2001, Putin began paying more attention to foreign policy. In conjunction with his carefully planned overtures to the United States, he put an end to the freewheeling and chaotic foreign policy of the Yeltsin period" by seeking to exert its influence on the former Soviet Republics. Hill evidences Russia's perceived beginning of leveraging of soft power by pointing to a 2004 meeting of Russia's ambassadors where Moscow's leadership noted that "Russia had not yet learned to use 'sufficiently well the historical credit of trust and friendship, the close ties that link the peoples of our countries'— in other words Russia’s soft power resources."\(^{62}\) However, other scholars write of soft power terms of countries influencing others through several approaches, and this view of non-military influence holds even before the modern, Westphalian state system.

The origin of the definition and the concept of soft power can be best understood by parsing the definition of power even before it is divvied up into soft and hard power. Scholars have widely defined power—especially in international relations—as the ability of one country or actor to get a second country or actor to do what they otherwise wouldn't do; that is, compulsion or persuasion. The preoccupation with power is almost retroactive: Lentner notes that "power is the central concept in the international politics
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literature of the post-World War II period." It is clear that power did not suddenly emerge in the post-World War II period; rather, the study of the phenomenon of the relationships between states attracted more attention and study post-World War I and II. However, the same is true for the entire political science discipline.

According to Lentner, Morgenthau first defined power in the 1970's as "a psychological relationship of control of an exercise and the one controlled." He further distinguished political power as inclusive of "the threat to use physical violence." Power of the military kind has been widely used to conceptualize relations between states, and their dominance thereof. There is a scholastic merging of power, the state and hegemony, that is, a hegemon is a state that has mostly military power over and above all other states in the same system. Claude, for example, defines power as "essentially military capability – the elements which contribute directly to the capacity to coerce, kill and destroy."

The definition of power subsequently attracted distinctions between its theoretical definitions and its practical applications. For example, Knorr (1973) considered coercive influence to be power, but added capabilities (the means to the intended goal) and outcomes which he characterized as putative / actualized power. Other definitions of power included its dimensions (weight, scope and domain), reciprocation of power
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(weaker and stronger parties) and capabilities and control. Truitt restates power's core definition and its dimensions thus: "total capabilities of a state to gain desired ends vis-à-vis other states; these capabilities which are also types of power are political, economic, diplomatic, propaganda, and most importantly, military power."67

To arrive at the idea of soft power, it is important to reconsider the idea of a pseudo-paradigm change: one that recognized that power, defined in terms of military and material capabilities, was necessary but not sufficient. The definition of the additional sources of influence between states can then be seen in what Vasquez refers to as the paradigm as exemplar, that is, the notion that scientific education aims to "solve problems."68 By solving problems to which answers are already known, students gain the ability to solve current and new problems.

This analysis can be applied to the problem of defining power in international relations: if scholars could define power (as a mix of capabilities, means and outcomes), they could then apply the same objectivity to think about influence between and from countries that did not necessarily involve material and military means. Their influence was driven (or propagated) by changes and growth in new technologies, ideologies and interactions such as cultural and interpersonal connections, thereby necessitating new thinking old problems influenced by novel ways of resolving them.

The concept of soft power, therefore, stems from the iteration of the form and function of power. Just as states interacted with each other and capabilities that included political, economic, diplomatic and military influence over other countries, I argue that


they also had the capacity to influence others through non-military means, such as diplomacy, trade, culture, sports, entertainment, ideology and similar avenues.

Soft power then was not necessarily isolated, or identified as a way that one country exerted influence over another. One of the reasons therefore is the timeline of the development of these avenues; for example, global sports (such as the Olympics) were not widespread until the early 20th century; neither was film or radio. To the extent that scholarship had not quite studied or separated the independent studies of the effect of such non-traditional approaches to international relations and identified them as having utility in statecraft, these activities had not been formally defined as soft power. Yet, there is evidence that even without the specific definition as soft power, the application of these influencers was on-going. Examples of the recognition and utility of soft power are numerous and include, for example, countries' competition in sports such as the World Cup, the Olympics, growth of the entertainment industry and the widespread appreciation of artifacts of the Renaissance, music, tourism and today, the internet.

Predating these more modern notions and expressions of soft power, scholarship shows that even in pre-modern state, kingdoms, bishoprics and principalities recognized the limitations of military power and sought to use other means to influence areas they ruled or intended to rule. Neal, for example, writes that "Mercian power in early Anglo-Saxon England (about 600-800 AD) rested on at least three principal strategies and their ancillaries: these encompassed political, military and economic spheres – and included such principals as the annexation of neighboring polities, a broad and integrated military infrastructure and economic policies."69

Even Nye acknowledges that soft power's definition may be new, but the concept it defines, the very condition it seeks to articulate, is not new. Nye notes that "the behavior it (soft power) denotes is as old as human history. It is implicit in Lao-Tzu's comment that a leader is best not when people obey his commands, but when they barely know he exists. In eighteenth-century Europe, the spread of French language and culture enhanced French power."\(^{70}\)

Nye recently reiterated this belief that soft power is has often been used in conjunction with, and often in the place of military conquest. Nye asserts that as an example of how countries leverage cultural (in this case, the French language) assets to supplement military capabilities, France began to establish the Alliance Français Institutes in foreign countries in the 1880's shortly after France lost the Franco-Prussian war. Germany, according to Nye, followed suit with the establishment of the Goethe Institute, the survivor to Deutsche Akademie, a Weimar Republic institution.\(^{71}\)

It is important to restate that while most scholarship on the history of soft power and mutual attraction contends that it is positive, the limitations of soft power's promise and ability has been noted by its very proponent of soft power. Nye observes the criticism that has been leveled against soft power, that "armies weren't stopped by even the deepest cultural affinity."\(^{72}\)
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Contemporary scholarship on soft power

Nye, defining soft power in contemporary international relations, writes that "the type of resources associated with soft power often include intangible factors such as institutions, ideas, values, culture and the perceived legitimacy of policies." Nye points to the dual application and interchangeability of the resources available to one power to the opposite power; for example, "the US Navy's help in providing relief to Indonesia after the 2004 East Asian Tsunami had a strong effect on increasing Indonesians' attraction to the United States" while the US Navy's 2007 maritime strategy referred to "maritime forces employed to build confidence and trust among nations."74

Nye differentiated between "hard power" and other aspects of power. He articulated this difference as "command power"—hard power—with its "tangible resources like military and economic strength."75 He defined soft power as "co-optive power", or being "getting others to want what you want";76 its main characteristics include "culture, ideology and institutions."

Li defines soft power as a function of its application, arguing that "soft power does not exist in the nature of certain resources of power, but rather it has to be nurtured through a soft use of power."77 This definition tends towards the application, not the defining constituent elements of power, although Li acknowledges the more Nye's more
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contemporary conceptualization of soft power, writing that "soft power is demonstrated in attraction, persuasion, appeal, and co-optation."\(^{78}\)

Fuller and Sondhaus reflect on Matthew Fraser’s assertion that “American hard power is necessary to maintain global stability; American soft power—movies, pop music, fast food, fashions, theme parks—spreads, validates and reinforces common norms, values, beliefs and lifestyles. Hard power threatens; soft power seduces. Hard power dissuades, soft power persuades."\(^{79}\) Sondhaus summarizes soft power as “all aspects of power beyond military and economic measures.”\(^{80}\) Peter van Ham’s definition of “social power” mirrors the constituent elements of "soft power", he writes that "social power (is) based on non-coercive mechanisms, structures and processes."\(^{81}\) Given these conceptions, citizen diplomacy tends more towards the non-military, non-forceful and often non-traditional definition of power and influence.

**Hard power**

Hard power can be broadly defined as actor A getting actor B to do what actor A wants by leveraging economic and military capabilities, and at an accepcost to an actor that would otherwise be disinclined to act. Specifically, Van Ham defines "hard power based on coercive measures – be they economic or military in nature."\(^{82}\) Further, he writes that

\(^{78}\) Ibid.
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"military power is visible and mediagenic (battleships are moved, and shots fired, oftentimes live on TV)."  

This definition is likewise articulated by Nye, who argues that "military power and economic power are both examples of 'hard' command power that can be used to get others to change their position. Hard power can rest on inducements (carrots) or threats (sticks)."  

The principal proponent of soft power differentiated hard power from soft power by suggesting a spectrum of power, from hard or command power to co-option / attraction / soft power. Nye writes that "the types of resources associated with hard power include tangibles such as force and money."  

Mearsheimer observes generally that "power is based on the particular material capabilities that a state possesses and is derived from latent sources—socio-economic ingredients that help build the military power and the actual military that is built through the socio-economic ingredients such as population, wealth, size, money, technology, skilled personnel. Mearsheimer takes the view that "hard power is the "function of a state's military forces and how they compare with the military forces of rival states" constitutes effective power."  

Although scholars have attempted to differentiate between hard power and soft power, Koenig-Archipugi and Held view power as a continuous spectrum, much like  
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Nye’s concept of power. They argue that, "hard power and soft power are two sides of the same coin." They further write that "there is no soft power without hard power. But there is also no hard power without soft power." Li writes that "hard power is evident in the practices of threat, coercion, sanction, payment and inducement." Li, however, adds that "hard power is not always uses for coercion, threat, intimidation, and inducement. Hard power can also produce attraction, appeal, and amity in certain circumstances." The concept of power – hard and soft – will be debated long past the scholarship here; however, it is important to differentiate between hard and soft power. This dissertation concerns itself with the soft power aspect of power.

**Overview of the dissertation**

This dissertation is presented in six chapters, which are divided as follows: in chapter 1, an introduction to the research is presented. The definition of key terms, for example citizen diplomacy, soft power and hard power, are outlined. In chapter 2, the research outlines the theoretical framework in which the research is grounded. The theoretical framework outlines the major theories that explain foreign policy making, and thus support the placement of citizen diplomats in foreign countries as part of especially the United States’ soft power approach to foreign policy. The theories discussed in this
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For each approach, the research seeks to answer the question, "does the approach hypothesize that citizen diplomacy will affect a target country’s foreign policy?" Chapter 2 concludes with an overview of the critical gaps in literature. Chapter 3 develops twelve test hypotheses, loosely grouped based on the four models that the quantitative research design uses. These four groups are: the omnibus model (all variables), the bilateral attraction factors (factors between the US and the recipient country), the host country variables (variables or attributes found specifically within the recipient country) and finally, the temporal and regional effects.

Chapter 4 outlines the methodology used to evaluate the efficacy of citizen diplomacy. It discusses the difference between – and justifies – the use of both qualitative and quantitative statistical methods. It also discusses the rational for choosing a mixed-methods approach. It discusses each of the qualitative and quantitative sections of the study, the study variables, variable coding and the sources of data.

The chapter also specifies data treatment procedures, including missing data and data for countries that did not exist until, for example, 1991 when the Soviet Union broke up and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) came into being, or the breakup of Yugoslavia into several independent republics. It outlines the operationalization of variables, presents the groups of variables and explains study sample. It discusses statistical issues including collinearity, heteroscedasticity and their treatment.

Chapter 5 of the research tests the quantitative hypotheses based on the four models and also based on the two primary sources of data. It then discusses the findings.
from the statistical regressions. It discusses whether the findings support the primary hypothesis that citizen diplomacy positively correlates with foreign policy behavior of the country in which they serve, towards the US as shown through congruent voting at the United Nations General Assembly. Chapter 6 examines the perceived qualitative impacts that citizen diplomacy has on the recipient countries by studying elites' statements and evidence of the efficacy of citizen diplomacy as reported by the recipient country.

The qualitative section of the dissertation develops three models: issue linkages model, the interpersonal model and the foreign policy approach model, based on case studies of where citizen diplomacy has had outcomes measurable through non-qualitative methods. In each of the models, a case study is discussed. The cases are Ethiopia (issue linkages model), Peru (interpersonal model) and Tanzania (foreign policy model). The chapter's findings supplement those of the quantitative statistical regressions in determining that citizen diplomacy is positively correlated with congruent voting and therefore, influences foreign policy behavior towards the US.

Chapter 7, the conclusion and discussion chapter, first reviews and then summarizes the findings. It discusses the implications of the findings for policy and scholarship, highlights the contributions of the dissertation to the literature on soft power, citizen diplomacy and the foreign policy fields. It then suggests potential applications of the findings, including citizen diplomacy's provision of a plausible path to the future of soft power and mutual attraction, through the influence of citizen diplomats.

The chapter provides caveats to the risk of generalizing the utility of citizen diplomacy, and argues that other factors can account for the foreign policy behavior of foreign states towards the US. It also suggests directions for future research and in-depth
studies of how citizen diplomacy affects the foreign policy views of target communities, and the transference of hypothesized effects through citizen-elite interactions and onto the inter-governmental bilateral interactions.
CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction and chapter organization

This chapter provides a framework for evaluating the processes and key approaches to foreign policy making. By understanding these approaches and processes, the study sets the parameters for evaluating how international volunteering can affect foreign policy preferences in the volunteer recipient countries and cause (re)alignment with the volunteer-sending country at the international level. The important question here is: (how) does citizen diplomacy affect the foreign policy preferences of the host countries and cause them to align with those of the sending country?

The chapter discusses four foreign policy making theoretical frameworks: the domestic audience approach, elite theory, the citizen participation approaches and emerging approaches such as the foreign policy approach. The chapter also discusses the sources of negative and positive incentives for countries' and elites' foreign policy choices given different political systems. It focuses on citizen diplomats, who work for and on behalf of the state as they fulfill their own altruistic goals.

Next, the chapter situates these arguments within the soft power literature. It argues that citizen participation -- and to some extent domestic audiences' involvement -- in foreign affairs illustrates the importance of soft power as a tool for statecraft. The chapter then examines the concepts of volunteering, synthesizing international volunteering as a foreign policy function in the tradition of soft power. The chapter concludes by identifying the literature gaps and sets the stage for the methodology.
chapter, which will discuss how to measure the effect of citizen diplomacy on state behavior, as specified in chapter 1 and theoretically located in chapter 2.

Foreign policy making processes

The process of foreign policy making is little understood by voting publics, citizens, and individuals outside the elite political class. It is often unresolved who, in a country's political structures, influences foreign policy most and to what degree. One difference is found in democratic countries where citizens participate in foreign policy making through the selection of their representatives to legislative bodies, which then have either direct roles in, or oversight over foreign policy. In democratic systems of government, the persons/institutions in authority determine the character of foreign policy, often with the oversight and potential consequences from the citizens on whose behalf they act.

Although conventional international relations theories place a premium on how the system influences how states act especially towards others, governments' internal structure shape states interests. Domestic audiences hold regimes accountable and are therefore an important consideration in foreign policy making. After internally formulating their interests and preferences, the articulation of these interests and preferences to the outside world occurs through states' foreign policy. Foreign policy "signaling" addresses external audiences, articulating the state's interests. George affirms this, arguing that "the foreign policy of a nation addresses itself not to the external world, as is commonly stated, but rather to 'the image of the external world' that is in the minds of those who make foreign policy."¹

Foreign policy reflects a country's strategic interests and generally articulates to foreign publics the originating country's core values. A practical example of this reflection—Truman's doctrine regarding aid to Greece and Turkey with the goal of constraining the spread of communism—was the beginning of the 'containment policy'. It reflected not only a strategic decision to advance US economic, security and socio-cultural interest, but also American values of individual freedoms, democratic governance and the advancement of a capitalist economic system. These were values the US had fought to preserve in Europe during World War II. Almost half a century later, President George H. W. Bush's statement that "this aggression shall not stand" with reference to the 1990 Iraqi invasion of Kuwait reflected a similar exposition of values.

US foreign policy and the national interest

Foreign policy is a function of expression towards other countries of those issues that define a country, a people, and reflects the interests that a particular country has, often thought of as the national interest. Defining the national interest is an arduous task: no one issue by itself defines the national interest. The Commission on America's National Interests outlines five components of US national interests:

Prevent, deter, and reduce the threat of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons attacks on the United States or its military forces abroad; ensure US allies' survival and their active cooperation with the US in shaping an international system in which we can thrive; prevent the emergence of hostile major powers or failed states on US borders; ensure the viability and stability of major global systems (trade, financial markets, supplies of energy, and the environment); and establish productive relations, consistent with American national interests, with...
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nations that could become strategic adversaries, China and Russia.¹

Krasner provides a less specific definition of the national interest, describing it as "a set of roles and institutions having peculiar drives, compulsions and aims of their own that are separate and distinct from the interests of any particular societal group...associated with either general material objectives or with ambitious ideological goals related to beliefs about how societies should be ordered."⁵ The national interest can also be defined as "the preferences of American central decision-makers" and they must be "related to general societal goals, persist over time and have a consistent ranking of importance."⁶

According to Trubowitz, it can be defined by "those societal interests who have the power to work within the political system (i.e., maneuver in federal institutions and the party system to build winning coalitions) to translate their preferences into policy."⁷

Scholars have frequently attempted to define the national interest exclusive of in-state dynamics such as systems of governance, or sources of "interests". Krasner disagrees with this view, arguing that "the fundamental problem for political analysis is to identify the underlying social structure and the political mechanisms through which particular group determine the governments behavior...the state does not have objectives that cannot ultimately be understood in terms of societal wants and needs."⁸
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The definition of the US national interest also has continuously changed to reflect changes in US domestic interests, US interactions with the rest of the world and in world order. Containing the spread of communism is no longer the most pertinent objective; the primary objective was democratization and the spread of freedom especially to newly free countries. This shift was articulated by the-then Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice stating that "we recognize that democratic state building is now an urgent component of our national interest. And in the broader Middle East, we recognize that freedom and democracy are the only ideas that can, over time, lead to just and lasting stability, especially in Afghanistan and Iraq." This view has been similarly articulated equally by Democratic and Republican administrations; "foreign policy...will proceed from the firm ground of the national interest, not from the interests of an illusory international community. America can exercise power without arrogance and pursue its interests – in concert with those who share its core values – the world becomes more prosperous, democratic and peaceful." 

Evidently, the national interest of the United States has evolved given changing geopolitical realities. When isolationism and non-involvement in foreign wars was beneficial and in the US national interest, the US went so far as outlawing war through the Kellogg-Briand Act. When non-cooperation with others was in the interests of the US, it was exploited to the fullest, for example through the Connally Amendment which conditions US cooperation with the International Court of Justice and simultaneously asserts sovereignty for the United States. The amendment provides that "the United
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States excludes from its acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court ‘disputes with regard to matters that are essentially within the jurisdiction of the United States of America, as determined by the United States of America.’”

Gradual and far-reaching changes have occurred and affected geopolitical realities in the world since the US began assuming co-leadership of the world with the Soviet Union during the Cold War and as a unipolar power in the modern, post-Cold War era. As illustrated by the discussion above, as the Commission on America’s National Interest has determined and from the policy perspectives advanced by the administration, the US approaches its National Interest pragmatically, using “traditional” and “non-traditional” tools of statecraft to meet its national interest goals articulated through its foreign policy.

The traditional tools of statecraft include military capabilities, formal diplomacy and through economic means. They include bilateral and multilateral diplomacy, through accreditation of ambassadors to foreign countries and participation in international institutions, participation in bilateral and multilateral agreements, such as NPT, START, SALT and more than 10,000 other treaties. The US utilizes economic strategies, such as trade, with membership and leadership in global and regional trade organizations such as NAFTA, WTO and extending preferential trade agreements such as AGOA.

Another traditional tool of statecraft that the US has successfully leveraged is membership in international organizations. Its participation and influence extends to the physical location of the United Nations, membership and funding of its programs and


funds, financial contribution to these organization and provision of loans, bilateral and multilateral aid through national and multilateral institutions such as USAID, UNDP, World Bank, IMF, IBRD, IDA and others. US membership and leadership in security alliances and security communities such as NATO, ANZUS, APEC, among others, buttress a robust, unrivaled military with global reach.

The non-traditional tools of statecraft have been recast as soft power. Soft power encompasses those aspects of country A that make country B align its interests with those of A through attraction, rather than through coercion. These soft power variables include culture, ideology and institutions.\(^\text{13}\) Within culture, ideology and institutions are concepts such as democracy, individual freedoms, elections, sports, entertainment, films, fashion, civil society and participation in government. The attraction largely occurs outside of traditionally established government structures: through non-profit organizations, the media and cultural vignettes such as books, movies, sports activities, exchange, tourism, international volunteering and other person-to-person contacts.

While they are only a part of the whole soft power spectrum, person-to-person contacts can transmit aspects of soft power such as ideas about democracy, beliefs, religion, cultural practices, sports, and starting and participating in different non-profit organizations from the volunteers originating from country A to the recipients in country B. This is one of the assumptions that the Peace Corps, a government program and agency, makes by listing “helping promote a better understanding of Americans on the part of the peoples served”\(^\text{14}\) as its second goal. There is an implied correlation between


person-to-person contacts and the product of these interactions being somehow related to how foreign publics' view the United States and to its foreign policy.

There are a number of assumptions that this study makes. First, that government supported international volunteering is significantly different from individual volunteering, can be characterized as citizen diplomacy, and serves some function for the government or extracts some benefit to its benefit. Secondly, international volunteering, the person-to-person contacts, have the capacity to transmit soft power ideas, such as ideology, that make the US attractive.

Thirdly, that while the US government's placement of international volunteers may be altruistic, there is an obvious foreign policy function to state-supported international volunteering. Fourth, that there is a mechanism by which the transmission of soft power ideas to the recipients affects the way the US is perceived by that country and that perception is presumably expressed at the national leadership level as support for the United States and its policies.

Finally, it assumes that while there are many disparate expressions of mutual attraction including bilateral and multilateral relationships, one way to measure the mutual attraction imparted by citizen diplomats is whether the outcomes of citizen diplomacy can be discerned and measured as an expression of support for US foreign policy in international institutions. This approach classifies state-supported international volunteering as citizen diplomacy, and thereby investigates its effect and thus the effectiveness of soft power as a foreign policy approach.
Theoretical frameworks

The major theoretical frameworks that this dissertation uses are the domestic audiences, elite theory, citizen participation approaches and the emerging foreign policy approaches. Theoretical frameworks are those approaches, theories or well-grounded generalizations that allow a researcher to consider phenomenon and to best explain why the problem exists; they serve as a basis for conducting research. Among other functions, theoretical frameworks allow a research to see clearly the variables of the study, that is, those consequential events that might explain the phenomenon under study, provide the researcher with a general framework for data analysis and helps to lay the groundwork and justification for the use of descriptive and experimental methods.

The paradox of approaches to the viability of citizen diplomacy is well articulated by Converse, who writes that there is little consistency among the public's foreign policy attitudes. Citizen diplomats in the mold of the US Peace Corps Volunteers are purported to serve US foreign policy interests, especially through promotion of a positive view of America(ns) on the part of the communities served. Yet, Peace Corps Volunteers have the most contact with individuals who are hypothesized to have the least influence or knowledge of foreign policy issues – the masses – and whose attitudes exhibit a lack of consistency or knowledge about important foreign policy issues. Conversely, PCVs have relatively little contact with the elites who have the greatest sway on foreign policy. Some approaches, including elite theory and citizen approaches suggest, then, that (a) citizen diplomats should have little effect on a host country’s foreign policy; and (b) the
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Peace Corps program is predicated on an understanding of foreign policy-making that is at best naïve, and at worst theoretically unsound.

This research explores four major theoretical approaches to the study of citizen diplomacy. These are the domestic audience costs approach, which argues for rewards and punishment for foreign policy behavior on the principal by the domestic audiences; elite theory, arguing that elites, rather than citizens, manage the affairs of a country, including foreign policy; and citizen participation, which suggests that citizens are actively involved in the formulation of policies, including foreign policy. It also looks at the impact of emerging approaches, such as foreign policy approaches, and finally examines what ‘soft power’ approaches contend is an emerging, viable approach to foreign policy that complements the traditional ‘hard power’ approach.

**Domestic audiences and their costs**

Domestic audiences are considered to be the sources of a government’s authority over its citizens. Domestic audiences can impose ‘costs’, that is, take actions in support or punishment of a leader or government for selected courses of actions domestically and in international affairs. Fearon hypothesizes that in most countries’ political systems there are potential consequences to leaders for selecting courses of action they negotiate with regard to contending positions in international interactions. Interactions such as citizen diplomacy can be perilous at a domestic audience level, especially if a country is grappling with fiscal crises or terrorism such as hostage-taking.

If leaders select foreign policy approaches, for example supporting immigration, free trade or disarmament and those approaches are contrary to their publics’ perceived
best interests, there is potential for 'punishment' through government selection mechanisms. Other expressions of this 'punishment' include public protests such as burning of foreign flags and extreme actions such as the Iranian hostage crisis of 1979. Fearon writes that "there is the domestic and international price for conceding the issues at stake, which is the same regardless of when concessions are made or after how much escalation. Second, there are whatever additional costs are generated in the course of the crisis itself."\(^{17}\)

Most forms of government have some domestic constituency to which they owe some or all of their legitimacy. Often such allegiance depends on the constitution of the political system giving rise to the form of government and is especially valid in democracies. The choices governments make depend on the influence the domestic audience has in the selection, deselection, incentivization and punishment of leaders. Democracies, the "rule by the people" generate the highest domestic audience costs,\(^{18}\) peaceful conflict resolution\(^{19}\), alliance reliability\(^{20}\), economic sanctions\(^{21}\), trade agreement


compliance\textsuperscript{22}, and international cooperation.\textsuperscript{23} Democracies are of different shades and organization, with differing degrees of costs imposed by audiences.

Putnam essentially makes this argument in evaluating the 1978 Bonn Summit and the varied concessions that participants eventually extracted given their audience costs. The concessions, while not necessarily optimal for negotiators, their constituents and the opposite negotiating actors, were the best in the circumstances: "key governments at Bonn adopted policies different from those that they would have pursued in the absence of international negotiations – agreement was possible only because a powerful minority within each government actually favored on domestic grounds the policy being demanded internationally."\textsuperscript{24}

The key consideration in the decisions that leaders make is articulated by Slantchev. Slantchev argues that "if the principal [citizens] could design a 'wage contract' for the foreign policy agent [leader], the principal would want to commit to punishing the agent for escalating a crisis and then backing down – principals who conduct foreign policy themselves may not be able credibly to commit to self-imposed punishment (such as leaving power) for backing down in a crisis."\textsuperscript{25} This explanation validates Putnam's appraisal of the Bonn Summit of 1978, providing one of the strongest
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arguments for the contemplation that governments value their citizens’ perceptions and evaluation of their foreign policy choices.

The previous argument can be reversed and applied to domestic audience costs. In a democracy, the “principals” can theoretically punish their leader for taking a position contrary to their perceived best interests unlike in non-democratic countries. If citizens have a particular preference for their leader’s commitment to a certain course of action and the leader fails to meet that commitment, costs will be extracted by the electorate at the next opportunity (elections). The audience costs for international actions are generated by different governance systems. For example, in democracies, which select their leaders through periodic elections, the incentive and punishments will differ from the costs to technocratic systems - rule by scientists and intellectuals, or from theocratic systems, which are based on religious law. So too, will they differ from those in a monarchy / aristocracy (rule by royalty / kings / queens / princes), as they will differ amongst military governments, whose domestic audience may be the soldiers, or to kleptocratic rulers who may incur no consequences at all.

In other systems of government such as communism, the formulation of foreign policy may is often managed by party apparatchik, or councils, not answerable to the citizens, but to central party organs and to militaries. The fundamental element in all these systems, as Dalton points out, is that they “engaged the public in the political process.” Except for communist systems, engagement “primarily served as a means to socialize and mobilize the populace. Even in authoritarian regimes, the citizenry has wants and needs that they hope the government will address.”26 Where foreign policy

options are not optimum in any one government's favor, or where interdependence across any number of fields necessitates some form of collective rather than unilateral action, international regimes (agreements, negotiations) are necessary, and the audience costs that will potentially be generated influence the position taken in the bargain.

*Domestic audiences and citizen diplomacy*

Domestic audiences are invested in the government apparatus that implement foreign policy by supporting different programs and initiatives, for example increased immigration or opening up to trade. Citizen diplomacy, as previously discussed, constitutes a "soft-power strategy" and an "ideational approach to foreign policy", where ideas and impacts can be formulated and "sustained through institutionalization" for further transmission. The successful institutionalization of ideas requires continuity and a perception by the public that they are effective.

In democracies, domestic audiences shape state foreign policy preferences through election of representatives, who then form governments. Governments formulate and implement foreign policy among other aspects of governance such as service on important budgetary allocation committees. Elected representatives through committees and the budgetary process determine program funding; in the example of the US, the Peace Corps, the premier vehicle for articulation of citizen diplomacy has through its existence received bipartisan support and funding from both major political parties.

Domestic audiences act in concert in forms of lobbies, testify before committees and legislators or exert influence through free press. Domestic audience support of citizen diplomacy and the crafting of foreign policy is evidenced by the Peace Corps, which has received bipartisan support and funding.

---

diplomacy is therefore measurable and in the case of the Peace Corps, sustained. Through their actions, public outreach programs, achievements and experiences of returned citizen diplomats, programs that promote citizen diplomacy provide impetus for the bureaucracy that promotes their placement to further its goals as an institutional survival mechanism, and as a foreign policy option. The interactive nature of this relationship is articulated by Drezner who writes that "for it is then that an idea, however morally powerful and however authentically grounded in the national political epistemology, encounters the instruments, the forces, and the fallible (or obstreperous) human beings who implement (or thwart) foreign policy programs."^{28}

In the recipient countries, there is often heightened interest in citizen diplomats, since the recipients stand to gain from citizen diplomat-supported initiatives and development programs. Since citizen diplomats conceivably produce positive outcomes in the communities they serve, there is ongoing support for their continued placement. It is plausible too, that the recipients would lobby to have more citizen diplomats placed and either reward the government for facilitating their placement, or punish it for the withdrawal of citizen diplomats.

The domestic audience paradigm by itself does not explain how or whether citizen diplomats influence foreign publics towards a positive view of the US and thereby cause the recipient nations to vote congruent with the US in international organizations.

_Elite theory_

Scholarship has identified a political, economic and intellectual class that controls the critical economic, governance and foreign policy functions of a country. In considering
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^{28} Ibid., 733.
elite theory as an explainan for foreign policy making, this research identifies contrary incentives for elites for requesting, placing and supporting citizen diplomats. Citizen diplomats provide positive benefits for elites, in the form of a good reputation where their volunteer work flourishes. There are also positive, tangible development benefits for the recipient communities for cooperating with citizen diplomats, which may free government resources and personnel to be deployed to other areas of the country.

There are potentially negative benefits associated with citizen diplomacy. If citizen diplomats are engaged in civic education, capacity-building, and resource management their success may challenge prevailing non-democratic regime governance. Their success in community mobilization, civic education and democratization potentially equips citizens with civic-mindedness, teaches skills such as community organizing, rights agitation, thereby undermining government influence and potentially raises credible opposition to governance. From this perspective, the elite theory approach to foreign policy making would suggest that citizen diplomats ought to have negligible influence due to the contrary incentives.

The literature on elites controlling functions of societies is well documented. Knocke argues that "debate about state structures and processes fundamentally revolves around the existence of a cohesive ruling class, which effectively dominates all the major decisions made by government officials." Functionally, these elites are located positionally (placement in the system), decisionally (participation in making or influencing decisions), reputationally (believed to be knowledgeable and have actual or potential power) and relationally (importance of relationships maintained with other
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actors).\textsuperscript{30} All these variables combine to give elites "influence" over a polity's critical systems and governmental functions.

Cypher writes that "influence occurs when one actor provides information to another with the intention of altering the latter's actions" which leads to "actors who are well connected to other informed actors gain[ing] power through their positional ability to tap into larger stores of useful political information."\textsuperscript{31} Logically, actors neither connected to the central network nor with ties to the influential persons, are "in uniformed, hence un-influential locations"\textsuperscript{32} but providing information has the potential to increase levels of information throughout the system.

Often, individuals in positions of influence exert domination not only of the subjects and other non-influential network actors, but also of collective preferences, since any negative consequences can be easily mitigated through the influence networks. Such influence is seen through, for example, "the efforts of US and Mexican governments and large corporations on either side of the border to "sell" a fictitious version of Mexico to the US Public"\textsuperscript{33} in order to increase cross-border trade and gain support for the North American Free Trade Area (NAFTA), whose benefits accrue more to the elite class.

Some scholars have disputed the nature of the influence of "elites" who articulate policy through mass communication and media tools available to them such as radio, TV and newspapers. They argue that globalization has diluted the control of the 'national

\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., 273.


\textsuperscript{32} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid.
agenda' and diffused it to individuals. Yet, "evidence suggests that a growing proportion of the public is less inclined to consume 'political news'. National newspapers and broadcasting networks have seen a steady decline in their audience figures over recent decades."34 This implies that the decisions that affect the welfare of the state are left to certain groups of people who have an abiding interest in insuring certain outcomes, and the disinterest among the public makes it easier to shape a nation's preferences and present them to the 'other' as collective preferences, that is, foreign policy.

During election cycles presidential (foreign) policy debates sometimes reduce important policy questions to either/or positions, depriving stakeholder citizens of the facility to engage in robust debate on foreign policy questions. For example, Davis (2003) argues that press coverage even for elites is often relegated not to policy discussions, but to the defense of positions taken. "I had ten years in Whitehall, and 70 percent of press relations there was keeping stuff out of the papers."35 The probability of communicating unintended messages is enhanced, despite the probability that the public do not have sufficient information on foreign policy positions. The net effect of the dearth of policy discussions is the continued dominance by the elites of resources that manage public expectations and therefore, foreign policy.

Even as they “make” foreign policy, elites' perception of the world is intrinsic to the foreign policy strategies they select, in part affirming the human-sciences approach to foreign-policy analysis. For example, Dotter writes that

high-level policy-makers may not always be consciously aware of the fundamental psychological underpinnings of their attitudes, beliefs, opinions,


35 Ibid., 678.
values, perceptions, and behavior, especially how these may affect a particular decision or policy initiative. High-level policy-makers and others who may influence policy are not always entirely candid about their roles, especially in retrospective writings about possible misperceptions or mistake.36

Given the vague and incomplete information on the sources of the elites’ sum of beliefs, attitudes and values, which drive them to act on behalf of their constituents and states, or the biographical misrepresentation of the motivations that drive them to pursue certain foreign policy outcomes that affect business, culture or politics, we can theorize that as rational actors, elites act in what they believe to be the best interests of the self, their interests and those of the state, to maximize their utility under Nash equilibrium conditions and limited information. This does not always lead them to select the best foreign policy options or produce optimum outcomes for the national constituency.

Elite theory and citizen diplomacy

It can be argued that citizen diplomacy is not an important consideration in the selection of foreign policy of a country, especially by elites, given the contrary and often marginal incentives. However, exploratory citizen diplomacy qualitative research demonstrates that elites care about its impact and use citizen diplomacy to promote their role in international cooperation.

The social systems perspective suggests that elites are the owners of the means of production, determine the direction of a country’s critical sectors such including foreign
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policy and trade. Yet, good bilateral relations with the US imply that the country benefits from trade opportunities; as owners of means of production, elites benefit directly. Elites may undertake other pro-US actions, such as providing better investment climate, improving relations with the US, cooperation in US foreign policy for example in the war against terror, or entering into other beneficial arrangements such as defense alliances, which may be of greater foreign policy value than citizen diplomacy.

Elites often engage in acts of ‘public participation’ directed at the local constituencies; these include philanthropic giving such as at fundraisers, local development projects, scholarships, social and economic development and other public causes. Because citizen diplomacy can be portrayed as positive bilateral relations and as public largesse from officials to the recipient communities, it is difficult for elites to dismiss its utility. Public officials however can appeal to national sentiment to justify the exclusion of citizen diplomats from a country by alleging ‘foreign conspiracies.’ Examples of such exclusion include President Robert Mugabe’s anti-colonial arguments, or Venezuela government’s anti-American rhetoric. On a global scale, the anti-ICC protests in African countries, or anti-American sentiment in the Middle East indicate.

Contrarily, elites are interested in the success of citizen diplomacy, since as community and national leaders, they can take the credit for social and economic development resulting from citizen diplomacy. The added benefit is the improvement of bilateral relations especially where citizen diplomacy is likely to be viewed as a positive contribution by the recipient publics. For elites who must occasionally seek the consent

of the governed through elections, citizen diplomacy is compatible with the values of elite theory. On the other hand, for polities where selection of the leadership does not involve elections or some citizen expression of preferences, citizen diplomacy is not necessarily expected to influence elites' behavior towards citizens or the US except where an overriding interest to do so is identifiable.

One of the most concrete indicators of the impact of citizen diplomacy on elites is captured through the reports that accrue from different leaders of government functions at state, national, regional and local municipalities. For example, the immediate former president of Madagascar, Marc Ravalomanana suggested that;

We need Peace Corps now more than ever. We do need development and there are resources for that, but principally we need to learn how to think differently and the Peace Corps is the only group that helps with that. We need to see opportunities, not challenges. We need to find solutions, not problems. And for this we need more Peace Corps Volunteers.\(^{38}\)

In China, the following was reported: “Peace Corps Volunteers have made remarkable contributions to the English education development in Chongqing municipality. I’ve been proudly telling people that Volunteers are great!”\(^{39}\)

The impact of the citizen diplomats was more pronounced, even reported in the same definitional, outcome and operational terms under which it was started. Although elites do not always consider the implications of accepting citizen diplomats as inclusive of foreign policy, they do highlight the benefits of accepting and working with citizen diplomats such as the Peace Corps. There are instances where the government identifies these negative foreign policy / influence outcomes and proceeds to act on them. In 1971.


\(^{39}\) Fu Minghua, Standing Deputy Director of International Cooperation, Department of Chongqing Municipal Education Commission, China/ (CBJ, 2009): 96.
the Peace Corps was required to depart Bolivia "because of rising anti-US sentiment stimulated in part by the release of a popular 1969 movie, Blood of the Condor. Because some members of Bolivian society saw the Corps as an infringement on their country's sovereignty, and Bolivian President Juan Jose Torres agreed."\(^{40}\)

The presidents and public officials – the elites – may indeed be playing to the public gallery, but because they are agents of their governments who articulate (especially foreign) policy positions which are domestically and internationally representative, it is evident that citizen diplomats – in this case the US Peace Corps Volunteers – have tangible, albeit non-foreign-policy-intended outcomes in the countries and communities that they serve.

*Citizen participation*

Domestic audience costs especially in democracies have received wide consideration in political science literature. It is important to review how they affect foreign policy processes. The “domestic audience” paradigm stems primarily from democratic countries: democracy is the rule by the people. In order for "the people" to rule, Dahl set out extensive criterion for democracy with three necessary but insufficient conditions, including the provisions that, "citizens must be able to formulate their preferences, signify those preferences to fellow citizens and government through individual and collective action and have their preferences weighed [considered] equally in the conduct

---

of government without discrimination."\(^{41}\) Citizen participatory approaches are somewhat akin to the domestic audience approaches.

The electorate can be assumed to understand pertinent issues, including foreign policy issues. Any lack of interest is most certainly not functional, e.g. illiteracy or lack of media permeation. One of the most commonly operationalized requirements for the successful conduct of democracy is the availability of different sources of information and generally, these countries demonstrate high Human Development Indicators (HDI). Education and literacy is one of the constituents of the HDI index.

It is not always the case however, that citizens have the right, necessary or sufficient information to make rational choices. \textit{A priori}, the expectation that citizens have access to information and care about the issues supports Dalton’s argument that "through the initial selection of candidates and the choice between parties at elections, the public can select political leaders who represent their opinions. Citizens can also contact public officials, write letters to the media and engage in similar forms of political participation."\(^{42}\)

Dalton suggests that ideally, "for voters to make meaningful decisions, they must understand the options that the polity faces a sufficient knowledge of the working political system they intend to influence."\(^{43}\) However, increasing numbers of studies have found that


for most citizens, political interest and involvement barely seemed to extend beyond casting an occasional vote in national elections. Furthermore, citizens apparently brought very little understanding to their participation in politics. It was not clear that voting decisions were based on rational evaluations of candidates, parties, and their issue positions.44

Indeed, Dalton suggests that individuals structure information and become knowledgeable in 'issues of interest'45 to assist them make their decisions, characterizing voting behavior in democracies as "the story of the three blind men and the elephant".

Other scholars' findings support Dalton's research on citizen participation especially on issue-based electoral voting. Zhang summarizes "Almond's Mood Theory", writing that “Foreign policy attitudes among most Americans lack intellectual structure and factual content. Under normal circumstances the American public has tended to be indifferent to questions of foreign policy because of their remoteness from every day interests and activities.”46

Chuanjie surmises that the stability of foreign policy over time is limited, and that foreign policy attitudes among the citizens “lack both a ‘static constraint’ and a ‘dynamic constraint.’”47 Isernia, Juhász and Rattinger concur, finding in their study aggregating the stability of the public mood towards foreign policy issues in the OECD countries France, Germany post-World War II to be as sand similar to those of the US publics.48 Numerous

44 Ibid.
45 Ibid.
47 Ibid., 294.
other scholars have supported this finding of stability in foreign policy attitudes over time, whether citizens are fully informed or not.\textsuperscript{49} Attitudes and information are often based on incomplete information and sometimes the foreign policy views arising from such incomplete information are not logical. Scholars generally suggest a wide expanse of the role of the public in determining US involvement in other countries affairs (diplomacy and foreign policy).

On one hand, scholars suggest that the general American public is either ill-informed has little intellectual basis for the formulation of diplomatic and foreign policy positions, or that their mood is 'fickle' and cannot be used to determine US foreign policy options due to changes in positions given their perceived importance. On the other hand, some scholars hold the view that the public's mood is 'stable', and that there is rationality in US Foreign Policy. Klarevas for example writes that "a study of Americans' attention to post-Cold War crises concluded that no event brings greater public attention to American foreign policy than the commitment of military force."\textsuperscript{50} On aggregate, there appears to be dissenting views over whether citizens are sufficiently equipped to understand, and determine, the direction that their foreign policy choices should take.

\textit{Citizen participation and citizen diplomacy}

Citizen participation implies a greater level of political participation by the public in political activities. Macedo \textit{et al} record 'traditional' indicators of political participation" such as "voter turnout, writing letters to the editor, participating in rallies, demonstrations


and volunteering in campaigns" as having fallen by about fifty percent between 1970's and 1990's. This view is supported by Putnam, who contends that in the case of the US, for instance, symptomatic of Americans' participation in civic affairs, "net participation by Americans, both in religious services and in church-related groups, has declined modestly, by perhaps a sixth, since the 1960s."52

On the other hand, some statistics suggest that volunteering among the American public is steadily increasing. For example, in 2011 the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported a “0.5 percentage point increase to 26.8 percent for the year ending in September 2011”. The Bureau further reports that, “about 64.3 million people volunteered through or for an organization at least once between September 2010 and September 2011. The increase in the volunteer rate in 2011 followed a decline of equal size in 2010.”53

If citizens volunteer at home for organizations such as churches, for charity events and related activities are they more likely to volunteer and support volunteering and philanthropic activities abroad? Debates in the US political and social circles seem to either point to or recommend an increased role for philanthropy as a private undertaking (churches, individuals) in aiding foreign states in times of disaster, even amongst Republicans who traditionally appear less likely to support foreign aid. It is plausible that citizen diplomacy finds greater support among civic-minded individuals. If individuals support civic engagement at their local communities, they are more likely to support the


concept and funding for citizen diplomacy abroad and to participate in citizen diplomacy programs. Therefore, citizen diplomacy is compatible with citizen participation and is one of the key components of citizen participation.

Emerging foreign policy approaches

Approaches that explain the making of foreign policy, and its key variables – whether it’s the leaders, the publics, the elites, history and contemporary geopolitical conditions – are gaining scholarly importance. One of the growing paradigms that help explain foreign policy making is the Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA) approach. According to Hudson, “the explanans of FPA are those factors that influence foreign policy decision making and foreign policy decision makers. Thus, two of the hallmarks of FPA scholarship are that it views the explanation of foreign policy decision making as multifactorial, with the desideratum of examining variables from more than one level of analysis (multilevel).”

To explain decision-making in foreign policy, analysts rely on “insights from psychology, sociology, organizational behavior, anthropology, economics, and so forth” but critical to the analysis is the “human decision-maker”. More succinctly, the emergent FPA approach is premised on the assumption that human beings, acting individually or in collectivities, are the source of much behavior and most change in international politics.

---
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This stands in stark contrast with the general assumptions that international relations, which drive foreign policy, are based on the invariant preferences of states. Hudson and Vore assert that "the decision-making approach of FPA breaks apart the monolithic view of nation-states as unitary actors" and looks at the individuals, units and interests that make up the state. This approach better integrates the macro-level state approach, and the more modest potential explanatory variables such as government systems, ideology, and political systems such as democracy, autocracy, or communism.

Conversely, this presents a dilemma from the cold-war era international relations' perspective: how do statesmen, assumed to be in full control of the activities of government within their polities, articulate their (or their citizens') preferences abroad to their and their constituents' benefit, given the anarchic condition of the international system? By assuming that state-level actors do not base their decisions on rationality – rather, they depend on the human sciences such as psychology to understand the actors' motivations and decision-making processes. International volunteering and citizen diplomacy can be articulated through this lens.

**Soft power approach to foreign policy**

The difference in influence between nations is often expressed – and measured – through the concept of "power". As such, power is an indispensable currency in international relations. Political scientists generally agree that states almost invariably strive for maximization of power and security. Nye defines power as the "ability to do things and

---

57 Ibid.

58 Ibid. 211.
control others, to get others to do what they otherwise would not."\textsuperscript{59} due to the possession of attributes that make it possible to compel / encourage others - attributes such as population, territory, natural resources, economic size, military forces, and political stability.\textsuperscript{60} Traditionally and post-World War II, state capabilities were calculated not only in terms of the ability to coerce others but based on military resources, alliances and economic resources at a country's disposal. With the changing geo-political realities of the post-Cold War era, the notion of power has morphed – it is no longer enough to describe power solely based on economic or military capabilities.

In 1990, recognizing the global changes in the way power was perceived and the ongoing transitions of the form and exercise of power, Nye first discussed "mutual attraction" or "fostering an alignment of other countries’ preferences with one’s own" as central to the definition of soft power. Nye explained that "the definition of power is losing its emphasis on military force and conquest that marked earlier eras. The factors of technology, education, and economic growth are becoming more significant in international power, while geography, population, and raw materials are becoming somewhat less important."\textsuperscript{61}

The apparent shift from emphasis on the traditional indicators of power, and – or – the inclusion of other factors such as technology, education and economic growth implied a different approach to aligning one’s priorities. It implied that rather than sending soldiers into a battlefield, the battle would entail winning hearts and minds...


\textsuperscript{61} Nye, 1990: 154.
through person-to-person exchanges, culture, sports and ideology. Citizen diplomacy exemplifies the duality of this shift: it relies on individuals, albeit with the backing of the government, and involves person-to-person contacts, often working in social and economic development programs.

Nye laid the foundation for articulating the evolution of a new, adaptive currency of international relations. He argued that "[T]his second aspect of power – which occurs when one country gets other countries to want what it wants – might be called co-optive or soft power in contrast with the hard or command power of ordering others to do what it wants." As previously discussed, Nye further defined 'co-optive power', as the "ability of a country to structure a situation so that other countries develop preferences or define their interests in ways consistent with its own. This co-optive power tends to arise from such resources as cultural and ideological attraction as well as rules and institutions of international regimes."63

The exercise of power transcends military and economic dimensions; it includes participation in global affairs, involvement of and projection of influence through and towards other non-traditional actors such as states, multi-national corporations, regimes, institutions, ideologies and strategies. Soft power encompasses traditional and non-traditional types of power including economic capabilities (for example, through foreign aid), technological (for instance, through travel and communication), ideological (democracy) and transmission of cultural values and artifacts.

Nye identified three primary sources that generate soft power: culture, political values and foreign policy in the shift from emphasis on territory size, superior economy
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and production and military superiority. These traditional factors, while not entirely
disfavoring population, territory and other factors characteristic to traditional mercantilist
production and thus the basis of traditional state power have in and of themselves become
necessary but not sufficient. McClory notes this and in his conception of soft power,
increases the number of soft power components to include "government, diplomacy,
culture, education and business innovation."64

With the collapse of the Soviet Union, the increase in number of free polities,
increase in globalization and communication, and the proliferation of state and non-state
actors, power no longer lies exclusively in the sizes of armed forces. Nye suggests that
"proof of power lies not in resources but in the ability to change the behavior of states."65
Thus, the need for a different conceptual framework of what matters and how to achieve
it becomes necessary. After 1945, the ability of probability of achieving change through
institutional mechanisms increased whereas prior to that, the power of institutions was
not viable; this denoted transition to a different conceptual framework.

McClory concurs, acknowledging that "while military force remains the ultimate
form of power in a self-help system, the use of force has become more costly for modern
great powers than it was in earlier centuries. Other instruments such as communications,
organizational and institutional skills, and manipulation of interdependence have become
important."66 While this soft power definition is newer, the practice has been ongoing
since the end of the Second World War. Nye notes that US statesmen were cognizant of
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this phenomenon as a foreign policy tool: "soft power came in the Marshall Plan – we did the same thing in Japan."67

The theoretical concept of soft power has found its way into the political life of not only the US, but other regional and rising powers. Canada and the Scandinavian countries can get some (smaller) states to change their behavior on certain issues by applying pressure, withholding financial aid, or calling for censure at international organizations. The US has continued to apply traditional tools of power and diplomacy, yet increasingly, recognizes the utility of soft power tools. Without concisely defining, or empirically outlining its variables, forms, application, constraints, outcomes and effectiveness as measured empirically by metrics other than public perception articulated through opinion polls, surveys and other instruments that are more likely to capture the period public 'mood', rather than the sustained effects of foreign policy decisions, exchanges between countries and sustained interactions, the application of soft power will remain unappreciated, understudied and a political catch-phrase.

As currently defined and applied to foreign policy scholarship and practice, and used in current political debates, soft power is not an entirely new concept: it has been in existence almost as long as the modern Weberian state. This research will show that the current theoretical definition has not been sufficiently studied to be such a key strategic component of US foreign policy. To date, there are no empirical studies that show the in/effectiveness of this "mutual attraction". Indeed, often, nations that are recipients of 'soft power' instruments including foreign aid, citizen diplomats, technology, among others, consistently vote differently than the US in at the UN General Assembly.

Citizen diplomacy: theorized outcomes

It is important to outline what this research aims to determine: citizen diplomats, with the backing of their government, serve in a number of foreign countries with several goals, including attempting to create "mutual attraction" between the two states. The work of citizen diplomats is hypothesized to lead to the foreign country aligning its preferences with the sending country. More narrowly, the United States, through the Peace Corps Volunteers, aimed to "change foreign perceptions about the US", "change Americans' perception about the world", and "provide trained manpower to people and countries that need it". This research aims to test whether citizen diplomats, through the values they impart to the recipient communities, do "change foreign perceptions about the US" through mutual attraction.

To accomplish this theorized change, citizens interact in a personal capacity with the foreign publics; this research hypothesizes the plausible outcomes of citizen diplomacy as "political outcomes" and "socio-economic outcomes". Political outcomes assume that interaction with the citizen diplomat increases the recipient community's political awareness (political participation) such as voting and public visibility, positive feedback from the recipient communities to their leadership, thereby making public officials more likely to support the sending country in bilateral and multilateral forums.

This should be evident in global favorability polls or through international bilateral and multilateral actions. "Sociological outcomes", on the other hand, are those 'personal connections' such as 'inspiration', 'admiration' and 'mentorship' that eventually lead an individual to pursue certain paths and options that may be limited without exposure to the citizen diplomat, due to spatial and geographical limitations.
Political outcomes: foreign policy

At its inception, the Peace Corps program was an explicitly foreign policy strategy with foreign policy outcomes, designed in part as an extension of the US containment policy – restricting Soviet influence everywhere by any means, and increasing the US presence in different – especially newly independent – countries in Africa, South East Asia and Latin America. It was proposed by John F. Kennedy, US Senator-elected-president, and received the highest levels of support from this elite group, surrounded by the core of society. While the outreach work, performed by volunteers, would be primarily socio-economic and socio-political in nature, the national security and foreign policy goals were no less important. By countering or matching the Soviet Union’s provision of technical experts, the US would appeal to the world, train manpower and improve its standing especially among newly independent states.

The drivers for the political outcomes recognized higher level outcomes through international volunteering: not only would the volunteers counter Soviet expansion and in some cases, aggression, they would provide and teach technical skills to newly independent countries, and influence the publics to want democracy. The cosmopolitan effects that vector into political outcomes of international volunteering assume that by interacting and learning about cosmopolitanism (of the democratic kind), individuals are more likely to express themselves and agitate for personal liberties, which eventually opens countries up to democracy.

It is difficult to measure how much more cosmopolitan an individual is, or how much more aware they are about, for example, human rights, or how that translates into voting or other democratic participation especially in non-democratic systems. Similarly,
the implied expectation by the Peace Corps is that such cosmopolitanism, expressed
individually, has no place in inter-state relations: it is only useful if it translates into
action that supports the sending country.

Political outcomes of citizen diplomacy are hypothesized to include change in
public opinion. Here, reliable indicators that measure public opinion and attitudes
towards the US and the many facets of its global presence ought to demonstrate that as a
result of citizen diplomacy. Controlling for all other sources of pro-US effects, there is a
significant difference in the way individuals perceive the US, an expectation that this
perception will translate into selection of policy-makers with a pro-US view, and
therefore the country will vote more congruently with the US at international
organizations. Overall, the expected political outcomes are therefore more direct,
measurable, especially with the direct effects more than the public opinion and the
cosmopolitan effects of citizen diplomacy.

Socio-economic and development outcomes
Socio-economic and development (SED) outcomes suggest that the impact of citizen
diplomacy is primarily about social and economic development, and possibly only
peripherally important to foreign policy. The impact of citizen diplomacy is therefore
confined to altruistic reasons, and the outcomes are simply social and economic, without
regard for relationships between the sending and receiving countries. SED outcomes are
more difficult to measure, and provide the basis for counter-arguments to the measurable
impact of citizen diplomacy proposed in this research.
The SED outcomes, were the volunteering simply altruistic, include – and are denoted by – increasing socio-economic development, promoting socio-cultural understanding and friendly relations between individuals and development outcomes such as improvement of community health through construction of wells, teaching business skills, agricultural skills, teaching English or running a health clinic. The belief that volunteering is an altruistic undertaking finds traction within the constructivist and feminist theoretical approaches where individuals and their experiences are important. Despite the fact that the findings from these theoretical approaches difficult to aggregate and do not have to correlate with leaders’ formulation of foreign policy;\(^6\)\(^8\) the outcomes are not sufficiently specified or understood as a basis for foreign policy options.

There are obvious weaknesses in believing that the sole objective of the Peace Corps – and other citizen diplomacy initiatives – is confined to socio-economic development outcomes. Although the ultimate goal of the volunteering was to share America’s altruism with the world, the objective was to attract the foreign countries towards the US. Therefore, there is a stronger foreign policy goal subsumed within the altruistic goal. The focus on foreign policy through altruism has been a staple of US foreign policy, even though scholars have attempted to restrict the study of foreign policy to non-altruistic strategies.

Deriding the shift in focus towards institutionalism and bilateralism, Mandelbaum for example differentiates between foreign policy areas by defining a "powerful and

potentially dangerous members of the international community category and an "international periphery." The latter, Mandelbaum argues, was the Clinton Administration's initial foreign policy approach. Mandelbaum argues that the administration, in focusing US foreign policy on humanitarian concerns while pursuing democratic transitions was trying "in 1993 to make the cornerstone of American foreign policy into a branch of social work", without success.

The difficulty of pursuing social and economic outcomes as a foreign policy end-game is exemplified by the low levels of confidence in presidents and administrations perceived to be weak foreign policy through pursuit of non-traditional diplomacy. It is in a president's interests to portray strength in foreign policy, perceived as a more military, than diplomatic approach to foreign policy. The conduct of traditional international relations rarely sees states utilize social-economic development approaches as a methodical foreign policy strategy.

The pursuit of more traditional forms of foreign policy does not necessarily preclude diplomacy and non-military options such as foreign aid; however, these are not the primary vehicles for foreign policy. No state can reasonably expect to conduct foreign policy, or employ a foreign policy strategy that expends the manpower of over 200,000 citizen diplomats and $20 billion in direct costs, in the hope that random volunteers interact with citizen diplomats, view the US positively, some day run for political office and then practice or influence pro-US behavior in the country's foreign policy options.

---
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Gaps in the literature

From the foregoing discussions, a number of issues are clearly identifiable. One of the strategic foreign policy options that the US has utilized since 1960 to increase its attractiveness to other nations, has been the use of citizen diplomats. Fifty years after the Peace Corps was founded, there have been few empirical studies to determine whether the more than 200,000 volunteers have substantially changed the world’s perception of America, as one of the objectives of Peace Corps holds. The Affinity of Nations Index and the State Department statistics will show, there is a positive correlation between the placement of citizen diplomats in a foreign country and indicators of positive perception of the US and its foreign policy as measured through congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly.

At the same time, citizen diplomacy has been ongoing for the past fifty years. Successive American presidents have suggested increasing the numbers of citizen diplomats. Citizen diplomacy is increasingly finding traction as an alternative, less militarized and inexpensive path to diplomacy. Citizen diplomacy has altruistic motivations on the part of the citizen diplomat, but a citizen diplomat cannot purport to escape the perception, whether accurate or not, of acting in some capacity on behalf of the sending government.

A synthesis of citizen participation and elite theories suggest that it might be more feasible to target actions to influence foreign policy at elites who can influence the direction of key organs of state, including government and the making of foreign policy. One of the major criticisms leveled against citizen diplomacy stems from domestic audience costs and citizen participation approaches: communities, groups and individuals
targeted by the citizen diplomats are not sufficiently politically enfranchised to influence domestic and foreign policy issues. Because of the low levels of participation and influence on government and therefore foreign policy, citizen diplomacy is therefore the application of the right strategy to the wrong target.

There is a glaring absence of inquiry whether international volunteering, citizen diplomacy and foreign-country placement by state-supported enterprises, with foreign policy objectives impacts the foreign policy behavior of the recipient country as measured through the extent to which a country votes congruently with the US at the UN General Assembly. Additionally, studies have seldom examined how foreign policy influence is construed in citizen diplomacy.

It can be assumed that the values that citizen diplomats transmit national, rather than partisan values. In exposing another gap in scholarship, no studies have studies the differences in political ideologies among citizen diplomats and whether these have an impact on country voting behavior. Neither have there been studies on whether the foreign publics become more politically active after hosting citizen diplomats, whether they vote and express their preference’s more often and whether these reflect in the representatives elected, who then vote in congruence with the US at the UN General Assembly. No studies have studied the level of elite involvement in citizen diplomacy, and whether such involvement is critical to influencing congruent voting patterns with the US at the UN General Assembly.

Given that the congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly, aggregated across time, all votes and all UN members, has historically hovered around twenty nine percent, it appears that there is a gap between the perception that citizen
diplomacy brings the two peoples or nations together, or that the perception if any, is not reflected in the international preferences of the national authority and elites. It may also be the case that citizen diplomacy has no foreign policy functions, or that the target audience is politically uninvolved in selecting leaders, or that there is not transmission mechanism from the citizen diplomacy recipient communities to their national authorities. However, controlling for other variables, it is important to determine what, if any, the effect of citizen diplomats on foreign policy is.

Almost uniformly, scholars studying theories, motivations, patterns and outcomes of citizen diplomacy casually mention issues of peace, international cooperation and foreign policy without articulating how these concepts are operationalized, implemented and affected through the volunteer training, placement or interaction with the host community or organization. Few studies have highlighted the importance of these transnational links as a conscious government-sponsored foreign policy.

Theoretical approaches, such as Almond’s Mood Theory, the Elite Theory, domestic audience and citizen political participation approaches lead us to hypothesize that citizens have little information and involvement in foreign affairs and political matters in general. Therefore, elite make a country’s foreign policy choices, yet even as they are uninvolved in foreign policy making, citizen diplomacy continues to attract funding and support even while support and funding of international institutions such as the UN and foreign aid continue to suffer cuts.

Prior studies show that countries voting at the UN reflect more of an alignment with regional blocs, rather than with their greatest benefactors in terms of aid, cultural exchanges or security guarantees. Given this reality, the question remains, of why the US
continues to support citizen diplomatic exchanges with countries that do not vote in congruence with the US at the UN General Assembly. These are some of the questions that this dissertation will be seeking to answer. The dissertation hopes to contribute to the citizen diplomacy and foreign policy literature by seeking to uncover the correlation between citizen diplomacy and the recipient foreign state behavior towards the US.

Conclusion

This chapter began by looking at how the US interacts with the world as expressed through its foreign policy. The chapter then examined the process of foreign policy making, concluding that especially in the US, the government, the executive, specific agencies and government departments, the citizens, Congress and elites play an important role in the formulation of foreign policy. Different stakeholders influence – or subsequently punish – the government for making certain foreign policy decisions. This position contrasts some prevailing scholarly views that the public is uninformed or uninterested in foreign policy, and public mood regarding foreign policy is often fickle.

Specifically, the chapter studied role of domestic audiences, elites and citizen participation approaches, including the costs that citizens extract on democratically elected governments for international foreign policy behavior. The chapter then discussed emerging approaches to foreign policy, including the Foreign Policy Analysis and soft power approaches. Because the key components of soft power include mutual attraction, it is important to set the terms of mutual attraction, which infer interaction with the recipient countries. Such interaction is accomplished through citizen diplomacy.
The chapter then outlined the gaps in literature. In summary, despite the fact that governments – from the UK, to Japan, to the United States and even international organizations such as the United Nations – continue to provide funding, training and other logistics to support international volunteers, there has been little empirical evidence that citizen diplomacy changes the way the sending countries are perceived by the recipient countries. There is also no prior evidence or studies that demonstrate that this perception can, or has been measured through congruence in foreign policy behavior.

The US Peace Corps volunteers program, a Cold War-era foreign policy strategy designed to contain Soviet expansion, has placed hundreds of thousands of volunteers around the world. There is no systematic, empirical evidence that this citizen diplomacy has changed foreign perceptions of the US abroad. Positive perception is not useful unless it translates into foreign policy support – congruent voting with the United States especially on important issues at the United Nations General Assembly. This is what the next chapter seeks to do: control for rival explanations of foreign policy behavior and investigate how other nations behave towards the US – whether they support the US agenda as a result of citizen diplomacy’s mutual attraction in multilateral forums.
CHAPTER III
HYPOTHESES

Introduction and chapter organization

This chapter derives several hypotheses on the relationship between citizen diplomacy and countries’ congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly. The view proposed by this research is that citizen diplomacy influences recipient countries’ foreign policy as shown through congruence voting with the US at the UN General Assembly. It is important to note here that the research is testing for correlation, not causation, between citizen diplomacy and state behavior towards the US. Scholars have long articulated that correlation is not causation: I reassert this caveat here.\(^1\)

Even as correlation is differentiated from causation, there is skepticism about relying on correlation to come to conclusions about different phenomena. Marc Racicot is quoted as saying, "you're trying too hard to find a correlation here. You don't know these people. you don't know what they intended. You try to compile statistics and correlate them to a result that amounts to nothing more than speculation."\(^2\) Still, Albert Einstein once said that "the important thing is not to stop questioning."\(^3\) This research therefore


intends to find potential explanations of citizen-diplomat recipient states’ voting behavior at the United Nations General Assembly. To determine what correlations exist, citizen diplomacy, foreign aid, military aid, foreign direct investment, military spending as a percentage of GDP and educational spending as percentage of GDP, immigration into the US, state fragility and regional and temporal effects will be tested against countries’ congruent voting patterns with the US at the UN General Assembly.

This chapter is organized as follows: it begins by introducing the objective of hypothesis formulation, and outlines the variable selection reasoning. The chapter then outlines the classification of the three groups of variables, namely 1) factors of bilateral relationships 2) attributes of host countries that affect voting patterns and 3) control variables such as the temporal and regional variables. In the subsequent chapter, a fourth category that groups all the variables together for the omnibus model is also included.

These hypotheses will be tested based on two sources of data, that is, the Voeten and Strezhnev Dataverse data and Dreher, Strum and Vreeland KOF Institute data. The chapter then provides a summary of the hypotheses tests and the independent variables expected to have an effect on the congruency of voting behavior of states at the UN General Assembly. The chapter concludes by summarizing the hypotheses and sets the stage for the actual estimation of eight models derived from the organizational factors.

Overview of the selected variables

Overall, this research seeks to test the efficacy of soft power as an emergent, foreign policy strategy – as opposed the traditional, hard-power strategies that relied on military capabilities (men, materiel and military alliances) and economic power (GDP per capita...
and to an extent trade). The strategies and tools of soft power are wide and varied. Some of them include foreign aid, which has been previously studied and varied conclusions drawn along the spectrum of zero to maximum utility as a foreign policy tool.

Research on the utility and function of foreign aid as a foreign policy tool has produced mixed findings. Some studies have found no relationship between foreign aid and state behavior towards the US, and does not influence the foreign policy behavior of countries one way or the other. Other scholars have found that foreign aid is a tool for "exerting influence on host country policies and programmes." Contrary to most findings, Wang finds that the impact of foreign aid is "most likely to emerge in voting coincidence rates on important issues."

This finding supplemented Hayter's argument that “USAID documents that aid is an instrument of United States foreign policy, and that as such, it is best suited to the promotion of economic development" and Rai's finding that for the Soviet Union, there was a non-existent relationship between foreign aid and General Assembly votes. Rai found a weak correlation between American aid as a percentage of recipient's GDP and voting congruence in international organizations. He concluded that "total foreign aid works neither as an inducement nor as a reward or a punishment in the General
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A separate finding showed that in 1970-1975, "American aid worked more effectively as an inducement than as a reward or a punishment. The Soviet aid works more effectively as a reward or a punishment than as an inducement."\(^{79}\)

There are other aspects of soft power that affect the voting congruence of countries. These include level of globalization (penetration of internet and modern communications, TV, social media etc.) which increase awareness between different areas of the world. Migration, and immigration, has become not only a source of individuals’ better welfare, but also of financial wellbeing through remittances. In addition, as western countries’ Human Development Index (HDI) levels increased and the population levels stagnated, immigrants began to migrate to these countries and take up high-level jobs such as doctors and nurses, thereby increasing the interaction of western countries with migrants from diverse countries.

Ideology – democratic capitalism – significantly eroded socialism and communism and increasingly became a dominant ideology. As the world became more globalized, levels of trade and interdependence increased, thereby increasing trade between countries and progressively diversified manufacturing and service-location through offshoring and outsourcing. The fall of the Soviet Union made democracy a new standard for countries aiming to receive favor amongst the great powers, thereby increasing the soft power capabilities of countries with weaker military capabilities. And as the Soviet Union collapsed, state fragility and failure increased, and these became determinants of how countries interacted with each other.


All these points of interaction constitute soft power, and are increasingly affecting how countries are viewed and view themselves. The war against terror is often prosecuted under the mantra of “they don’t like us/they don’t like our way of life”; this implies some knowledge of the “way of life” and a positive or negative perception of the particular way of life. It is these points of interactions, these manifestations of soft power that this research proposes to interrogate and determine how such variables affect the behavior of one state to another – more specifically, how soft power interactions affect state behavior towards the global hegemon, through voting at the United Nations. The next section will outline the general, followed by specific hypotheses on the effects of various variables on state behavior.

**Primary assumption / hypothesis**

Overall, I expect that soft power variables originating from the US and favoring the bilateral relationship will positively influence states’ to vote positively with the United States. I hypothesize that US behavior towards other countries is reciprocated as shown by foreign publics’ perception of the US and its foreign policy, of American citizens and by congruent foreign state voting behavior with the US at the UN General Assembly. Therefore, the overarching expectation (hypothesis) is that:

*States that receive citizen diplomats will vote more in congruence with the US at the United Nations General Assembly than states that do not receive citizen diplomats*
In the subsequent chapter, I will run regression analyses for the correlations with citizen diplomacy as one of the variables in each regression model. In successive models, in addition to the citizen diplomacy variable, I will add the individual predictors of state behavior to determine what variables individually best explain states’ foreign policy. I will then test for multiple correlations – the prediction of state behavior from multiple independent variables – to determine what combination of variables best explains countries' foreign policy behavior towards the US. In order to effectively test these hypotheses, I will begin by organizing all the test variables into three groups. These are the measures of bilateral relationships, host country attributes and other factors that may affect countries’ voting patterns at the UN General Assembly.

**Hypotheses organization**

The two dependent variables in this research are: all UN General Assembly votes and key UN General Assembly votes. If citizen diplomacy positively correlates with foreign policy behavior, the frequency of voting with the US at the UN General Assembly will change given the variance of citizen diplomats placed in recipient countries.

The four main groups of hypotheses organization factors are: all the variables, the bilateral relationships, host country attributes and control factors. The bilateral relationships are variables of dyadic relationships between the US and the citizen diplomat-recipient country. They are factors that strengthen the relationship between the two countries and make cooperation in international forums as shown by congruent voting at the UN General Assembly more likely. These factors include military aid, US foreign aid (net ODA), level of foreign direct investment and immigration to the US.
Host country attributes can lead to mutual attraction between the US and foreign country-dyads and therefore correlate with congruent voting with the United States at the United Nations General Assembly. They include military spending as a percentage of GDP, educational spending as percentage of GDP, GDP per capita, level of state failure and state fragility, level of globalization and the level of democracy. The relationships between these attributes and voting with the US at the UN General Assembly will be explained in this chapter. Control variables consist of geographical regions and the year.

Measures of bilateral relationships

_Citizen diplomacy and congruent voting at the UN General Assembly_

Elsewhere in this research, I argued that, whether they take the form of altruistic volunteering or the form of a foreign policy strategy, few studies exist on the impact of international volunteers on the communities and countries they serve from the perspective of the communities served. However, the impact of these volunteers or citizen diplomats – especially from the Peace Corps – has been documented in over 50 books, reports to Congress in the Congressional budget justifications, and by volunteers’ participation in programs such as “Speaker’s Match”, primarily from self-reporting.80

The validity of self-reported accomplishments by returned volunteers cannot be dismissed offhand, but it is important to recall studies that provide impetus for an alternative perspective on the volunteers’ accomplishments given post-volunteering conditions. For example, Hirshon, Eng, Brunknow and Harxell report a study in which “approximately 25 percent of volunteers who returned under regular circumstances

experienced feelings of depression”⁸¹ among other known self-reporting problems.⁸²

Given these and other problems that citizen diplomats experience, it is possible that their self-reported accomplishments are not wholly objective. Also, since citizen diplomats are intended to affect the perception of the United States on the part of the countries, communities and peoples they serve, it is not expected that they would report failing.

It is possible that citizen diplomats have no effect whatsoever, much like some scholars have asserted of foreign aid, on congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly, or that the effect of citizen diplomacy on state congruent voting with the US cannot be measured or isolated from other voting behavior explanans. However, I expect to find that citizen diplomats positively affect foreign countries perceptions of the US, which in turn is reflected in foreign states' congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly. From this expectation, I develop the general hypothesis that:

\[ H_{01}: \text{There is a positive correlation between citizen diplomat placement and congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly} \]

Military aid

Provision of military aid, much as military alliances likely do, is expected to cement the relationship between the US and the recipient country. Traditionally much of US military
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assistance has gone to its allies or strategically placed countries and countries in which the US has an overwhelming national security/interest in. Such countries include, for example, Egypt and Israel after the 1978 signing of the Camp David accords. Other countries receiving the highest amounts of US military assistance in 2010 included Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan, Jordan, Somalia, Colombia and Russia. The US military involvement in Afghanistan, Iraq and Pakistan post-9/11, for example demonstrates the increased allocation of military assistance to that region, compared with the year 2000 when Israel, Egypt, Jordan, Colombia, Russia, Poland, Mexico, Greece, Bahrain, Thailand and Ecuador were the top recipients for US military assistance.

Historically, the US also provided military aid to autocratic governments such as Brazil in 1961, and to Argentina and Peru in 1962. US military aid also supported successful and attempted military coup d'états in Cuba, Guatemala, the Dominican Republic and Honduras, and accounted for over $500 million in military aid in the same period. Military aid relative to increases in GNP per capita decreased during the 1980's. Poe and Meernik also find that "leftist states can be considered of extreme importance to US strategic interests and rewarded with large aid packages as a result.”
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NATO states were given $360 million more than non-NATO countries, while Egypt and Israel received majority of US Military aid as a result of the 1978 Camp David Accords.

I expect that higher amounts of military aid from the United States to the recipient country in the dyadic relationship will correlate with more congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly especially on key votes. While there may be other variables such as military alliances not controlled for in this research, I nevertheless expect to find a positive correlation between US military aid and voting with the United States at the United Nations General Assembly. The test hypothesis is:

\( H_{ai} : \text{Military aid positively correlates with higher congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly.} \)

In addition, I expect that countries receiving higher levels of US military aid will vote more in congruence with the US at the UN even on all UN General Assembly votes.

**US foreign aid**

Foreign aid is one of the clearest indicators of a country's attempt to affect the economic growth of another country. It can improve the bilateral relationship between the US and the recipient country. During the Cold War, economic assistance was a key method of insuring “attraction” for other countries to the Soviet or the US spheres of influence. The Washington Consensus of the 1980s was a means of encouraging countries to move towards more democratic and capitalistic societies by conditioning IMF and World Bank funding on democratization and economic reforms. Yet, prior literature generally
indicates that there is weak or no correlation at all between foreign aid and voting at the United Nations General Assembly and that majority of foreign aid is tied to political considerations and support for donors in bilateral and multilateral organizations.\(^8^9\)

Poe and Meemik write that during the Cold War, the US and the USSR "used foreign aid to address international threats and opportunities to win or maintain allies, to help countries fighting adversaries, and to encourage economic development and thus, presumably, political stability."\(^9^0\) I hypothesize therefore that there is no statistically significant correlation between foreign aid and congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly. Therefore:

\[ H_0: \text{Higher US foreign aid allocation correlates with higher congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly} \]

**Foreign Direct Investment**

Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) is one of the ways that countries interact with each other economically and bilaterally; the most common forms of these bilateral interactions are foreign aid and trade. There are differences in the way countries conceive of their financial and trade interactions in these bilateral relationships; trade favors stronger bilateralism and responds to global market conditions. Alesina and Dollar allude to this
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difference, writing that "while foreign aid responds to political incentives, foreign direct investments are more sensitive to economic conditions in the receiving countries." 91

Interestingly, while foreign aid responds more directly to "political" openness (democratization), FDI responds more to "economic" openness (improvement in policy management, trade liberalization, better and protection of property rights). 92 Other perceived benefits – for example lower labor costs, favorable investment climates and proper infrastructure – can help explain countries' decisions to undertake foreign investments even in countries with different political systems. This may explain why US companies, for example, continue to invest in, and do business with countries like China, Saudi Arabia, Venezuela and other countries with poor human rights despite this being at cross-purposes with US human-rights and democratic ideals.

Foreign Direct investments are made in two directions: FDI into the USA from foreign countries, and FDI from the US to the recipient country. FDI in the US by foreign countries into the US is expected to correlate positively with a positive perception of the US. However, this variable may correlate negatively with citizen diplomacy, since substantial FDI investment into the US indicates higher levels of economic well-being by the investing country. A well-to-do country needs less assistance. I hypothesize that individuals and firms investing in the US perceive the US to have a favorable investment climate, increased potential for efficiencies and increased investment returns.

A caveat is in order. The hypothesized outcomes of the Foreign Direct Investment variable are pose a challenge to verification, given that investment into the US may take
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the form of sovereign debt (e.g. investment by Chinese government in US treasury bonds), rather than individuals' investments. For the purposes of this research, I consider foreign direct investment in the more traditional sense of land, labor, capital and firms investing in a foreign country. An example of these FDI investment processes is the mobile phone and computer applications manufacturing investments that the well-known firm Apple, Inc., makes in China, including partnerships and subsidiaries such as Foxconn. Sovereign debt is therefore excluded from this measurement of FDI.

According to the US Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA), there are numerous indicators that measure FDI into the US and abroad. For this research, I used the Direct Investment & Multinational Companies (MNCs) data as an indicator of bilateral foreign direct investment. This data is further selected on "US direct investment abroad (outward direct investment) – ownership by a US investor of at least 10 percent of a foreign business" and the "Foreign direct investment in the United States (inward direct investment) – ownership by a foreign investor of at least 10 percent of a US business" indicators. “Foreign Direct Investment Position in the United States on a Historical-Cost Basis measure” is the selection variable.93

FDI from American companies into foreign countries is expected to increase the positive intensity score of foreign publics' perception of the US. It is assumed that foreign direct investment abroad creates jobs and therefore improves peoples' lives. The workers

are likely to identify with the philosophy of the companies and the executives that run them, which would hypothetically be pro-US. A high US FDI-abroad score will correlate positively with congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly as an expression of the relationship between the US and the foreign nation and also with the number of citizen diplomats.

Although the case of US investment in China demonstrates that US economic concerns often triumph preference for democratic governance and respect for human rights in the target countries, Alesina and Dollar find that FDI responds to economic openness, often attributed to more democratic countries. Therefore, I expect that countries that attract higher volumes of investment are more likely to vote with the US at the UN General Assembly than those that do not due to the economic benefit they derive. The exceptions as noted previously include less or outright non-democratic countries such as China, Hong Kong and Venezuela. Therefore;

\[ H_{03}: \text{High US Foreign Direct Investment recipients vote more in congruence with the US at the UN General Assembly} \]

**Immigration**

The level of migration into the US is expected to correlate positively with congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly. Immigration from foreign countries is likely to lead to increased remittances from the diaspora, a perception of better welfare and standards of living abroad and therefore a positive perception of the US. A preferential immigration policy towards the second country in the dyadic relationship can
therefore lead to congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly. For countries whose representational interest groups have significant influence in the US, for example the American-Israeli Public Affairs Council (AIPAC), the bilateral relationship – and consequently voting at the UN General Assembly – is likely to be stronger than countries where the bilateral relationship is weaker.

I expect that the level of interest in US government policies, for example on immigration, will attract significant interest in Mexico, Cuba and other countries in Latin America with high immigration rates into the US, and increase or decrease the mutual attraction between the countries. Overall, I expect that higher levels of global migration into the US will correlate positively with congruent voting with the United States at the United Nations General Assembly.

Low levels of immigration are expected to correlate with lower levels of foreign country congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly. However, since the US often allows immigration from countries experiencing conflict, for example Vietnam, Afghanistan, Iraq or Cuba, the findings might indicate a different finding, that in protest of immigration and other foreign policies, such countries will not vote with the US at the UN General Assembly. Therefore, I expect that;

\[ H_{04}: \text{Higher levels of immigration to the United States correlate with more congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly} \]

**Host countries’ attributes**

Some selected variables reflect in-country preferences, but have implications for bilateral relations. Selection of these variables is based in part on the areas of expertise and service
in which the citizen diplomats from the US are assigned, for example agriculture, education and small business development. These variables include military spending and educational spending as percentage of GDP, a country’s GDP, extent of state failure and state fragility, the level of globalization and extent to which a country is democratic. Each of these variables are hypothesized to affect the placement of citizen diplomats, and by extension, affect the dyadic relationship between the US and the second country and the expected relationship is outlined in the hypotheses.

Military spending as percentage of GDP

I expect that higher military spending as percentage of GDP is likely to have a negative effect on congruent voting with the US on key votes – and all votes – at the UN General Assembly. The more a country allocates to military spending, the less likely it is to receive US military assistance except in cases where the US has an alliance or a strategic interest. Since fewer insurgencies occur in democratic countries, assuming that democratic processes allow for alternative points of views to be tolerated and accounted for in governance through the opposition, the US is expected to provide fewer military resources to governments that are less democratic, and those that may suffer state fragility, save for Israel.

I hypothesize that low military assistance will positively correlate with congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly; the less military assistance a country gets, the less it is likely to vote with the US. On the other hand, the US is expected to provide military assistance to countries where it has a strategic interest, for example, Israel, Egypt and Saudi Arabia and members of NATO or where it has military
agreements. It is expected that higher military assistance will be positively correlated with congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly. I hypothesize that:

\[ H_{65}: \text{Countries with higher military spending as percentage of GDP vote more in congruence with the US at the UN General Assembly} \]

**Educational spending as percentage of GDP**

Education is one of the areas in which countries can invest in order to improve their long-term productivity, health and other HDI indicators. Education is also one of Peace Corps’ key areas of operations; for example, in 2012, 40 percent of Peace Corps volunteers worked in education, 23 percent in Health and HIV/AIDS. The other five sectors – business development, environment, youth development, agriculture and "other" – combined for 35 percent of the project areas of the Peace Corps.\(^{94}\) Education is an important area for the Peace Corps and the importance is likely to be reflected in the volunteers placed and the funding priorities of USAID and the US government.

Given these statistics, I expect that countries that allocate more of their resources towards education will receive more citizen diplomats (volunteers) and will also vote more in congruence with the US at the UN General Assembly. I expect that education and citizen diplomats' work in this area produces a higher convergence of interests, i.e. more mutual attraction. In addition, education is one of the areas where citizen diplomats are more likely to positively influence the perception of the United States in foreign countries. I therefore expect to find that countries that spend a higher percentage of their
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GDP on education will vote more with the US at the UN General Assembly due to closer connections as a result of higher levels of funding and closer connections with the US through citizen diplomacy.

\[ H_{a0}: \text{Countries with higher spending on education as a percentage of GDP per capita vote more in congruence with the US at the UN General Assembly} \]

**GDP per capita**

GDP per capita is included as a predictor of how countries behave towards the US. Generally, the higher the GDP per capita, the better-off country is, and the less likely it is to receive citizen diplomats. Countries with higher GDP per capita are generally more democratic than countries with lower GDP per capita, and are more likely to align with the US at the UN General Assembly. As a measure of economic well-being, GDP per capita demonstrates that countries have achieved some level of growth, that the citizens have access to resources and that they require less foreign socio-economic intervention through citizen diplomats who mostly work in socio-economic development capacities. Citizen diplomats rarely serve in the wealthier, advanced industrial and OECD countries.

I expect to find that countries with a higher GDP per capita are more likely to be democratic and therefore closer to the US in economic, political and social systems, and have less need for citizen diplomats. Countries with a lower GDP per capita will have a higher foreign attraction index to the US (to achieve similar levels of development) and are therefore more interesting to select for the study. Intuitively, I expect that higher GDP
per capita will correlate with higher congruent voting with the US on key votes and on all votes at the United Nations General Assembly. I develop the hypothesis that:

\[ H_0: \text{Countries with a higher GDP per capita vote more with the US at the UN General Assembly} \]

State failure and state fragility

States that are "simply unable to function as independent entities" are defined as 'failed states.' The former United Nations Secretary General Boutrous Boutrous Ghali defined failed states as characterized by collapse of state institutions and lawful use of force, breakdown of law and order, general banditry, suspension of functions of government, looting, destruction and displacement of the public.\(^5\) The exact definition of a failed state is contested but generally implies a country that is unable to provide the traditional functions of a Weberian state to its citizens.

I expect that state failure will correspond with low numbers of citizen diplomats, and a low incidence of congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly. The reasons thereof are varied. At one point or another on their road to failure and complete breakdown, the US often finds itself involved in reversing such failure. The outcomes have not always been positive. Examples of negative outcomes, whether as a result of, or

\(^5\) The complete quote according to Daniel Thürer was: "A feature of such conflicts is the collapse of state institutions, especially the police and judiciary, with resulting paralysis of governance, a breakdown of law and order, and general banditry and chaos. Not only are the functions of government suspended, but its assets are destroyed or looted and experienced officials are killed or flee the country. This is rarely the case in inter-state wars. It means that international intervention must extend beyond military and humanitarian tasks and must include the promotion of international reconciliation and the re-establishment of effective government.” See: Daniel Thürer. "The 'failed State' and International law." *International Review of the Red Cross*, No. 836 (Dec, 1999).
Despite US involvement, include Somalia in 1993, Iraq in 1990 and in 2003, Afghanistan in 2001 to present, Libya in 2011 and Syria in 2011 to present where the US is perceived to be insufficiently involved and where the outcomes are uncertain. The US has alternately been accused of meddling, or not being involved enough, and its involvement is often negatively perceived. In addition, the insecurity and breakdown of law and order in a country sliding into chaos presents obvious challenges to any citizen diplomats due to risks of kidnapping and other insecurities.

Failing states are not territorially, economically or politically cohesive. They have fractured governments, often pitting one ethnicity against another; they may have equally fractured positions on different issues. Therefore, their voting patterns at the UN General Assembly may differ. When a state is fragile or failing, it is difficult to negotiate with the elites of such a state, who might not be cohesive. Therefore the expression of preferences does not always reflect the state’s priorities. A key example of this is the current Somalia government, which has long conducted its affairs from Nairobi, Kenya, and most recently, from the ten blocks it controls in Mogadishu, Somalia.

I expect a negative correlation between UN General Assembly voting and state fragility: the more fragile a state is, the less likely the state is to vote with the US at the UN General Assembly. This is because of the state’s fragility, factionalization of elites, and lack of recognition of a government by the United Nations and the United States. Fragile, failing and failed states often have government changes through unconstitutional means, and in the case of civil wars, often have competing representation in bilateral relations and multilateral institutions. Internationally, countries’ voting patterns often lead to missed votes due to logistical issues or contested representation. Within the
country, the relationship with the US is complicated by the lack of diplomatic accreditation or expulsion of US diplomatic representatives from those countries, as expression of disagreement with the US position on different issues, especially those that concern issues of security, terrorism and other important issues.

The problems of a fragile, failing and failed state are not only found at the bilateral or multilateral level; failure has implications for the failing’s state citizens. Mallaby writes that “once a nation descends into violence, its people focus on immediate survival rather than on the longer term, including external relations. Savings, investment and wealth creating taper off; government officials seek spoils for their cronies rather than designing policies that might build long-term prosperity.”

I hypothesize that:

\[ H_{08}: \text{Failed states vote less in congruence with the US at the UN General Assembly} \]

**Level of globalization**

Scholars argue that over the past twenty years, globalization has intensified and accelerated significantly. Roland Robertson argues that globalization is a recent phenomenon and "is intimately related to modernity and modernization, as well as to postmodernity and 'postmodernization.'" Stiglitz considers globalization to be "the removal of barriers to free trade and the closer integration of national economies" and a
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force for good, especially for the poor. Appadurai suggest globalization is linked with modernity: "globalization has shrunk the distance between elites, shifted key relations between producers and consumers, broken many links between labor and family life, and obscured the lines between temporary locales and imaginary national attachments."  

Appadurai further touches on a key aspect of globalization, culture. Appadurai writes that developmental modernization "is often punctuated, interrogated, and domesticated by the micro narratives of film, television, music and other expressive forms, which allow modernity to be rewritten more as a vernacular globalization." It is easier to know in a global instant the events occurring in different parts of the world, beamed into the living rooms of billions worldwide. Recent examples include protests in Tahrir Square in Egypt at the beginning of the Arab Spring in 2011; the 25-year house arrest of Aung Sun Syu Ki; the current Syria crisis; and even more powerfully, the visibility of the warlord Joseph Kony in a "Kony 2012" documentary. This awareness is what Appadurai argues are "diasporic public spheres that such encounters create are no longer small, marginal or exceptional. They are part of the cultural dynamic of urban..."
life and in most countries and continents, in which migration and mass mediation co-
constitute a new sense of the global as modern and the modern as global.\footnote{102}

The spread of globalization is increasing awareness of global experiences, which
individuals characterize as either compatible or incompatible with their own values (for
example, tolerance for political opposition, free speech and women's rights). The global
publics can then exert pressure on their governments to signal to the second country their
(dis)satisfaction. A good example of this pressure can be imputed from the events of the
Arab Spring beginning in 2011. A reciprocal relationship can be expected where dyadic
levels of globalization are high. As Pew Global research shows, foreign countries
frequently express their opinions on the United States and US foreign policy.

The level of globalization is expected to be positively correlated with congruent
voting with the US at the UN General Assembly, in part reflecting the role of technology
in improving economic production. For example, in 1970, the highest globalization
indices were observed in Western European, North American and other OECD countries,
which have also traditionally enjoyed higher levels of industrialization, mechanization
and higher GDPs. The richer a country is, the higher its globalization index is likely to
be. This can be explained by the fact that in richer countries, individuals have more
disposable income, and can buy other accessories such as TVs, cable, access to internet,
faster jet travel and other communication opportunities. High levels of globalization do
not cause congruent voting. Rather, it is the correlation between high levels of
globalization and GDP per capita and its relationship with democracy that might explain
the positive correlation in the globalization index and voting behavior. The level of

\footnote{102} Appardurai. Modernity at large: 10.
globalization can cause an indirect effect on congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly through its correlation with other variables.

Since richer countries are more globalized and therefore need less assistance with their social and economic development, globalization index will negatively correlate with the number of citizen diplomats and also with foreign aid. It will correlate positively with GDP per capita. It is expected to correlate positively with level of democracy. In the regression statistics in the following chapter, I will test for evidence of high levels of collinearity between levels of democracy, GDP per capita and level of globalization.

Richer nations are also expected to be more democratic. OECD countries exhibit higher levels of democracy and cultural similarity with the US. Because of conditions incidental to their socio-political systems, these countries may enjoy mutual attraction that excludes the effects of citizen diplomats. I hypothesize that:

\[ H_{alt}: \text{Technologically advanced countries vote more in congruence with the US at the UN General Assembly.} \]

**Polity score: level of democracy**

The system of government often dictates the presence, direction and strength of bilateral and multilateral relationships between countries. To illustrate this concept, Nincic argues “that the fabric of internal politics and foreign policy are interwoven is an important but not a novel idea.”\(^{103}\) Nincic demonstrates this by showing how the US Senate thwarted President Woodrow Wilson's attempt to join the League of Nations by non-ratification of

the Treaty of Versailles.\textsuperscript{104} While Wilson was in favor of, and campaigned vigorously for
the treaty to be ratified by the Senate, democratic processes disallowed ratification.

The foreign policy behavior of democracies often leads to the perception that such
democracies may be interfering in other countries' internal affairs.\textsuperscript{105} Savun and Phillips
find that "states that are actively involved in international politics are likely to create
resentment abroad and hence more likely to be the target of transnational terrorism.
Democratic states are more likely to be targeted by transnational terrorists not because of
their regime type \textit{per se} but because of the type of foreign policy they tend to pursue."\textsuperscript{106}
This is because "democracies have incentives to promote democracy abroad and do so
through a broad range of means."\textsuperscript{107}

The Systemic Peace Institute’s Ted Robert Gurr, Monty G. Marshall and Keith
Jaggers have previously produced the Polity IV data on Political Regime Characteristics
and Transitions, 1800 - 2010. Among the several categories of data in the specific Polity
IV data is a Polity II category which tracks the level of democracy or political openness
in different countries. Scores range from -10 to 10 where -10 is a totally authoritarian
regime and 10 is a completely free country. I expect that countries that demonstrate
higher levels of tolerance but are poor are more likely to receive citizen diplomats in

\textsuperscript{104} Ibid. 2.

\textsuperscript{105} See for example, Sharon K. Hom, "Female Infanticide in China: The Human Rights
(1991): 249; also, Mark J. Leavy, "Discrediting Human Rights Abuse as an Act of State: A Case
Study on the Repression of the Falun Gong in China and Commentary on International Human


\textsuperscript{107} Ibid.
order to facilitate their transformation into a western, liberal democracy. It is also expected that democratic countries may vote more frequently with the US at the UN General Assembly than mixed or authoritarian political systems. I hypothesize that:

\[ H_{all}: \text{Democratic countries vote more in congruence with the US at the UN General Assembly than non-democratic countries.} \]

**Control factors**

Temporal and regional variables may help explain the variation in congruence in voting with the US at the UN General Assembly. The two major control factors (variables) in this study are the year and the region. Since the beginning of placement of citizen diplomats in foreign countries in 1961, various geopolitical events that directly affect the need for citizen diplomats have taken place. These have included the entrenchment of ideological differences between the US and the-then USSR, and the gradual economic development, for example in India and China, the integration of several former Warsaw Pact countries such as the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Moldova, among others, in the European Union and therefore receiving allocations from the European Union, conceivably diminishing the need for citizen diplomats in those and other countries.

Regional differences might also affect the placement of citizen diplomats and therefore, the perception effects that regions have on congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly. The study identifies six continental regions: North America, South America and the Caribbean, Oceania, Asia, Europe and Africa. The 1950-1960
decade witnessed a significant increase in the number of countries in the international system as they became independent or broke apart from federations and unions.

In Africa for example, of the 54 countries recognized by the African Union – and the United Nations – seven countries gained independence before 1960. Another 19 countries became independent in 1960. They required a lot of assistance in developing their systems and infrastructure; the citizen diplomats assisted in such development. This assistance was provided within the context of the Cold War ideological divide between the "West" and the "East". Much of post-independence East and South Asia was embroiled in conflict or faced similar challenges of cohesion, peace and nation-building.

By the early 1990s, the Soviet Union was disintegrating, negating the most plausible reason for the advent of citizen diplomacy – that is, containing Soviet expansion to the new world. I expect therefore, that as the geopolitical landscape changed, the need for citizen diplomacy decreased. After 1990, despite their location and because of the primacy of democracy and capitalism as the primary ideologies, countries would vote more consistently with the United States at the UN General Assembly.

Regional and temporal differences are often correlated. Most African countries were quite poor and underdeveloped when they became independent. They benefitted from the placement of citizen diplomats as much as they bore the brunt of East-West ideological battles. Southeast Asia was also fairly underdeveloped, but through the pursuit of different economic models and strategies developed economically faster than African countries. In their economically marginalized state, I expect that different countries that received citizen diplomats were more likely to vote with the US at the UN
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General Assembly given the foreign aid and citizen diplomat assistance they attracted. Therefore, I expect to find some correlation between citizen diplomacy and some regions.

Regional differences are important, even in regions that do not benefit from citizen diplomacy or other instruments of bilateral cooperation such as foreign aid or military aid. OECD countries and Oceania are regions with higher levels of economic development, and therefore less likely to receive citizen diplomats. The correlation between variables such as level of globalization, GDP per capita and levels of democratization and similarity with the US are more likely to account for congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly. This is the case especially given the limitation of citizen diplomacy from the US to these countries.

Temporal effects are also expected to show a gradual reduction in the number of citizen diplomats placed in different countries. The Peace Corps' mission's three goals include helping the people of interested countries in meeting their need for trained men and women; helping promote a better understanding of Americans on the part of the peoples served; and helping promote a better understanding of other peoples on the part of Americans. It is expected that with time, countries will more independently train their own manpower, utilize tools of modern communication (TV, internet, radio and other popular culture) to learn about Americans and others with this they will gain more understanding of Americans without the actual presence of citizen diplomats in these countries. Therefore, over time, it is expected that citizen diplomacy will correlate less with congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly. I develop the following regional and temporal effects hypotheses:

---

Conclusion

This chapter has outlined the theoretical underpinnings of the twelve hypotheses that will be tested in the following chapter. It has outlined the three factors of organization, which are first, factors of bilateral cooperation, which outline specific dyadic relationships between the US and a second country. These factors include bilateral exchanges such as foreign direct investment (FDI), foreign aid, military assistance and immigration to the US, among others. Secondly, it outlined the host country factors that can lead a citizen-diplomat recipient country to align its foreign policy behavior more with the US as shown by congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly.

These host country factors include level of democratization, level of state failure and state fragility and the level of globalization among other variables. These factors can influence the decisions, levels and numbers of citizen diplomats placed in the foreign countries. The chapter then outlined the third group of factors of organization, which are the temporal (year) and regional effects and how they are hypothesized to affect foreign states behavior towards the US as demonstrated by congruence in voting with the US at the UN General Assembly. The next chapter will test the hypotheses that have been developed in this chapter and present the results.
CHAPTER IV
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The previous chapter argued that international volunteering – citizen diplomacy – serves foreign policy purposes and is therefore a foreign policy strategy. There is a dearth of studies on how volunteering changes foreign nationals’ and nations’ perception of the United States or leads a country to align its foreign policy preferences with those of the United States. To address this deficit, this research investigates the correlation between factors of mutual attraction, host country factors and temporal and regional variables with countries’ foreign policy behavior in dyadic relationships specifically with the United States. Controlling for rival explanations, the research evaluates this correlation by investigating countries’ congruence in voting with the US at the UN General Assembly and how dyadic relationships with the US correlate with such voting.

The objective of the research is to evaluate the efficacy of citizen diplomacy as a foreign policy strategy, using both qualitative and quantitative statistics by applying a mixed-methods research design. Overall, I hypothesize that citizen diplomacy is effective, and citizen diplomats, through their service, are transmitting values considered to cause mutual attraction between the US and other countries in a dyadic relationship. I hypothesize that those countries which receive US assistance – both in terms of foreign aid and citizen diplomacy – vote more with the US at the UN General Assembly than countries that do not. The third expectation is that citizens – foreign or otherwise – differentiate between state-level interactions and individual / societal level interactions.
At the individual level, I hypothesize that even under foreign government sponsorship, important and mutually attractive relationships are formed. These relationships affect bilateral relationships and influence the frequency of voting with the US at the UN General Assembly.

This chapter proceeds as follows: it introduces and justifies the use of mixed methods, and then outlines the qualitative and quantitative sections of the study. It outlines the study variables, their coding in the dataset and the sources of the data. The following chapter presents the results of the quantitative analysis.

**Research design: mixed methods research**

The mixed methods approach is an emerging research paradigm that integrates both qualitative and quantitative approaches to social inquiry. For this research, mixed methods are most suited for the type of study. The quantitative research component, through the selected variables, paints the broad strokes of the expected interactions between the dependent, independent and control variables, using statistical approaches. The quantitative variables are broad and aggregated over countries, regions and time. Using quantitative research, we can synthesize the broad outlines of phenomena, although this does not give us specificity. These broad outlines often require more specific explanations to account for the observed variations, and this is where the qualitative research approaches and methods are important especially when used in conjunction with the quantitative research methods.

The qualitative case studies allow a researcher to more closely investigate specific cases and hypothesize the reasons for the outcomes. Qualitative case studies are more
specific and take into account regional, spatial and other considerations that may alter the results or differ from one place to another where the same phenomenon is observed. Qualitative case studies help a researcher to instigate the intervening factors that are not always captured in the data and statistics. Thus, qualitative case studies provide a more nuanced explanation and allow the researcher to more validly explain the differences across countries and cases.

The use of mixed methods is gaining wider acceptance in social inquiry. Brewer and Hunter, for example, argue the necessity of proper measurement – presumably encompassing both qualitative and quantitative measures – writing that "empirical measurement is essential to determine the nature and frequency of social phenomena." To do so, it is equally important to "know what to measure and to choose appropriate methods."\(^{110}\) The utility of the mixed / multi-method approach is to "explicitly solve problems at other stages of the research process as well as to answer more narrowly defined questions of measurement validity" such as the impact of citizen diplomats.\(^{111}\)

Creswell defines mixed methods research as

> a research design with philosophical assumptions as well as methods of inquiry. As a methodology, it involves philosophical assumptions that guide the direction of the collection and analysis of data and the mixture of qualitative and quantitative approaches in many phases in the research process. As a method, it focuses on collecting, analyzing, and mixing both quantitative and qualitative data in a single study or series of studies. Its central premise is that the use of quantitative and qualitative approaches in combination provides a better understanding of research problems than either approach alone.\(^{112}\)

---


\(^{111}\) Ibid., 9.

Greene defines the mixed methods approach as "an orientation toward social inquiry that actively invites us to participate in dialogue about multiple ways of seeing and hearing, multiple ways of making sense of the social world, and multiple standpoints on what is important and to be valued and cherished." Mixed methods are especially utilitarian in their application as shown in Greene and Caracelli, who state that "these methods [observation and interview] were invaluable in helping her [hypothetical researcher, Wanda] to understand, interpret and contextualize ... identities."

In applying mixed methods to the evaluation of service organization models that are quite relevant to this research, Touati et al find that the results of such approaches "do not lend themselves to an instrumental use", i.e. they have no utility for policy-making. They also find that the approaches "are instead better suited to either a 'conceptual' use, corresponding to an enlightenment function" i.e. deepening the understanding of the subject matter and thereby help to persuade individuals to collaborate in the achievement of a goal. According to Evans, Coon and Ume, studies of the mixed methods nature
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"must combine qualitative and quantitative research in viewpoints, data collection and analysis, and inferences."\textsuperscript{116}

\textit{Quantitative research component}

Since this is a mixed methods research study, it is important to set the terms for the research questions, hypotheses formulation, data analysis and conclusions that will follow this and other subsequent chapters. Quantitative methods in (social and pure) scientific inquiry "focus attention on measurements and amounts of the characteristics displayed by the people and events that the researcher studies."\textsuperscript{117} Thomas observes that the multi-method quantitative analysis provides a researcher with tools that provide best, but not necessarily rival explanations given the difference in the types of knowledge a researcher is seeking and the data or variables available to the researcher.\textsuperscript{118}

King, Keohane and Verba write that "quantitative research uses numbers and statistics methods. It tends to be based on numerical measurements of specific aspects of phenomena; it abstracts from particular instances to seek general description or to test causal hypotheses; it seeks measurements and analyses that are easily replicable by other researchers."\textsuperscript{119} Quantitative researchers formulate research questions or hypotheses, whose variables are then categorized. Researchers perform statistical tests on the


\textsuperscript{118} Ibid.

independent, dependent and control variables to determine their effects on the subject of inquiry.\textsuperscript{120} Bernard provides a simple characterization of quantitative analysis, writing that such analysis "in the social sciences involves reducing people as observed directly or through their texts to numbers."\textsuperscript{121} This reduction therefore can miss out on important explanations and differences.

This research will begin by utilizing quantitative research methods to determine to what extent citizen diplomacy correlates with state signaling behavior – congruent voting – with the US at the UN General Assembly, after controlling for effects of other bilateral and multilateral interactions between the US on the one hand and 191 countries in a dyadic relationship with the US. The research recognizes that even controlling for other possible explanatory effects such as immigration, bilateral foreign direct investment, GDP per capita, foreign and military aid, among others, it is not possible to claim with absolute confidence that the correlations are actually causation. At best, the research will demonstrate the significance of citizen diplomacy and other variables in explaining correlations among votes. The findings in the quantitative section will be further buttressed by the findings as outlined in the qualitative section that follows.

\textit{Qualitative research component}

In the study and conduct of citizen diplomacy, it is important to rely on the statistical tests that allow the research to test inferred foreign policy behavior towards the US, but also consider other ways of understanding the same behavior. As is often the case in

\textsuperscript{120} Ibid.

relations between nations, the expression of support through public statements is vital to credibility and expression of intentions. Previously, the research discussed the 1990 Iraq invasion of Kuwait and the then-president George H. W. Bush's public statement that "this aggression shall not stand", and how such signaling often sets the political and strategic course for the United States and other powers. Signaling can be quite difficult to capture from a statistical perspective and therefore, qualitative explanations suffice.

In the case of citizen diplomats, there have been expulsions, for example from Bolivia in 1969/1970. It is important to consider these cases whose merits cannot be adequately captured by the data showing, for example, that there were zero (0) Peace Corps Volunteers in Bolivia in 1970. Here, the explanation for having no citizen diplomats matters. For this and other reasons, the research will, in the second portion of the research design and methodology, turn to qualitative analysis of selected cases.

According to Murray, qualitative methods "involve a researcher describing [kinds] of characteristics of people and events without comparing events in terms of measurements or amounts." This type of research "is multi-method in focus, involving an interpretive, naturalistic approach to its subject matter" through studies of the subject in their natural environment, i.e. without any attempt to control for any of the variables involved in such interactions. On qualitative research, King, Keohane and Verba write that "qualitative research covers a wide range of approaches, but by definition, none of these approaches relies on numerical measurements. Such work has tended to focus on one or a small number of cases, to use intensive interviews or depth analysis of historical
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122 Murray. _Blending qualitative & quantitative research methods in theses and dissertations_. 1.
materials, to be discursive in method, and to be concerned with a rounded or comprehensive account of some event or unit.\textsuperscript{123}

Further support for the use of qualitative methods in social science research is found in Balnaves and Caputi, who write that, "case studies investigate 'what is happening' and are very common in policy research and in exploratory work."\textsuperscript{124} Creswell holds that "in a qualitative study, inquirers state research questions, not objectives – i.e. specific goals for the research – or hypotheses. The research questions assume two forms, a central question and associated question."\textsuperscript{125}

Asking the broadest question, according to Creswell, and following it with some sub-questions, is a most proficient way to approach the qualitative study. Bernard writes that "most qualitative analysis involves reducing people to words – your words about the meaning of their words or actions or artifacts."\textsuperscript{126} This research will follow in the tradition of examining case studies as an additional, complimentary method of determining the impact of citizen diplomats on state behavior.

\textit{Quantitative variables and measures}

Since Nye defines "soft power" as mutual attraction, the analogy of wooing an individual comes to mind. Wooing cannot succeed uni-dimensionally; it is expected that a country wooing another will pull out all the stops – flowers, dinner, phone calls – here equated

\textsuperscript{123} King; Keohane and Verba. \textit{Designing social inquiry}. 4.


with citizen diplomacy, high FDI, consistent and substantial foreign aid, ease in obtaining visas and other positive indices of a positive relationship. For this study, the process of 'wooing other countries' is expressed in terms of variables that explain the relationships or interaction points between the countries. I identify three categories of variables: independent, dependent and control variables.

**Operationalization of variables**

This research synthesizes current approaches to international volunteering with national interest and foreign policy implications, leading to findings that can be generalized across nations utilizing such soft power strategies. It also leads to the formulation of theories that can be used to explain the success, or lack thereof, of international volunteering as a foreign policy strategy. One of the key steps in any research project is the operationalization of variables. Operationalization of variables refers to "defining a concept or variable so that it can be measured or expressed quantitatively." Operationalization of variables involves two steps: formulating a conceptual definition (what the variable / concept means) and formulating an operational definition, i.e. how to measure it. Variables, when used in ordinary terms, can represent different
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meanings and be measured in a number of ways, the definition of a variable is often based on specificity of jargon in specific disciplines, in this case, political science. In addition, operationalization allows for specification of how the variables will be measured in quantifiable terms. The unit of analysis (the object which will be described in terms of the research variables) of the cumulative effect of citizen diplomacy on congruent voting behavior with the US at the UN General Assembly will be "interactional variables" which are the independent variables. These "interactional variables" will primarily express a non-essentially reciprocal or equal relationship, for example citizen diplomacy (sent from one country to another).

Variables, variable groups and coding

The study variables are coded into three major groups. These groups provide a general expectation of the interactions between the dyads. The host country attributes, for instance, are present in the citizen recipient country; the factors of bilateral / mutual attraction happen between the two countries, and the third group of variables, temporal / regional variables, consider the interactions of the dyad over time and region. The findings help explain the sources of foreign countries behavior towards the US, and the 'interactional factors' represented by the variables are important in explaining the variable effect on the country's behavior. Membership in the UN is interpreted as a forum for international interactions and signaling. The United Nations Organization is selected as it is the all-inclusive membership of most countries in the international system.
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The bilateral attraction factors include bilateral and multilateral interactions between the US and the dyadic state. They include the number of citizen diplomats that the US sends to any the recipient country, levels of direct investment between the US and the foreign country, amounts of foreign Aid the US gives and levels of migration to the US. The expectation is that higher levels of migration, for example, indicate friendly bilateral relations, a state of ethnic or internal conflict in the sending country, for example Ethiopia and Cambodia, or prior involvement of the United States in a way that may jeopardize individuals collaborating with the US, for example the interpreters during the Iraq and Afghanistan conflicts.

The second group of variables consists of the host country factors which would make the dyadic country attractive to the US, by aligning its domestic preferences with US preferences. I expect that the factors and their positive direction especially from the US will increase attraction between the US and the foreign country. An example of factors in this category, and this hypothesized alignment would be in the provision of education without gender bias. This can be measured in part through educational spending as a percentage of GDP. A higher expenditure on education would be an enhancing factor given that the citizen diplomats serve about thirty nine percent of the time in educational fields. Other factors include military aid, levels of democratization and level of state failure and state fragility.

State fragility however will decrease mutual attraction due to the insecurity that the citizen diplomats might be subjected to. High levels of globalization and high GDP per capita will decrease the likelihood of citizen diplomats being placed in the recipient country. Other negative factors include political violence, and a higher military
expenditure as a percentage of GDP, unless the country suffers from civil war or internal insurrections, in which case the citizen diplomats would not go to the country anyway due to insecurity. The third group of variables, coded as dummy variables for different regions, is intended to check for regional variances and determine if citizen diplomacy is more successful in certain regions than in others. A fourth group of variables will be derived combining all the variables into one omnibus model with all observations.

Research study period

This research looks at the period between 1960 and 2010. The logic for selecting the 1961-2010 time period relies on a number of factors. If international volunteering that is supported by state bureaucracies is effective in influencing or altering foreign publics' perception of the US, it is important to select a time when such international volunteering was officially commissioned as a foreign strategy function in 1961 with the start of the Peace Corps program. This also excludes other forms of unofficial international volunteering such as missionary work or tourism.

Second, international volunteering as a function of US foreign policy in its original form has continued even after the end of the Cold War. It is important to recall that Peace Corps began in part to serve a US foreign policy goal, that is, to counter Soviet expansion and its provision of trained, technical manpower. Since the Soviet Union is no longer a force to be countered, why is citizen diplomacy still a foreign policy strategy?

Third, emerging literature has argued for the utility of 'soft power' through economic, social and cultural exchanges such as those promoted by citizen diplomacy. If citizen diplomacy is viable, can it be leveraged in the modern day foreign policy arena to
counter emerging transnational issues and improve the prospects for US foreign policy and global hegemony? This study will seek to conclude whether, or how these non-traditional diplomatic exchanges impact states behavior in the international arena.

_Justification of selected period_

The period after the Second World War, between 1945 and 1990, most countries aligned either with the Soviet-led Warsaw Pact/Eastern Bloc, or with the US and her allies in the western bloc. A third group of countries, comprising mostly of newly independent and Latin American countries, coalesced into the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM). Other regional organizations distinguished themselves; however, they generally interacted with or supported one of the two major blocs. For purposes of this study, the Non-Aligned Movement and other regional groups will not be distinguished as a 'third force', rather, they will be considered as aligned to either the East or the West and also as one of the contested spaces for the future of superpower influence.

At the end of the Cold War, the benefits of a new state's alignment with one bloc or the other were not only non-existent; the incentives to do so, whether economic, military or diplomatic were diminished. The emergence of one super-power, the United States, and the lack of an effective, viable competing ideology decreased the attractiveness countries to the sole remaining hegemon, the US, unless the country directly contributed to the national interest, power and security of the hegemon, meant that the degree of attractiveness of any one country to another was diminished.

Between 1950 and 2010 the nation-state system suffered significant international turbulence. It also saw the disruption of existing order with the addition of more than 100
sovereign states. Membership to the UN, reflecting the total number of internationally recognized sovereign states increased from 51 in 1945, to 191 in 2000, a fourfold increase. By 1990, the UN System comprised of 159 sovereign states. The increase from 159 in 1991 to 180 represented the single greatest increase in membership in any one decade (30 members). The increase is only rivaled by the 39-member increase in the 1950-1960 decade, when 39 members joined the UN mostly due to African countries becoming independent. Other decades with significant increases included the 1960-1970 and 1970-1980 with an average of 27 members, as shown in Fig. 4.1 below.\(^{132}\)

\[\text{Fig. 4.1: Increase in United Nations Membership, 1945-2010}\]

Study sample

The study sample consists of 191 countries that have been admitted to the United Nations as “Member States of the Record.” There are 193 sovereign countries that are members of the United Nations Organization, but the study eliminates the United States, with whom the dyadic relations with all the other member countries are under study. It also eliminates South Sudan, because South Sudan became independent, and was admitted to the United Nations on 7/9/2011, it is outside the data period coverage and is excluded. The United States is the subject of inquiry – how other countries behave towards the US as a result of its conduct towards the foreign nations, through the placement of citizen diplomats; it is not represented in the data, producing a total of 191 countries.

Countries that ceased to exist, or were amalgamated into new countries and federations, for example East and West Germany, Yugoslavia, North and South Yemen, North and South Vietnam are not included in the dataset by their old names; the ‘new’ countries are included instead. Therefore, data for countries such as Yugoslavia is excluded, while that of Serbia, Croatia and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia are included. Countries that came into existence between 1960 and 1990 are included in the years for which their data was available.

Some databases separate territories such as Guam and Puerto Rico, the Netherlands Antilles, British and US Virgin Islands and other non-independent territories from their affiliated countries; such distinctions are not reflected in this research and the countries, territories, principalities and holdings are considered unitary. The countries in both datasets are the Member States of the Record of the United Nations Organization.
Data collection and sources

This study utilizes secondary data drawn from different databases. The major sources of the research data comes a number of databases, datasets and organizations. The data and sources are discussed below.

The US State Department (United States Agency for International Development)

Under the auspices of the State Department, the US Agency for International Development (USAID) keeps a record entitled "US Overseas Loans and Grants", which is also known as "The Green Book." Recent changes in reporting; as a result of the Open Government initiative changed the format of the data presented by USAID on US loans and other obligations to foreign nations. The dataset tracks information on disbursements to countries, beginning 1945, that have received over US$500,000 in loans and/or grants / assistance and were considered "independent states". The State Department is also an important source of data on US military assistance to different countries since 1945.

Data on congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly

Data on voting practices at the United Nations comes from two main sources. Data on all UN General Assembly voting is extracted from Alex Dreher and Jan-Egbert Sturm's 2010 study on IMF and World Bank influence on voting in the General Assembly. The second source is Erik Voeten's and Anton Strezhnev Dataverse Network. Data on key UN


\textit{Dreher and Sturm UN voting data}

This dataset, developed by Alex Dreher and Jan-Egbert Sturm at the KOF Swiss Economic Institute, covers the years 1970 to 2002.\footnote{Axel Dreher and Jan-Egbert Sturm, “Do IMF and World Bank Influence Voting in the UN General Assembly?”http://ideas.repec.org/p/kof/wpsko/06-137.html Accessed 1/31/2013.} Data for the 2003 - 2010 period was manually extracted from the State Department Website on Voting Practices at the United Nations and combined with the Dreher and Sturm data, following their data treatment procedures. In the data analysis and regression statistics models 1 - 4, sections (a) and (b) utilize the Dreher and Sturm data, while models 1-4, sections (c) and (d) utilize Erik Voeten's and Anton Strezhnev Affinity of Nations data.

\textit{Erik Voeten's dataverse (The Affinity of Nations data)}

According to the authors, Erik Voeten's Affinity of Nations is a dataset of roll call votes in the General Assembly 1946-2011. It also contains Affinity of Nations scores. The latter refers to a computation of the congruence of voting on an issue between dyads of all countries on all votes at the United Nations. Originally developed by Erik Gartzke, this dataset was updated through 2011 by Erik Voeten and Anton Strezhnev, who recoded the data as the Affinity of Nations data.

In this dataset, I select the $s3n$ variable, which is the computed variable on congruent voting at the UN, calculated based on three types of votes: yes (1), no (2) and...
abstention (3). Voeten and Strehnev calculate abstentions as half yes, half no votes.

Voeten and Strehnev's congruence in voting ranges from 0 to 1 with voting congruence presented as fractions; I convert this scale to 0 to 100. There are no data gaps in Voeten's Dataverse, which both capture votes in the United Nations General Assembly from 1946 to 2011, with dyads not involving the US excluded from the final dataset.137 This data is supplemented by the US State Department's "Reports to Congress, US Votes, Fact Sheets, Testimony, Reports" found on the State Department's website.138

Key United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) votes

Data on key UN General Assembly votes extracted from the Bureau of International Organization Affairs of the US State Department. According to Public Law 101-246, "issues which directly affected United States interests and on which the United States lobbied extensively" constitute the basis for "key UN General Assembly votes."139

The US Peace Corps

The US Peace Corps is the premier source of data on placement of Peace Corps Volunteers, also labeled here as citizen diplomats, for the purposes of this research. The data available reflects the activities of the Peace Corps, specifically number of citizen placement.


diplomats placed since the Peace Corps' inception in 1960. The Peace Corps website depository for mandated reports to Congress is the source for this data.\textsuperscript{140}

\textit{Integrated Network for Societal Conflict Research (INSCR)}

The state fragility index data was obtained from the Integrated Network for Societal Conflict research (INSCR) and the Center for Systemic Peace. It is drawn from the Major Episodes of Political Violence, 1946-2008 dataset using the variable CIVTOT2. CIVTOT2 sums up the total episodes of civil violence, civil war, ethnic violence and ethnic wars within a country in any given year.\textsuperscript{141} The data is coded as 0 for no conflict, 1 for conflict for the periods 1961 to 2008, the last year of data availability. I include this variable given the expectation that a state experiencing significant disruptions in these indices is unlikely to attract citizen diplomats due to insecurity, and may not do much voting and/or vote against the US anyway since often the states have had some sort of US intervention before their complete failure.

\textit{Ethical considerations}

As is the case with most political science inquiries at the systemic level, this research does not involve human subjects and as such, ethical issues as related to the treatment of subjects are non-existent. As discussed earlier, the research uses mixed methods; for the

\textsuperscript{140} Data from the previous years was graciously provided courtesy of Kelly McCormack and was computed from the reports available as part of the Congressional Budget Justifications from the 1960s-2004. From 2005-present, the data is available at http://www.peacecorps.gov/open/

quantitative part, it uses quantitative data from widely available sources such as the World Bank and the United Nations. For the qualitative part, the research studies specific cases that illustrate the perceived and reported benefits of citizen diplomacy as a soft power strategy, but also examines the less successful cases of citizen diplomacy. These cases will include instances in which the receiving government perceived the volunteers as detrimental to the national interests/values, for example in the 2012 stand-off between the United States and Egypt over the Republican Institute and the National Democratic Institute staffers in Egypt (see chapter 7 for further discussion).

**Data limitations: availability**

The data suffer from a number of limitations. One of the major limitations is the availability period across a number of key variables. The classification of key votes by the State Department began in 1983. Prior to 1983, there is no data on the key votes; therefore, models evaluating voting behavior with the US at the UN General Assembly on key votes will have the 1983 to 2010 observation years.

The data limitation leads to another possible issue, that of selection bias. In any study, the experience of participants is generalized to non-participants and taken to be what they would have experienced had they participated (also referred to as the generalization of effect). Since standard methods evaluate the outcomes for samples, not the entire population, the outcomes of the non-participants, are not known. It is possible that non-participants would have had a different experience if they had participated; this is the essence of selection bias.\(^\text{142}\) Heckman identifies two sources of sample selection

---

bias: "self-selection by the individuals or data units being investigated and data may also be non-randomly selected because of decisions taken by data analysts." for example the exclusion of now-defunct states and the changes that their inclusion would have brought about to the findings and conclusions.\textsuperscript{143}

This research has some possible selection bias on a number of variables, for example the key UN General Assembly voting, whose data is available beginning 1983. It is possible that countries voted more in congruence with the US prior to 1983, and therefore the findings of the study cannot be used to explain foreign policy behavior towards the US before 1983 especially in the absence of tracking the votes. It is also possible that, confronted with the knowledge that their votes were being evaluated by the State Department, countries started voting more with the US at the UN General Assembly for fear of potential such monitoring and its outcomes.

While data are available on many of the variables which have observations for the entire study period (1961 - 2010), structural data limitations i.e. limitation of datasets have made some observations less than optimal. Countries of the former Soviet Union, for example, have observations for country years dating from 1991 to 2010. Zimbabwe became independent in 1980, Mozambique in 1975 and Namibia in 1990. Countries' data availability is based on independence dates and international recognition before 2010. South Sudan, the world's newest country, is not included in the study. Other data limitations include the effective start of the measurement of the indicator; for example, the World Values Survey, which began tracking individuals' attitudes in 1981. Eight

different regression models constructed on the basis of three main categories of test variables will be developed and tested.\textsuperscript{144}

The research expects to find that a number of curious 'outlier' conditions and results. These will be manifested in results obtained from regressing variables especially with newly independent countries. Countries transitioning to democracy may show higher incidences of higher amounts of foreign aid because they are more likely to be supported by the US as they transition to democracy and new statehood (for example, Zimbabwe in the 1980’s, Namibia in the 1990’s and Montenegro after 2006). Also, the former Soviet satellite countries, in the 1990 period, may have received more foreign aid in an attempt to stabilize them and orient them more towards the western system of democratic governance.

\textit{Multiple regression analysis}

Multiple regression analysis will be used to investigate the degree to which foreign aid, citizen diplomats and other interactional variables influence positive (or negative perceptions) of the US by foreign publics and how this reflects in voting at the United Nations by the specific country. Because the study is testing the hypothesis that citizen diplomats positively affect foreign citizens' and countries’ perceptions of the US and its foreign policy, that countries signal their preferences at international forums by voting in congruence with the US at the UN General Assembly, variables will be added and excluded from the model to measure these expected variances. This and other bivariate and multivariate regression modeling statistics and procedures will be used.

\textsuperscript{144} For more on the models and the variable selection factors, see chapter 5
Models

The eight models on which the data analysis will be performed are developed fully in the next chapter. There will be eight models, based on four groups of variables. These are: 1) measures of bilateral relationships, 2) home countries' attributes and 3) temporal and regional variances. The fourth model will be based on the omnibus model which includes all the variables. In addition, the models will test for differences on key votes versus all votes at the UN General Assembly to determine what variables help explain countries voting behavior, and whether countries vote differently with the US at the UN General Assembly on key votes versus all votes.

Statistical issues

Collinearity

Every quantitative researcher should worry about correlation between study variables. Collinearity is simply defined as a close, almost perfect linear relationship between one or more of the independent variables in a regression model; in other words, two variables are in effect measuring the same concept. It has also been defined as interdependence among selected independent variables. Collinearity may introduce bias to statistical tests.

Schroeder, Lander and Levine-Silverman argue that the following six factors indicate possible collinearity: correlations between independent variables; regression coefficients are contrary to those which have been predicted; regression coefficients are unsover repeated measurements (validation); the $R^2$ estimate for the model is high, but the partial correlation coefficients are low; the estimated regression coefficient have large
mean square error (MSE) and the common interpretation of the regression coefficients cannot be made.\textsuperscript{145}

Several positive correlations will be expected among some variables; for example, it is expected that there will be correlation between the level of globalization and GDP per capita. Richer nations are more likely to be more highly globalized and vice versa. There is also a significant likelihood that GDP per capita will be correlated with levels of democracy, since most democratic countries are also wealthier (this does not imply that democracy causes wealth or vice versa; the two are correlated). On the other hand, lower GDP per capita may be correlated with high incidence of state failure. The research will examine the preliminary bivariate and multivariate regressions for these correlations.

To control for the problem of (multi)collinearity, initial bivariate regression analyses will be carried out among the independent variables and highly correlated variables excluded from the study. The research will review the correlation matrix and correlations between variables that exceed the $r = 0.85$ threshold. However, recognizing that even variables whose correlation is as low as 0.1 may exhibit multicollinearity, the selected variables will all be included in the models developed.

Collinearity implies that variables may be measuring the same concepts even when regressed separately.\textsuperscript{146} Mason and Perreault write that despite collinearity, "overall prediction is not affected, but interpretation of and conclusions based on the size of the regression coefficients, their standard errors, or the associated $t$-tests may be misleading


because of the potentially confounding effects of collinearity."

Most researchers caution on the importance of dealing with the issue of data collinearity; however, Mason and Perreault discuss why this is not a critical concern. They write that,

> the harmful effects of collinear predictors often are exaggerated most important, we demonstrate that collinearity cannot be viewed in isolation. Rather, the effect of a given level of collinearity can be evaluated only in conjunction with the other factors of sample size, $R^2$, and magnitude of the coefficients. For example, bivariate correlations as high as .95 have virtually no effect on the ability to recover "true" coefficients and to draw the correct inferences if the sample size is 250 and the $R^2$ is at least .75. In contrast, a bivariate correlation of .95 in conjunction with a sample size of 30 and an $R^2$ of .25 results in Type II error rates of 88% or more. Thus, the interactions of collinearity with the other factors known to affect accuracy are both significant and important.

Other scholars disagree. For example, Mansfield and Helms write that "examination of a set of data for the existence of multicollinearity should always be performed as an initial step in any multiple regression analysis." They further outline the problems of collinearity, writing that "the major problem with multicollinearity is that the least squares estimators of coefficients of variables involved in the linear dependencies have large variances. All additional adverse effects are a consequence of these large variances: the estimates themselves are often large and may have signs that disagree with known theoretical properties of the variables."

Massy provides one of the possible solutions to deal with multicollinearity: deletion of components or variables that are collinear; this research will, however, not utilize this solution. This leads to the next question: "what components should be deleted

147 Ibid.

148 Ibid., 269.


150 Ibid.
in order to simplify the statistical analysis without destroying whatever basis may exist in
the explanatory data for predicting the dependent variable?"\textsuperscript{151} Massy proposes deletion
of “components that are relatively unimportant predictors of the original independent
variables” and “deleting components that are relatively unimportant as predictors of the
dependent variable (y) – i.e. those have the smallest values of gamma.”\textsuperscript{152}

Because Mason and Perreault, and other scholars who do not consider
multicollinearity a problem, do not actively advocate for exclusion of its examination and
investigation, this research will adopt the Mason and Perreault approach and will not
exclude any variables from the research. I propose to use Massey’s approach: deletion of
components that allow for the simplification of the analysis without destroying the basis
for the proposition that they are important in predicting state behavior towards the US.

\textit{Heteroscedasticity}

In weighted least squares estimations, the values of y corresponding to various x values
should be evenly weighted; when they are not, a condition of error variance not being
constant on all observations is referred to as heteroscedasticity. Heteroscedasticity is
therefore the violation of the assumption that the error term in the predicted model has a
constant variance.\textsuperscript{153} Homoscedasticity is an equal-variance assumption that holds that
given X, the error terms are constant for all observations, i.e. whenever X varies; the

\textsuperscript{151} Massy, William F. "Principal Components Regression in Exploratory Statistical

\textsuperscript{152} Ibid., 241.

\textsuperscript{153} Xin Yan and Xiaogang Su. \textit{Linear Regression Analysis: Theory and Computing}.
corresponding response $Y$ has the same corresponding variance (on $Y$) around the regression line.$^{154}$

Wang and Jain list the following as the two major causes of heteroscedasticity: 1) one or more variables in a database with values with a large range (i.e. the range between the smallest and largest values is very large); 2) degrees of growth between the independent variable and the dependent variable vary significantly during the modeling period especially in series data and in heterogeneous data (cross-sectional data analysis).$^{155}$ By visually inspecting the residuals, carrying out the Goldfeld-Quandt test or the Park Test, one can detect the presence of heteroscedasticity.$^{156}$ Treating data for heteroscedasticity can often be a simple process through the use of the Generalized Least Squares Method (GLS) transforming the data by an appropriate factor and then applying the OLS procedure to the transformed data to estimate the model.$^{157}$

**Conclusion**

The objective of this chapter is to outline the research methodology that the dissertation will use. In the chapter, I begin by outlining the research design and justifying the use of a mixed-methods approach, i.e. qualitative and quantitative approaches and briefly discuss each of the approaches. I explain the choice of case studies for the qualitative section of the research, and then delves into the quantitative section of the research. In

---

$^{154}$ Ibid. 197.


$^{156}$ Ibid. 93.

$^{157}$ Ibid. 94.
this chapter, I outline the selection, grouping, coding and operationalization of variables. I then discuss the study period and the theoretical underpinning of the study period.

Next, I discuss the sources of data, which are mainly drawn from the US State Department, the Affinity of Nations datasets by Voeten and by Dreher, the Systemic Peace Institute's Polity IV and State Fragility datasets, and the Freedom House and Foreign Policy's state failure data. I then discuss the limitations of the data, which includes unavailability of data (for example, on key UN General Assembly votes, whose tracking began in 1983) and the limitations imposed by different countries' varying independence dates and break-up of countries, for example the Soviet Union in 1991 and Yugoslavia in 1993. I then discuss the data analysis procedures, the four analysis models, and finally the statistical issues such as heteroscedasticity and collinearity.

In the following chapter, I perform the data analysis across four base models outlined in the previous chapter, each model with two dependent variables. These models are: the omnibus model, the factors of bilateral attraction, attributes of the host country and the temporal and regional variables. For robustness, I use two sources of data, i.e. the Gartzke Affinity of Nations voting data and Dreher and Sturm data. The chapter therefore produces sixteen models which will be then summarized in two tables. The findings of the multiple regressions will then be outlined and discussed.
CHAPTER V
QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

Introduction

This chapter tests the hypotheses developed in chapter 3, using the quantitative methods discussed in chapter 4. Keeping with the outline first developed in chapter 3, I develop four models based on the groups of variables. These groups of variables are: first, the entire group of variables grouped together in an “omnibus” model; secondly, the factors of bilateral attraction; thirdly, the host country attributes and fourth, the control variables.

I will first test the “Omnibus model”, which includes all the variables in the study. If the entire group of selected variables matter, this is the most robust model, since it allows for testing of each variable while holding all the other variables constant.

I will then test the second group of variables, which are the factors of bilateral relationships: these are the variables directly related to US involvement in the second country. I will then test the third group of variables, the attributes of the host country that influence the way countries vote in congruence with the US at the UN General Assembly. Third, I will test the final group of variables, which are the temporal and regional variables. These tests develop four models. The subsequent use of two sets of data for the UN General Assembly votes produce a total of sixteen models.

Previously, I stated the expectation that countries will vote differently on key UN General Assembly votes than on all UN General Assembly votes. This expectation arises from the importance attached to key votes and the support they signify for the voting country towards the United States. Key votes are “votes on issues which directly affected
United States interests and on which the United States lobbied extensively. I will run regression tests of all variables on the UN General Assembly key votes and a second set of regression tests of all variables on all the UN General Assembly votes. Given the four groups of variables, there will be eight models total.

After performing the regression tests for the four base models, I will discuss the findings that the regressions procure. Finally, I will highlight the caveats and the challenges of determining whether or not countries vote with the US at the UN General Assembly primarily based on bilateral and multilateral interactions, specific attributes of these interactions or through a combination of factors. The chapter will conclude by examining other evidence of how countries vote, the qualitative aspect of the study.

Hypotheses tests

In this section, I test and present the results of the multiple regression statistics. There are a total of sixteen models, presented in four groups; a) the omnibus model, b) the factors of bilateral attraction, c) the host country attributes and d) the regional and temporal effects. In each of the four models, I perform statistical regressions for key UN General Assembly votes and for all UN General Assembly votes. Additionally, I perform these regressions based on the Voeten & Strezhnev Dataverse network data, and on the Dreher, Strum and Vreeland KOF Institute data. Within each of the four models, the data is presented as a) Voeten & Strehnev (abbreviated as VS), b) key UN General Assembly votes, Dreher, Strum and Vreeland (abbreviated DSV) key UN General Assembly votes. c) Voeten & Strehnev all UNGA votes and Dreher, Strum and Vreeland all UNGA votes.

---

The omnibus model

1a) Voeten-Strum (VS) key UN General Assembly votes

From table 5.1 below, the Voeten-Strum model summary has an adjusted $R^2$ of .294.

Table 5.1 Omnibus, Key UNGA Votes VS model summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adjusted $R^2$</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.571*</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>12.07325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 5.2 Omnibus, key UNGA votes VS Model Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstand. Coefficients</th>
<th>Std. Coefficients</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity Stats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2549.870</td>
<td>495.327</td>
<td>5.148</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>-1.263</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>-5.105</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Diplomats</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>2.234</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Military Aid</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Aid</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>1.683</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI from US</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-1.058</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI to US</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.681</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-2.748</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mil. Expenditure</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>1.453</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ. Expend</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>.979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP p.c.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.602</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Fragility</td>
<td>-.210</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>-2.988</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalization</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>3.886</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. America</td>
<td>34.372</td>
<td>12.114</td>
<td>2.837</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. America</td>
<td>9.614</td>
<td>2.089</td>
<td>4.602</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>21.991</td>
<td>3.294</td>
<td>6.675</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>5.861</td>
<td>1.849</td>
<td>3.170</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.548</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Key UNGA votes
More importantly, as shown in table 5.2 above, the coefficients for the year, citizen diplomats, immigration, democracy and regional dummy variables for North and South America, Europe and Asia are statistically significant. Half of the variables in the model are statistically significant. The coefficient for the year is negatively signed, indicating that over time, countries vote less with the US at the UN on key votes.

1 b) DSV key UN General Assembly votes

The Dreher, Sturm and Vreeland omnibus model has 444 valid observations. Its adjusted \( R^2 \) is also more robust at .332 as shown in table 5.3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>13.62740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>13.958</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In the DSV model shown in the coefficients table 5.4 below, the year, immigration to the US, democracy and regional variables for North and South America, Europe and Asia are statistically significant. In this model, the citizen diplomacy variable unstandardized coefficient is not statistically significant contrary to the stated hypothesis. Neither is the democracy variable, unlike in the VS data model. The year variable is statistically significant and negatively signed, as is the case in the VS model, suggesting that over time, countries vote less with the US at the UN General Assembly. This finding holds across both models and this indicates some robustness.
Table 5.4 Omnibus, key UNGA votes DSV model coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>VIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2599.085</td>
<td>515.883</td>
<td>5.038</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>1.290</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>-.234</td>
<td>-5.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Dipl.</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>1.561</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Mil Aid</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Aid</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-1.026</td>
<td>.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI 2 US</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>-1.019</td>
<td>.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI from US</td>
<td>-8.076E-005</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.162</td>
<td>-2.211</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.162</td>
<td>-2.211</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>4.332</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP p.c.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalization</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td>.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUEXP%GDP</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>-.819</td>
<td>.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILEXP%GDP</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Fragility</td>
<td>-.319</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>-1.506</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N America</td>
<td>36.469</td>
<td>13.264</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. America</td>
<td>11.862</td>
<td>2.203</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>5.385</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>24.161</td>
<td>3.667</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>6.590</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>4.158</td>
<td>1.880</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>2.211</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Key UNGA Votes

1 c) All UN General Assembly votes – VS omnibus model

The VS omnibus model with all UN General Assembly votes is more robust than the key UN General Assembly vote model, with an adjusted $R^2$ of .474 as shown in the table 5.5 model summary below. The model has 451 valid observations. In this model, four of the eight variables are statistically significant, with the year variable demonstrating consistency in being negatively signed. The variables for year, citizen diplomacy, immigration, democracy and the regional variables for North America, Europe and Asia are statistically significant and their coefficients positively signed. State fragility is statistically significant and negatively signed, as expected and hypothesized. There is a negative correlation between state fragility and voting with the US at the United Nations General Assembly.
In this model, the citizen diplomacy variable is statistically significant and behaving as predicted, as shown in table 5.6 below. For every unit increase in the placement of citizen diplomats, there is a corresponding increase in the congruence in voting with the US at the UN General Assembly on all votes.

Table 5.6 Omnibus, all UNGA votes VS model coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3755.736</td>
<td>270.638</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.877</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>-1.362</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>-.569</td>
<td>-13.779</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Diplomats</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>3.312</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Military Aid</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.292</td>
<td>.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Aid</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>1.960</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI from US</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.415</td>
<td>.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI to US</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>-1.251</td>
<td>.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.198</td>
<td>-3.069</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mil. Expenditure</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td>.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ. Expend</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP p.c.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>1.106</td>
<td>.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Fragility</td>
<td>-.253</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>-.130</td>
<td>-2.242</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalization</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>-.892</td>
<td>.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>2.863</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. America</td>
<td>11.486</td>
<td>7.009</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>2.352</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. America</td>
<td>2.072</td>
<td>1.116</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>1.856</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>22.213</td>
<td>1.910</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>11.632</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>5.240</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>5.420</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: All UNGA Votes
The negatively signed but statistically significant state fragility coefficient confirms, as hypothesized, that the breakdown in law and order and governance is likely to correspond with either absentee voting, or non-congruence votes with the US.

*1d) Dreher, Sturm & Vreeland, all UN General Assembly votes*

The DSV omnibus model for all UN General Assembly votes has 444 valid observations, and a significantly lower adjusted R² of .170 as shown in the model summary table 5.7 below. Overall, this is not a very robust model for predicting how often nations will vote in congruence with the US at the UN General Assembly on all votes.

Table 5.7 Omnibus, all UNGA votes DSV Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


From the table of coefficients 5.8 below, the DSV model on all UNGA votes has five variables with statistically significant unstandardized coefficients. These coefficients are for the year, foreign direct investment into the US, democracy and the Europe dummy variables. The military expenditure as a percentage of GDP per capita is statistically significant at the 90 percent confidence level, and also positively signed. From this coefficient, we can conclude that some countries’ military spending correlates positively with congruent voting at the UN. This finding will be examined in subsequent models to determine if it holds. The year variable is positively signed, which suggests that over
time, countries vote more in congruence with the US at the UN. This finding differs from some of the previous findings where the year coefficient is negatively signed.

This is, however, a weaker model with fewer statistically significant variables.

Table 5.8 Omnibus, all UNGA votes DSV model coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-1182.086</td>
<td>534.771</td>
<td>-2.210</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>-593</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Dipl.</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Mil Aid</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>1.625</td>
<td>.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Aid</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>1.255</td>
<td>.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI 2 US</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>-1.037</td>
<td>.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI fr. US</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>4.015</td>
<td>.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>-3.471E-005</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-4.83</td>
<td>.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>3.138</td>
<td>.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP p.c.</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>1.407</td>
<td>.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalization</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>1.135</td>
<td>.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUEXP%GDP</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
<td>.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILEXP%GDP</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>1.729</td>
<td>.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Fragility</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.229</td>
<td>.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N America</td>
<td>5.677</td>
<td>13.741</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S, America</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>2.277</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>14.969</td>
<td>3.802</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>3.937</td>
<td>.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>2.848</td>
<td>1.947</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>1.463</td>
<td>.558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: All UNGA votes

Factors of bilateral attraction

2 a) Key UN General Assembly Votes - Voeten & Strezhnev data

Factors of bilateral attraction are indicative of relationships between the US and the second country in the dyadic relationship. The selection of US military aid, US development aid, foreign direct investment to and from the US and immigration are hypothesized to correlate with voting with the UN at the UN General Assembly. This is especially the case due to the "intimacy" of these factors, and their potential to
demonstrate the commitment of the US to the bilateral relationship. In this model, I will also include the citizen diplomacy variable. The model produces a total of 1463 valid observations.

This model tests for the effects of the individual bilateral attraction variables to determine the effects of the variables on congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly on key votes. As a whole, the model is a poor predictor of congruent voting, explaining about 7 percent of the variation in congruent voting as shown by the adjusted $R^2$ in table 5.9 below.

Table 5.9 Bilateral factors, key UNGA votes VS model summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>16.69862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F Change df1 df2 Sig. F Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.700 6 1456 .013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Immigration, Citizen Diplomats, US Military Aid, FDI from US, FDI to US, US Aid

As shown in the table of coefficients, 5.10 below, only one coefficient is statistically significant – the citizen diplomacy coefficient. It is nevertheless remarkable that this coefficient is statistically significant, showing that controlling for rival explanations, citizen diplomacy may be a better predictor of how nations vote on key votes at the UN General Assembly than other variables that might be expected to be more significant, such as foreign direct investment, military aid or foreign aid. It also provides the first clear evidence that countries attach importance to how they vote with the US at the UN General Assembly on key votes. This is one of the significant findings in this research; it demonstrates that there is a place for citizen diplomacy and by extension, soft power, in the conduct of nations’ affairs.
Table 5.10 Bilateral factors, key UNGA votes VS model coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>30.956</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td>45.542</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Diplomats</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>3.450</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Military Aid</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Aid</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-1.390</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI from US</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.281</td>
<td>.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI to US</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>1.557</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>-1.932E-005</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>-5.25</td>
<td>.600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Key UNGA votes

2b) Dreher, Sturm & Vreeland, key UN General Assembly

The DSV model testing for importance of different predictors towards voting on key votes at the UN General Assembly, based on factors of bilateral attraction has 1660 observations, slightly higher than that of the corresponding VS model. As shown in the model summary table 5.11, the adjusted $R^2$ is comparatively higher, but still quite low as a predictor of congruent key UNGA voting.

Table 5.11 Bilateral factors, key UNGA votes DSV model summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>Change Statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$R^2$ Change</td>
<td>$F$ Change</td>
<td>df1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>18.61171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Immigration, Citizen Dipl., US Mil Aid, FDI fro. US, US Aid, FDI 2 US

The more interesting part of the results can be seen in the unstandardized coefficients in table 5.12 below. Of the total of six coefficients, four are statistically significant at the 95 percent confidence level. These are the coefficients for citizen diplomacy, US foreign aid, foreign direct investment to the US and foreign direct investment from the US. The coefficients are positively signed. However, the coefficient for net US Aid is negatively
signed, suggesting that as has been previously found by other scholars and discussed earlier in this research, foreign aid does not correspond with congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly especially on key votes. The citizen diplomacy variable’s coefficient is statistically significant and positively signed, once again showing that the variable is behaving as predicted.

Table 5.12 Bilateral factors, key UNGA votes DSV model coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance VIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>27.263</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.043</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Dipl.</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>5.412</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Mil Aid</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Aid</td>
<td>-.429</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>-2.265</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI 2 US</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>2.299</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI fro. US</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>-2.550</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>3.964E-006</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Key UNGA Votes

2 c) All UN General Assembly votes – VS model

The VS model for all UN General Assembly votes has 1648 observations, with an adjusted R² of .020 (see table 5.13 below).

Table 5.13 Bilateral factors, all UNGA votes VS model summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.152₄</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>11.06136</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>6.489</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1641</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Immigration, Citizen Diplomats, US Mil. Aid, FDI from US, FDI to US, US Aid

Of the six variables in the model, the coefficients for two of the variables are statistically significant at the 95 percent confidence level, as shown in table 5.14 below. These are the
citizen diplomat and US foreign aid coefficients. However, the coefficients are both negatively signed. The coefficient for US foreign aid in this model behaves more or less as predicted and expected: there is no positive correlation between foreign aid and voting in congruence with the US at the UN General Assembly. The citizen diplomacy finding in this model suggests that countries receiving citizen diplomats do not vote in congruence with the US at the UN on all votes.

Table 5.14 Bilateral factors, all UNGA votes VS model coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>30.625</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td></td>
<td>72.656</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Diplomats</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>-3.408</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Military Aid</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.756</td>
<td>.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 US Aid</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>-2.640</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI from US</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>-1.184</td>
<td>.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI to US</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-0.965</td>
<td>.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>-3.519E-005</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>-1.482</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: All UNGA Votes

2 d) Dreher, Sturm & Vreeland model, all UN General Assembly votes

The number of observations in the DSV model for the factors of bilateral attraction is 1659, almost an equal number with the VS model of bilateral attraction factors. The adjusted $R^2$ is .039 as shown in table 5.15 below.

Table 5.15 Bilateral factors, all UNGA votes DSV Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adjusted $R^2$</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R Square Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.205*</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>19.63693</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Immigration, Citizen Dipl., US Mil Aid, FDI fro. US, US Aid, FDI 2 US
The table of coefficients (table 5.16 below) shows that half of the coefficients in this model are statistically significant at the 99 confidence level. These are the coefficients for the citizen diplomacy, US military aid and foreign direct investment from the US variables. These coefficients are also positively signed, and therefore behave as hypothesized. There is a positive correlation between citizen diplomacy, US military aid and foreign direct investment to the US with congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly, all UNGA voting.

Table 5.16 Bilateral factors, all UNGA votes DSV model coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>17.341</td>
<td>.898</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.317</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Dipi.</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>5.886</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Mil Aid</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>3.406</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Aid</td>
<td>-.181</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>-.907</td>
<td>.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI 2 US</td>
<td>1.529E-005</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI fro. US</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>4.460</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>5.042E-005</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>1.212</td>
<td>.226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: All UNGA votes

Host country attributes

3 a) key UN General Assembly votes (VS model)

Host country attributes are important predictors of countries’ foreign policy behavior. As previous literature has shown, factors such as democracy can determine how a country votes with the US at the UN General Assembly. The VS model has 581 observations, and at .435, a fairly robust adjusted $R^2$, as shown in the model summary table 5.17 below.
Table 5.17: Host country, key UNGA votes VS-model summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.665*</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>64.921</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Democracy, Educ. Expenditure, Citizen Diplomats, Mil. Expenditure, Globalization, GDP p.c., State Fragility

As shown in the table of coefficients 5.18 below, of the seven variables, four of the coefficients are statistically significant at the 95 percent confidence level. The coefficients are also positively signed, as expected. The statistically significant coefficients are those of military expenditure as percentage of GDP, GDP per capita, level of globalization and level of democratization. Globalization and democracy's coefficients are statistically significant at the 95 confidence level. The coefficient for the citizen diplomacy variable is not statistically significant.

This finding can be interpreted to mean that host country factors are important in determining the foreign policy behaviors of countries, but citizen diplomacy, as a foreign policy strategy, is not correlated with these host country factors. The statistically significant coefficients can be explained by the fact that liberal democracies have tended to vote with the US on many issues before the UN anyway. Similarly, most democratic countries tend to have a higher GDP per capita, which is also correlated with higher levels of globalization due to advanced industrialization. Therefore, these variables may be simply confirming the existing status quo, rather than explaining what causes countries to vote in congruence with the US at the UNGA.
Table 5.18 Host Country, key UNGA votes, VS model coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>14.532</td>
<td>4.412</td>
<td>3.293</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Diplomats</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>-.876</td>
<td>.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mil. Expenditure</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>3.132</td>
<td>.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ. Expenditure</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-1.809</td>
<td>.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP p.c.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>3.113</td>
<td>.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Fragility</td>
<td>-.305</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>-1.809</td>
<td>.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalization</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>4.583</td>
<td>.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>1.060</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>8.183</td>
<td>.613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Key UNGA votes

3b) key UN General Assembly votes - Dreher, Sturm & Vreeland

The Dreher, Sturm and Vreeland data produces a model with 657 observations, significantly fewer than the VS model. From table 5.19 below, the model has a robust adjusted $R^2$ of .435.

Table 5.19 Host Country, key UNGA votes DSV model summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>15.76920</td>
<td>.441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>73.131</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), State Fragility, EDUEXP%GDP, MILEXP%GDP, Citizen Dipl., Democracy, GDP p.c., Globalization

As was the case in the VS model, the DSV data model has four out of seven variables whose coefficients are statistically significant and positively signed as shown in table 5.20 below. The finding of the VS model is repeated with regard to the citizen diplomacy: the coefficient is not statistically significant. In this model, the GDP per capita is not statistically significant. However, the coefficient for state fragility is statistically significant and negatively signed, as expected. State fragility was
hypothesized to correlate negatively with voting in congruence at the UN General Assembly, due to breakdown in governance, ability to take votes and elite factionalization among other issues.

Table 5.20 Host Country, key UNGA votes DSV model coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>15.140</td>
<td>4.705</td>
<td>3.218</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Dipl.</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-1.463</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>1.199</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>9.101</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP p.c.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>1.711</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalization</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>4.158</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUEXP%GDP</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>-3.704</td>
<td>.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILEXP%GDP</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>2.758</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Fragility</td>
<td>-.573</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>-.174</td>
<td>-3.224</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Key UNGA Votes

3 c) All UN General Assembly votes - Voeten & Strezhnev

On the correlation between host country variables and voting with the US at the UN General Assembly on all votes, the Voeten and Strezhnev (VS) model generates 670 observations, and a robust, adjusted $R^2$ of .445 as shown in table 5.21 below.

Table 5.21 Host Country, all UNGA votes VS Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R Square Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.671*</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>10.79492</td>
<td>.451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Democracy, Citizen Diplomats, Educ. Expenditure, Mil. Expenditure, Globalization, GDP p.c., State Fragility

In this model, as shown in table 5.22 below, six of the seven variables have statistically significant coefficients, including the coefficient for citizen diplomacy. However, it is
negatively signed, suggesting that placement of citizen diplomats correlates negatively with congruent voting between the recipient country and the United Nations at the General Assembly, especially on all UNGA votes. This is a somewhat surprisingly signed coefficient. It is notable, however, that the coefficient keeps with the general expectation that host-country variables explain some of the congruent voting with the US at the UN. The coefficient for state fragility is also statistically significant at the 90 percent confidence level and negatively signed as expected; state fragility will correlate with decreased congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly.

Table 5.22: Host Country, all UNGA votes VS model coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>18.090</td>
<td>3.173</td>
<td>5.702</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Diplomats</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.138</td>
<td>-4.218</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mil. Expenditure</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>4.098</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ. Expenditure</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP p.c.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>3.965</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Fragility</td>
<td>-.203</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>-1.713</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalization</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>5.069</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>.692</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>7.712</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: All UNGA Votes

3 d) All UN General Assembly votes - Dreher, Sturm & Vreeland model

The DSV model on host-country variables and their explanation of the variation in congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly generates 657 valid observations and a less robust adjusted $R^2$ of .310 as shown in table 5.23 below.
Table 5.23 Host Country, all UNGA votes - DSV model summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>17.16840</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>43.097</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), State Fragility, EDUEXP%GDP, MILEXP%GDP, Citizen Dipl., Democracy, GDP p.c., Globalization

Of the seven variables, five of their coefficients shown in table 5.24 are statistically significant and all are positively signed, including the coefficient for citizen diplomacy, indicating citizen diplomacy does help explain some of the variation in the congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly on all votes.

Table 5.24 Host Country, all UNGA votes - DSV model coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>7.143</td>
<td>5.120</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td></td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Dipl.</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>5.294</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP p.c.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>4.871</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalization</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>2.751</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUEXP%GDP</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.369</td>
<td>.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILEXP%GDP</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>3.682</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Fragility</td>
<td>-.326</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>-1.683</td>
<td>.093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: All UNGA votes

In this model, state fragility is statistically significant and negatively signed as expected.

The level of level of expenditure on education as a percentage of GDP per capita is not statistically significant.

Temporal and regional effects

4 a) Key UN General Assembly votes (VS Model)
Previously, I outlined the expectation that the data here is expected to suffer from three of the most common time-series cross-sectional data (TSCS) statistical consequences, namely a) panel heteroscedasticity (residuals will not have the same expected values between two countries, b) contemporaneous correlation (correlation between two dyadic measures, for example countries in the same geographic region voting the same way, for example Egypt and Syria) and c) serial correlation (the way a country voted the previous year is unlikely to change significantly from one year to the next). The control factors, which include the regional dummy variables to control for regional variation, and the temporal control (year) are introduced in order to control, for example, for the serial correlation (by controlling for the year).

I develop two models each based on the Voeten & Strezhnev data model, and on the Dreher, Sturm & Vreeland data model, conducting regressions on the key UNGA votes and all the UN General Assembly votes. The first model, the Voeten & Strezhnev data, generates a sample of 2382 observations, with an adjusted $R^2$ of .314 as shown in table 5.25 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.562*</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>17.11184</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>156.506</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2374</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Oceania, N. America, Europe, Year, Citizen Diplomats, Asia, S. America

In the VS model coefficients shown in table 5.26 below, all seven variables have statistically significant coefficients, suggesting that as a predictor of voting with the US at the UN General Assembly on key votes, the region a country is in matters, that citizen
diplomacy is an important predictor of how countries vote. It is important to note that the regional variable for Africa was excluded from the model. The year coefficient is negatively signed, rehashing an earlier finding that over time, countries vote less with the US at the UN General Assembly on key votes.

Table 5.26 Temporal & regional effects, key UNGA votes, VS model coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2083.439</td>
<td>102.056</td>
<td>20.415</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>-1.029</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>-.350</td>
<td>-20.137</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Diplomat</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>5.305</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. America</td>
<td>27.955</td>
<td>4.102</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>6.815</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. America</td>
<td>14.720</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>17.193</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>31.578</td>
<td>1.195</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>26.435</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>5.978</td>
<td>1.020</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>5.864</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>38.491</td>
<td>7.026</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>5.478</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable. Key UNGA votes

4 b) Temporal and regional effects - Key UNGA Votes (Dreher, Sturm & Vreelund)

The DSV model generates 2687 valid observations, with an adjusted $R^2$ of .283 as shown in table 5.27 below, is less robust than the VS model despite 300 more observations.

Table 5.27 Temporal & regional effects, key UNGA votes, DSV Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.534</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>19.49681</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>152.732</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2679</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Oceania, N America, Europe, YEAR, Citizen Dipl., Asia, S. America

All the coefficients for the seven variables, as shown in the model coefficients in table 5.28 below, are statistically significant and positively signed, apart from the year variable
whose signage is negative as in most of the other models. The Africa regional variable is similarly removed. I conclude therefore that the regional and temporal factors affect the congruence in voting with the US at the UN General Assembly.

| Table 5.28 Temporal & regional effects, key UNGA votes, DSV model coefficients³ |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|-------------|
| Model                        | Unstandardized Coefficients   | Standardized Coefficients | t           | Sig.          | Collinearity Statistics |
|                              | B                    | Std. Error | Beta    |             | Tolerance | VIF |
| (Constant)                   | 2035.491             | 109.673    | .18560  | .000        | .959      | 1.042 |
| Citizen Dipl.                | .046                 | .006       | .135    | 8.085       | .000      | 1.036 |
| YEAR                         | -1.008               | .055       | -.305   | -18.351     | .000      | 1.293 |
| N America                    | 32.376               | 4.661      | .115    | 6.946       | .000      | 1.289 |
| S. America                   | 14.256               | .914       | .290    | 15.590      | .000      | 1.107 |
| Europe                       | 34.162               | 1.312      | .470    | 26.037      | .000      | 1.121 |
| Asia                         | 5.266                | 1.071      | .091    | 4.918       | .000      | 1.221 |
| Oceania                      | 43.473               | 7.998      | .089    | 5.435       | .000      | 1.007 |

4c) Temporal and regional effects - All UNGA Votes - Voeten & Strezhnev

The VS model for temporal and regional effects on congruence voting with the US at the UN General Assembly on all votes generates 3440 valid observations. The adjusted $R^2$ shown in the model summary table 5.29 is a robust .512.

| Table 5.29 Temporal & regional effects, all UNGA votes, DSV Model Summary |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Model           | R Square        | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1               | .716*           | .513             | .512             | 11.92567        | .513      | 516.628 | 7 3432 | .000        |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Oceania, N. America, Europe, Asia, Citizen Diplomats, Year, S. America

The model's seven variables, shown in table 5.30 below, have statistically significant coefficients at the 99 percent confidence level, except for the citizen diplomacy variable
coefficient, which is statistically significant at the 95 percent confidence level. This reinforces the finding that regional and temporal effects are important in predicting and explaining countries congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly. The year coefficient is still negatively signed, concurring with the DSV and VS models on regional and temporal effects on voting with the US at UN General Assembly.

Table 5.30 Temporal & regional effects, all UNGA votes, VS model coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1844.352</td>
<td>35.114</td>
<td>52.525</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>-.910</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>-.667</td>
<td>-51.641</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Diplomats</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>2.045</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. America</td>
<td>12.450</td>
<td>2.840</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>4.384</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. America</td>
<td>7.102</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>14.603</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>27.032</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>34.673</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>5.027</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>8.812</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>31.088</td>
<td>4.885</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>6.363</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: All UNGA Votes

4 d) Temporal and regional effects - All UNGA Votes - Dreher, Sturm & Vreeland

The temporal and regional effects DSV model on all UNGA votes has 3,282 valid observations, with an adjusted $R^2$ of .125 as shown in table 5.31 below.

Table 5.31 Temporal & regional effects, key UNGA votes, DSV model summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R Squa</th>
<th>R Squa</th>
<th>Adjust R Squa</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>356a</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>17.94040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Oceania, N America, Europe, Asia, Citizen Dipl., YEAR. S. America
The coefficients for the seven variables, including citizen diplomacy, temporal (year) and the five regional dummy variables (North and South America, Europe, Asia and Oceania) are all statistically significant and positively signed as shown in table 5.32 below. In most of the previous models, the year coefficient has been negatively signed; therefore this model shows a departure from previous findings with the year coefficient. This DSV model on all UN General Assembly votes shows that over time, countries vote marginally more in congruence with the US at the UN General Assembly on all votes than other previously models have shown. The changes are, however, quite marginal. The result suggests that in every progressive year, countries are more likely to vote in congruence with the US at the UN General Assembly on all votes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-111.239</td>
<td>61.878</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Dipl.</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>10.243</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>2.059</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N America</td>
<td>22.114</td>
<td>4.277</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>5.171</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. America</td>
<td>3.256</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>4.353</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>22.640</td>
<td>1.175</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>19.274</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>2.888</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>3.240</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>20.884</td>
<td>7.353</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>2.840</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.32 Temporal & regional effects, all UNGA votes, DSV model coefficients

Summary of results

The results from the sixteen models presented above have shown that for the most part, citizen diplomacy correlates with higher congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly on key votes and on all votes. The summary of the Voeten-Strehnev model is shown below.
### Table 5.33 The Voeten-Strehnev Data model summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Omnibus bilateral</td>
<td>Host Country</td>
<td>Temporal &amp; regional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>1463</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>2382</td>
<td>2687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Estimated coefficient (standard error)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Diplomats</td>
<td>0.029** (.013)</td>
<td>0.021*** (.006)</td>
<td>0.021** (.006)</td>
<td>- .013*** (.004)</td>
<td>- .009 (.011)</td>
<td>- .030*** (.007)</td>
<td>0.027*** (.005)</td>
<td>0.005** (.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Military Aid</td>
<td>0.001*** (.093)</td>
<td>- .001 (.002)</td>
<td>0.002 (.003)</td>
<td>- .002 (.002)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Aid</td>
<td>0.009* (.005)</td>
<td>0.006* (.003)</td>
<td>- .003 (.002)</td>
<td>- .004** (.002)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI from US</td>
<td>- .034 (.032)</td>
<td>- .007 (.017)</td>
<td>- .006 (.022)</td>
<td>- .016 (.014)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI to US</td>
<td>- .001 (.001)</td>
<td>- .01 (.000)</td>
<td>- .001 (.000)</td>
<td>- .000 (.000)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>0.00 (.000)</td>
<td>0.00 (.000)</td>
<td>-1.93e- (.005)</td>
<td>-3.52e- (.005)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Expenditure</td>
<td>0.280 (.193)</td>
<td>0.054 (.099)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>.625** (.200)</td>
<td>.551** (.134)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Expenditure</td>
<td>0.007 (.054)</td>
<td>- .001 (.015)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>-.002 (.061)</td>
<td>.001 (.022)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP p.c.</td>
<td>0.000 (.000)</td>
<td>0.00 (.000)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>.000** (.000)</td>
<td>.000** (.000)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Fragility</td>
<td>- .210 (.212)</td>
<td>- .253*** (.113)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>-.305* (.169)</td>
<td>.203* (.118)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalization</td>
<td>0.011 (.084)</td>
<td>- .04 (.044)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>.265** (.058)</td>
<td>.213*** (.042)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>0.536 (.138)</td>
<td>.212** (.074)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>1.060*** (.130)</td>
<td>.692** (.090)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. America</td>
<td>34.372** (.138)</td>
<td>16.486** (7.009)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>27.955*** (2.840)</td>
<td>12.45** (4.102)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. America</td>
<td>9.614** (2.089)</td>
<td>2.072* (1.116)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>14.720** (8.566)</td>
<td>7.102*** (4.866)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>21.991** (3.294)</td>
<td>22.213** (1.910)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>31.578*** (1.195)</td>
<td>27.032*** (.780)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>5.861** (1.849)</td>
<td>5.240*** (.967)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>5.978*** (1.020)</td>
<td>5.027*** (.570)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>-1.26*** (.247)</td>
<td>-1.86*** (.135)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td>-1.03*** (.051)</td>
<td>- .910*** (.018)</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at 0.1 level  ** significant at the 0.05 level  *** significant at the 0.01 level
In most of the models, the coefficient for citizen diplomacy behaves as predicted: it is statistically significant and positively signed, underlining this expected relationship. In the following section, I present the results in two tables, outlining the key findings of the research based on the Voeten-Strehnev (VS) data, and secondly, based on the Dreher, Sturm and Vreeland (DSV) data.

From the Voeten-Strehnev data summary model, it is easier to determine what explanatory variables are statistically significant, as hypothesized by the different hypotheses regarding how different variables help explain voting behavior. This research hypothesized that citizen diplomacy correlates with congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly as an expression of US support of the achievement of development activities, training of manpower, changing the way the US is perceived abroad. In return, citizen diplomat recipient countries vote more in congruence with the US at the UN General Assembly. This indicates mutuality in bilateral relationships and allows the US and the dyadic country signal to each other their positive relationship especially where such signaling is open (that is, at an international forum).

As hypothesized, citizen diplomacy is an important explanan of the congruence in voting with the US at the UN General Assembly. In the Voeten-Strehnev Data model, the coefficient for citizen diplomacy is statistically significant in seven of the eight models, which is in itself a robust finding. Countries therefore are more likely to vote in congruence with the US at the UN General Assembly if they receive citizen diplomats.

Of the seven models whose coefficients are statistically significant, three of the model's coefficients are statistically significant at the 99 percent confidence level, while the remaining four are statistically significant at the 95 percent confidence level. The
coefficients are positively signed the placement of citizen diplomats corresponds with congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly. The only finding of no significance in this data model was located in the host country factors as explanans of foreign policy behavior: citizen diplomacy has no effect on voting congruence with the US at the UN General Assembly on key votes even when they receive citizen diplomats.

There are other statistically significant coefficients – and therefore – findings. In three of four models, at the 95 percent confidence level, the coefficient for democracy was statistically significant and positively signed. More democratic countries therefore vote more in congruence with the US at the UN General Assembly. This is an important finding, since it can be argued that for the US, democratization has a positive outcome for support of the US at the UN General Assembly.

Another key finding is that in half the models in which the variable was tested, globalization's coefficient was statistically significant and positively signed. This finding confirms the hypothesized effect of globalization, which is expected to correlate with congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly. State fragility was hypothesized to correspond with more congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly, but the finding is just the opposite. In one of the four models, state fragility's coefficient is statistically significant and negatively signed. State fragility is expected to correlate with less congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly. The explanations can vary, but the breakdown of government, difficulty in logistics, factionalization of elites and other difficulties in the country can lead to this outcome.

Foreign direct investment, contrary to expectations, has no correlation with the congruence in voting with the US at the UN General Assembly. The case of trade
between the US and china can perhaps best illustrate the priorities of a country in pursuit of their economic interests without regard to how much support they get from the trading partner. In two of the four models High GDP per capita, which often denotes and corresponds with higher levels of democratization and globalization, has a statistically significant coefficient. It is also positively signed, indicating that as a country becomes wealthier, it is more likely to vote in congruence with the US at the UN General Assembly. Immigration to the US is not a robust explanan for whether countries vote in congruence with the US at the UN General Assembly. In the four models in which the variable was tested, the coefficient is statistically significant in only one of the four. It would appear that immigrating to the US does not translate into significant benefits for the US or the immigrant origin country.

The coefficient for US foreign aid is statistically significant in one of the four models in which it is tested. In addition, the coefficient is negatively signed, indicating that foreign aid does not lead to more congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly. US net military aid is also not an important consideration for countries in deciding their voting practices; in the four models where net US military aid was tested, none of the coefficients were statistically significant. This may be explained by the more robust consideration of US national interest, military alliances and other security commitments, for example the Camp David agreements that saw military aid to Egypt increase substantially.

On the host country factors, a country's military expenditure's coefficients are statistically significant in two of the four models and positively signed. However, the coefficients are only significant in the host country model. Expenditure on education is
also not an important explanation of how countries vote with the US at the UN General Assembly. Of the four coefficients from four different models, none of the coefficients are statistically significant.

The temporal and regional variables are statistically significant in four of the eight models. The regional variables' coefficients are positively signed. The coefficient for Africa is removed from all the eight models, while the coefficient for Oceania is only present in two of the eight models, but is positively signed. The year coefficient is statistically significant in four of the eight models. It is negatively signed, indicating that over time, countries vote less in congruence with the US at the UN General Assembly.

The Dreher, Sturm and Vreeland data model

The Dreher, Sturm and Vreeland Data model (DSV) was primarily used as a control mechanism to determine if the findings obtained by using the Voeten-Strehnev dataset and findings hold, given the different ways of computing the affinity of nations scores. As previously stated, the Voeten-Strehnev model calculates affinity based on all roll call votes at the UN, based on three criteria: yes votes, no votes and abstention.

Abstention counts for a half-yes, half-no vote. This accounts for all the votes taken at the UN General Assembly, whereas the Dreher, Strum and Vreeland's data that is used in this study uses the variable inlinehlusa, denoting voting in line with USA, definition according to Barro and Lee. In addition, the coding of the data begins in 1970, and eliminates nine years in which citizen diplomats were being placed by the US. Since the models with key UN General Assembly votes account for data beginning in 1983, it is not a major concern. I expect differences in the findings based on the two models.
Table 5.34 The Dreher, Sturm & Vreeland Model (DSV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Omnibus model</td>
<td>bilateral attraction</td>
<td>host country</td>
<td>temporal &amp; regional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>key votes</td>
<td>all votes</td>
<td>key votes</td>
<td>all votes</td>
<td>key votes</td>
<td>all votes</td>
<td>key votes</td>
<td>all votes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>2687</td>
<td>3282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanatory variable</td>
<td>Estimated coefficient (standard error)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.036***</td>
<td>0.041***</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>0.008*</td>
<td>0.046***</td>
<td>0.044***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomats</td>
<td>0.04 (0.014)</td>
<td>0.006 (0.007)</td>
<td>0.000 (0.021)</td>
<td>-0.017 (0.018)</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Military Aid</td>
<td>0.004 (0.003)</td>
<td>-0.001 (0.002)</td>
<td>-0.014 (0.02)</td>
<td>1.529 (0.03)</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Aid</td>
<td>-0.01 (0.014)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.015)</td>
<td>0.006 (0.018)</td>
<td>-0.005 (0.019)</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI from US</td>
<td>-8.076e-005 (0.000)</td>
<td>-0.001 (0.000)</td>
<td>-0.000 (0.000)</td>
<td>0.000 (0.000)</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI to US</td>
<td>5.347e-005 (0.000)</td>
<td>3.964e-005 (0.000)</td>
<td>5.042e-005 (0.000)</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>0.000 (0.000)</td>
<td>-3.47e-005 (0.000)</td>
<td>3.964e-005 (0.000)</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mil. Expenditure</td>
<td>0.605 (0.140)</td>
<td>0.454 (0.145)</td>
<td>0.541 (0.196)</td>
<td>0.786 (0.214)</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ. Expenditure</td>
<td>0.000 (0.001)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.001)</td>
<td>-0.000 (0.000)</td>
<td>-0.000 (0.000)</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP p.c.</td>
<td>0.22 (0.085)</td>
<td>0.10 (0.088)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.000)</td>
<td>0.00 (0.000)</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Fragility</td>
<td>0.023 (0.029)</td>
<td>0.004 (0.030)</td>
<td>0.000 (0.033)</td>
<td>-0.001 (0.036)</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalization</td>
<td>0.170 (0.185)</td>
<td>0.332 (0.192)</td>
<td>0.000 (0.062)</td>
<td>0.000 (0.067)</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>-3.19*** (0.212)</td>
<td>-0.05 (0.219)</td>
<td>1.199*** (0.132)</td>
<td>0.759*** (0.143)</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. America</td>
<td>36.469** (13.264)</td>
<td>5.677 (13.741)</td>
<td>32.38** (4.66)</td>
<td>22.11** (4.28)</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. America</td>
<td>11.86*** (2.203)</td>
<td>0.347 (2.277)</td>
<td>14.3*** (9.14)</td>
<td>3.256*** (7.48)</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>24.161*** (3.667)</td>
<td>14.969** (3.802)</td>
<td>34.162 (1.312)</td>
<td>22.640*** (1.175)</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>4.158*** (1.880)</td>
<td>2.848 (1.947)</td>
<td>5.27*** (1.071)</td>
<td>2.888*** (0.891)</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>5.27*** (7.998)</td>
<td>2.848 (7.353)</td>
<td>43.473*** (7.998)</td>
<td>20.884*** (7.353)</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1.290*** (0.258)</td>
<td>-0.593 (0.267)</td>
<td>1.60** (0.055)</td>
<td>0.64** (0.031)</td>
<td>- - -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at 0.1 level  ** significant at the 0.05 level  *** significant at the 0.01 level
In the Dreher, Sturm and Vreeland (DSV) model, the citizen diplomacy variable produces the hypothesized results in five of the eight models. The citizen diplomacy coefficient is statistically significant at the 99 percent confidence level in four of these eight models and statistically significant at 90 percent confidence level in the remaining model. In these five models, all the coefficients are positively signed indicating a correlation between voting in congruence with the US at the UN General Assembly and the placement of citizen diplomats. This is a significant finding since it demonstrates that even when the data is treated differently, and the congruence in voting with the US at the UN General Assembly defined in several ways, citizen diplomacy is still an important variable in bilateral relations and in how states behave towards the US.

In the bilateral attraction factors models, US military aid's coefficient is statistically significant in one of the four models; it is also positively signed. US foreign aid's coefficient is statistically significant in one of the three models, but is negatively signed, showing that countries that receive US foreign aid either do not vote in congruence with the US at the UN, or that countries do not view US foreign aid as a condition for their support of the US at the UN General Assembly.

Foreign direct to the US, however, has a coefficient that is statistically significant in three of the four variables, and is positively signed. However, the rate of change in the coefficients is very marginal. FDI from the US to the country in the dyadic relationship has a statistically significant coefficient in one of the four models. This coefficient is positively signed. Therefore, foreign direct investment as a whole, to and from the US, is statistically significant in four of the eight models.
In the host country factors, military expenditure as percentage of GDP per capita has a statistically significant coefficient in three of the four models and these coefficients are positively signed. The coefficients are statistically significant at the 90 percent, 95 percent and 99 percent confidence levels. Countries spending more of their GDP per capita on their military, surprisingly, vote more in congruence with the US than those that do not. In one of the models, however, the coefficient is statistically significant at the 90 percent confidence level. In the educational expenditure as percentage of GDP category, one of the four models has a statistically significant coefficient at the 95 percent confidence level.

As the previous model found, countries with higher GDP per capita also tend to vote more with the US as shown by the two out of four statistically significant and positively signed coefficients, although again, in the DSV key votes model, the statistical significance is at the 90 percent confidence level. Globalization, which has been hypothesized to be closely related with GDP per capita, also has two statistically significant and positively signed coefficients. Democracy's statistically significant coefficient is present in one out of four models in which the variable was tested, and in this model it is surprisingly negatively signed. State fragility has no statistical significance, contrary to the previous finding.

The temporal and regional variables mirror those of the prior model. North America's coefficients are statistically significant and positively signed in three of four models. Europe's four out of four coefficients are statistically significant and positively signed, as is the case with Asia and the two of four statistically significant coefficients for the Oceania regional dummy variable. Africa's coefficients have been removed. The
temporal effects are interesting in that while the coefficients for the four models are statistically significant, in two of the four, the coefficients are negatively signed and two are positively signed. It is not clear from these models whether over time, countries vote more, or less, with the US at the UN General Assembly.

**Summary of key results**

In this chapter, I performed the statistical regressions for two sets of data, the first dataset by Voeten-Strehnev (VS model) and the second by Dreher, Sturm and Vreeland (DSV). Each of the datasets had eight models, based on a) all variables observed, b) factors of bilateral relationships, c) host country attributes and d) regional and temporal variations. I found that as expected, citizen diplomacy correlates positively with congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly in seven of the eight models in the Voeten-Strehnev dataset, and in five of the eight models in the Dreher, Sturm and Vreeland model. In all these models, the coefficients were statistically significant and positively signed, denoting this positive relationship. All told, citizen diplomacy correlates with congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly in twelve of the sixteen models tested.

Other results are worthy of note. The level of democracy was statistically significant and positively signed in four of the total eight models, indicating that democratization may be beneficial for the United States in its pursuit of its foreign policy goals and objectives. The level of globalization, closely correlated with democratization and GDP per capita, was statistically significant in four of the eight models.
Regional variables were also significant in about 90 percent of the models in which they were tested, as were the temporal effects. It is clear from the results that some regions are more likely to vote in congruence with the US at the UN General Assembly than others; this is especially true of North America, Europe, Asia and Oceania. Over time, however, as has been demonstrated by the year variable, countries vote less in congruence with the US at the UN General Assembly. In six of the eight models with statistically significant coefficients, the coefficients were negatively signed indicating a decline in the support of US foreign policy.

The next chapter evaluates whether these correlations that are evident in the data are supported through case studies that demonstrate areas of agreement between foreign countries (governments, citizens and elites) with those of the United States. In particular, I will look at case studies of countries in which the country received citizen diplomats, and the work of such diplomats made a difference to the country in some way or another, where the outcome could change the country’s institutions, practices or perception towards the US. I will utilize three case studies that highlight areas in which citizen diplomacy has the potential to have much effect. These case studies will be a) effect of citizen diplomacy on national policy (Tanzania), b) issue linkage (US military and economic development support and Ethiopia's education sector) and c) personal and interpersonal connections and their effect on elites (Peru).
CHAPTER VI
QUALITATIVE EVIDENCE - CASE STUDIES

Introduction

The previous chapter demonstrated quantitatively that a relationship exists between citizen diplomacy and recipient states' foreign policy behavior measured through congruence in voting with the United States at the United Nations. The discussion on the use of mixed methods argued that quantitative studies are one of the ways in which a researcher can interrogate the relationship between citizen diplomacy and state behavior. This chapter explores the second of the mixed methods – that is, the qualitative approach through case studies – to examine the outcomes of citizen diplomacy.

Much of the research on the impact of citizen diplomacy has been largely based on qualitative measures, and the quantitative aspects of citizen diplomacy are still in their early stages. As such, it is important to use tools that have served the evaluation of citizen diplomacy well to consider its impact. Indeed, Bhandari and Belyavina note that while citizen diplomacy research has existed since the advent of the exchange of ideas between people and across nations, "scholars and program implementers have collected information on the outcomes of the programs, although much of the information gathered in the past has been anecdotal and focused mostly on the impact on individual participants" rather than the recipient societies and countries.¹

Due to the overwhelming focus on the impact of volunteering on the volunteer and not the recipient country, this has created a situation where assessment and analysis

of those outcomes for the target communities is minimal, almost nonexistent. This situation therefore necessitates researchers to use existing and/or propose new approaches to qualitatively examine the impact of citizen diplomacy on the countries the diplomats serve; this research, recognizing the dearth of such approaches, proposes new ones.

The chapter proposes three lenses through which the impact of citizen diplomacy abroad will be considered. These are, first, the interpersonal model, which examines personality and personal connections and how these changed the perception of individuals, communities and countries towards the US as a result of the citizen diplomacy. The second lens, the foreign policy model, will assess the role of citizen diplomats in affecting or changing the national policy of the countries in which they served, in a way that potentially altered the relationship with the United States. Third, the issue linkages model will be examined in view of the contributions of citizen diplomats; that is, how the US linked different issues with foreign policy behavior towards the US.

The chapter analyzes the contribution of citizen diplomacy through these three approaches. Three case-studies are selected: Tanzania, Peru and Ethiopia. The selected cases do not reflect an attempt to fit the cases to the models; rather, they represent some of the best successes that the Peace Corps’ citizen diplomats have experienced, and places where they have made the most significant contributions to changing the perception of the country’s foreign policy towards the United States. The selection of the cases also builds into some existing research about the outcomes of volunteering. Mati, for example, arguing in support of regional and international volunteering and its benefits, that in East and Southern Africa volunteer exchange programmes are bridges for people-to-people interactions that can aid a regional identity formation and in facing common developmental
challenges. As such, a number of indications are emerging that the enhancement of regional awareness and the development of a regional identity at grassroots level could be fostered through regional youth exchange programmes that support the development priorities of regional integration initiatives such as SADC, the EAC and the African Union. Such priorities include poverty alleviation, combating health challenges such as HIV and AIDS, human resource development, gender equality, environmental conservation and sustainable development, and even peace and security.²

It is imperative that the models suggested address the strongest cases possible, link to existing literature but also evaluate the outcomes which are adequately covered by the citizen diplomat outcomes in these three countries. In addition, the case selection takes into account the fact that approximately 40 per cent of Peace Corps volunteers go to Africa, which explains the two cases selected from the African continent. The research recognizes the importance of diversifying the case selection to different continents in order to account for any regional variances and account for rival explanations. However, the issue of missing and incomplete country reports where the models would be adequately justified was weighed against the need to begin formulating credible models that can help explain citizen diplomacy and its outcomes.

The three selected cases will be analyzed through the three models proposed, namely a) the interpersonal model, b) the foreign policy processes and approaches model and the c) issue linkages model.

Case studies

Case studies as defined by George and Bennett, are examinations of "a class of events" such as revolutions, types of government regimes, kinds of economic systems or

² Jacob Mwathi Mati. "Youth volunteer exchange programmes in southern and eastern Africa: Models and effects." Volunteer and Service Inquiry (VOSESA) and the University of the Witwatersrand, (2011): 3.
personality types. These methods have grown in acceptance and application in explanation of phenomena and development of theory.³ Their use derives from the limitation of quantitative methods and because of the stability of new qualitative methods and suitability of such methods in filling knowledge gaps.⁴ Dorothy Leonard-Barton views the qualitative study method as comprising of case study methodology (how and why) multiple cases and longitudinal studies.⁵

As for the role of interpretive case studies in research, Walsham attributes their importance to the "three distinct uses of theory: as an initial guide to design and data collection; as part of an iterative process of data collection and analysis; and as a final product of the research."⁶ While quantitative scholars may argue the undesirability of generalizing from single experiments such as the "classes of events" alluded to by George and Bennett, Yin writes that "scientific experiments are rarely based on single experiments; they are usually based on a multiple set of experiments" and further argues that "case studies, like experiments, are generalizable to theoretical propositions and not to populations or universes."⁷ The significance of case studies expanding and generalizing theories of citizen diplomacy and the larger topic of soft power therefore


⁴ Ibid., 4.


will aim to "expand and generalize theories, not to enumerate frequencies (statistical
generalization)." The objective then, is to generalize on the perceived impact of citizen
diplomacy across different communities, not to particularize such impact.

This chapter proceeds as follows: I begin by outlining the importance of case
studies in furthering the understanding of the alternative approaches to citizen diplomacy,
its role in foreign policy and the larger soft power theoretical and policy questions. I then
discuss the selection of case studies through three hypothesized approaches discussed
previously. The chapter then discusses how the case studies illustrate the importance of
citizen diplomacy, and concludes by showing the complementarity of the qualitative and
quantitative approaches.

**Qualitative impact on foreign policy**

Data from the previous quantitative section showed that there is, in many instances and
controlling for a number of rival explanations, a correlation between citizen diplomacy
and state behavior as measured through congruent voting with the US at the United
Nations General Assembly. It is important to note that citizen diplomats on a larger scale,
and their work, do not necessarily directly cause countries to vote in congruence with the
United States at the UN General Assembly. As the quantitative section demonstrated,
bilateral, multilateral and host-country variables also correlate with some level of
congruence in foreign policy behavior. This demonstrates that soft power as a foreign
policy option, through its multifaceted approaches, is an effective foreign policy strategy.

Correlation is not causation: citizen diplomacy has not been shown to cause
countries to vote more in congruence with the US at the UN General Assembly as a result

---
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of citizen diplomat placement. Indeed, since its founding, the Peace Corps demonstrated general apathy towards quantitative measurement of its impact in the recipient nations. One of the most challenging difficulties of measuring the Peace Corps impact is illustrated by Searles, who writes that "Ashabranner lamented in the 1960s that 'the rhetoric of the Peace Corps as a dramatic world force' had become a burden" and therefore "Peace Corps declared that the work of the agency was not susceptible to quantitative measures and needed to be accepted by faith." The question still remains: has the Peace Corps' 200,000+ volunteers made a difference especially in how the US is perceived abroad and does this translate to countries being more US-friendly?

Most scholars and a majority of the public and policy makers agree that it has but measuring that difference is exceedingly difficult. Searles quotes Peter McPherson, USAID administrator as suggesting that "the very nature of the Peace Corps militates against effective and sustained measurement of progress -- two-year tours, in-country jobs negotiated yearly with host governments, work with institutions that are disorganized and, most importantly, the intangibility of the Peace Corps service to the disenfranchised and disengaged." While this might be a plausible explanation, it is important to seek other ways of ascertaining that citizen diplomacy is indeed effective. How else then, can we measure the impact of citizen diplomats on state behavior, on elites and on citizens of the recipient countries? One of the ways to measure the impact is through qualitative
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means: assessing the statements of the foreign countries, foreign countries' leaders and communities for evidence of positive assessment of international volunteering's impact.

Evaluating Peace Corps Volunteers' qualitative impact ought to target foreign countries' nationals and policy-makers, and develop survey instruments and/or interviews that elicit responses regarding the perceived impact. However, as studies will repeatedly demonstrate, evaluation of Peace Corps volunteers' work is often carried out through surveying the PCVs themselves. Cohn, Wood and Haag illustrate this, writing that "in 1978 the Evaluation Division of ACTION's Office of Policy and Planning distributed a 20-page questionnaire to all Peace Corps volunteers abroad"\(^{12}\) to determine amount of time spent working with women.

Qualitative citizen diplomacy outcomes

The outcomes of citizen diplomacy, as represented by the Peace Corps Program, were multi-fold. As a quasi-development program originating from the "west" and coming so soon after many of the recipient countries became independent, it was important that the volunteers were perceived differently from the former colonial powers and their work understood in that particular context. The practice of citizenship and democratic participation, for example was not a theoretical exercise.

Madow writes that "instead of offering condescending lectures of on 'citizenship', (volunteers) must find a vital local project that can serve as a laboratory" for participation. Such a "laboratory" could be a community development project which would eventually "develop all community functions and institutions that are essential to a
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strong democratic society." Early on in its existence, Madow suggested two possible outcomes: "give emerging nations a truer understanding of the United States and its people and encourage the growth of democratic institutions."  

The Peace Corps recognized this potential trap, a pitfall that could lead to its philosophy, work and volunteers finding resistance and therefore strived to build itself as a different experience from the colonial experience. The Peace Corps' range of activities can be evaluated qualitatively from a number of approaches, given what the program aimed to accomplish. The program may have started with lofty goals expressed through its three objectives, but the work that volunteers performed was often modest in its scope.

Getachew Metaferia, for example, writes that Peace Corps "volunteers worked in rural development, education, law and agriculture" and that "the contribution of the US Peace Corps to Ethiopia's modern education and development is laudable"; these were hardly lofty, foreign policy goals. Often, Peace Corps volunteers were suspected of being a cover for subversive activities. For example, the (Peace Corps) program had become controversial in the 1960's; "the (Ethiopian) students alleged that some PCVs were working for the CIA and undermining Ethiopia's national interests and its culture."

Despite the mix of global skepticism such as that highlighted above, the contributions and experiences of volunteers – citizen diplomats – were largely positive even in the face of opposition to US other foreign policy positions. Merrill and Paterson
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note that generally, the experiences of most volunteers are positive and for the most part, volunteers believed that they contributed to the countries in which they served. Merrill and Patterson write that "Canada and Britain also sent volunteers to Ghana and their experiences in many ways paralleled those of the Americans." The Americans' experiences led one volunteer to write that "I am more pleased with the world and humans and myself than previously"\(^\text{17}\), indicating a positive experience.

The experiences of volunteers can be further aggregated, although to date, such experiences are often reported upon based upon volunteer nationality and the programmatic differences such as the role of the state, funding, training, length of service and extraction from trouble spots. The objective of this chapter is to especially evaluate through the policy lenses, the impact of citizen diplomats.

1. The interpersonal model

Chapter two of this dissertation outlined the elite theory approach to foreign policy, in which I discussed the view that elites play a key role in the formulation of foreign policy. The case of former Peruvian president Alejandro Toledo illustrates the power of interpersonal connections and how such connections often produce elites, who then affect the formulation of foreign policy based on their previous experiences.

Knocke argues that "debate about state structures and processes fundamentally revolves around the existence of a cohesive ruling class, which effectively dominates all

the major decisions made by government officials."\(^{18}\) The government officials often act in concert, as much as they often act individually; their motivations are varied but the outcomes often have implications for policy.

Indeed, it has been argued that in countries with strong executives, and in semi- and autocratic countries, the executive is less constrained in the exercise of agreements such as those with the Peace Corps. The fragmentation of political order leaves the executive with both supporters and opponents for whatever actions the government takes. Similarly, in fragmented countries, it is possible to place such citizen diplomats with little oversight from legislative and other bodies. The citizen diplomats therefore complement the elite function of determining the foreign policy of their countries, including appearing to be in good standing with western governments and thereby attracting "foreign aid and assistance" through the Peace Corps.

More importantly, elites' and individuals' experiences can be instrumental in shaping a country's orientation towards citizen diplomacy. For example, in his visit to the United States in 2002, President Alejandro Toledo reopened the doors to the Peace Corps to return to Chile after a 21-year absence. More importantly, President Toledo's desire to re-engage with the Peace Corps was first expressed during his inaugural address in 2001.\(^{19}\) Such a declaration points towards a foreign policy strategy and direction, for signaling and practical purposes.


The Peace Corps President

The case of the Peace Corps in Peru illustrates the influence that elites can exert on public policy and therefore foreign policy. Peru welcomed the first group of Peace Corps Volunteers in 1962, and has hosted a total of 3,170 Peace Corps Volunteers since then. Sheffield states that the Peace Corps program in Peru was one of the largest and most robust programs and provided the template for how most of the other Latin American country Peace Corps programs would be run.

Even as the Peace Corps program was taking hold in Peru, other foreign policy issues were ongoing, including a dispute between the United States and the International Petroleum Company and Peru's purchase of French Mirage warplanes, foreign policy crises that strained US-Peruvian relations. In addition, 1962 marked the overthrow of President Manuel Prado, Peru's constitutionally elected president, by Perez Godoy, leading to the suspension of diplomatic relations between the US (and many Latin American countries) with Peru. The subsequently elected president, Fernando Belaunde Terry, was deposed in 1968 by a military junta. Yet, even in the face of a growing domestic insurgency occasioned by the protests to military rule and despite the non-democratic government changes, the Peruvian Peace Corps program continued.

---


22 Ibid.

23 Ibid. 5

The Peace Corps program in Peru appeared not only to be broad, but to also enjoy significant support and participation, wherever fields of endeavor the volunteers were active in. For example, Anderson writes that the Peru arts and crafts "program has served as the basis for one of the most exciting and potentially productive Peace Corps programs to date." But did the Peace Corps volunteers in Peru participate, in Sargent Shriver's words, "advancing freedom and Peace" especially in the case of Peru?

It appears that even as the Peace Corps program was suspended in 1975 due to increasing political instability in Peru and the volunteers were withdrawn, the program may have achieved some of its objectives of changing foreigners' view of Americans. The Peace Corps not only assisted to weave baskets, create art programs and survey forests for preservation by the Peruvian Congress, it also made lasting impressions on democracy, service and volunteering on one Alejandro Toledo as early as 1964.

Toledo's journey illustrates the power of the interpersonal connections that the Peace Corps volunteers have brought to their work. Born Alejandro Celestino Toledo Manrique, born on 28 March 1946, he was elected to the presidency of Peru in April 2001. The eighth oldest of sixteen brothers and sisters, seven of whom died in infancy, he grew up in Chimbote, a poor town outside of Lima, Peru. His father was a mason, his mother a grocer. Alejandro shined shoes, sold newspapers and lottery tickets and snow cones, working nights and weekends and was the first member of his family to attend

---
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high school. While he was still in school, in 1964, 21-year-old US Peace Corps Volunteer Nancy Deeds assisted by Joel Meister, arrived in Chimbote, looking for housing. Toledo, then a teenager, convinced his mother to allow Nancy to rent a room for $7 a month, which was more than his mother made selling fruit and vegetables.

Toledo would go on to assist the Peace Corps Volunteers Nancy and Joel with the summer camp they ran, and spend time talking to Nancy about the world outside in the evenings. Eventually, the personal bond was demonstrated at Joel and Nancy’s wedding in 1965, when Toledo’s parents Anatolio and Margarita stood for in the absentee parents. In the same year, Toledo won a grant to go to the University of San Francisco in the US. Despite his reportedly poor English, Toledo had good soccer skills, held down part time jobs won a partial grant and completed University. He obtained a Ford Foundation fellowship to study at Stanford, graduated with two Masters Degrees in education and economics, and later with a PhD in Economics.28

At his presidential inauguration, Joel and Nancy were in attendance. Toledo is quoted as stating that “A large portion of the path that I took – through my education, leaving the shanty town in Chimbote - Peace Corps had a lot to do with. You people are responsible for this president!” Alejandro Toledo would go on to be referred to as “The Peace Corps President.”

Of course the Peace Corps alone did not have everything to do with the future President Toledo’s personal path to success. Nonetheless, one of the first actions of his presidency was to invite the Peace Corps to return to Peru. The Peace Corps returned to

Peru in 2002\textsuperscript{29} and was one of the highlights of President Bush’s visit, the first ever by a sitting US President to Peru. There are perhaps many other untold stories of how personal and interpersonal connections changed the lives of individuals and communities, but it is clear that these actions have had an effect on Peruvian elites, possibly the country and its relationship with the US.

Toledo may be the most famous of the elites who were impacted by the Peace Corps and later rose to become president, but the Peruvian experience is not necessarily an isolated case. It is plausible that many more untold stories of small and large impacts abound. Peru’s case demonstrates citizen diplomacy interfaces with individuals, communities and nations. In addition, statements and testaments about the effect of the Peace Corps in different countries by different leaders demonstrate the value of Peace Corps volunteers.\textsuperscript{30}

2. Issue linkages model

The history of the Peace Corps in Ethiopia, with its sporadic interruption and resumption, illustrates how the US successfully linked foreign assistance in the form of citizen diplomacy to its security objectives. The Ethiopian Peace Corps program has been active


\textsuperscript{30} See for example the statements by Mamadou Tandja (Niger's president), Ilham Aliyev (Azerbaijan president), Bakili Muluzi (former Malawi president), Justin Malewezi (former Malawi Vice President), President Teburoro Tito (former Kiribati President), Nevers Mumba (former Zambia Vice President), among others. http://www.peacecorps.gov/resources/media/mediacores/quotes/ (Web.) Accessed 2/5/2013.
in the years 1962-1977, 1995-1999 and from 2007-present. During these periods, US security interests in the Horn of Africa region have been paramount: first, during the post-colonial period, during the immediate post-Cold War period and in the post-9/11 era of war against terrorism.

The processes, benefits and pitfalls of issue linkage, cooperation and collaboration have been well chronicled by literature, for example in Davis (2004), Haas (2004), Gilbert, Morabito and Stohr (2010), Long and Leeds (2006), among others. Long and Leeds, for example, write that “issue linkage may allow leaders to surmount the dilemmas of cooperation by increasing the type and range of distributed benefits and by limiting incentives for opportunism.” Davis argues that “issue linkage is a common negotiation strategy that involves combining multiple issues to change the balance of interests in favor of a negotiated agreement.” Haas views the need for collaboration as arising "from the recognition that the costs of national self-reliance are usually


excessive." It is not absolutely clear that issue linkage equally benefits both parties, even though the expectation is that both parties benefit.

Literature on issue linkages between US foreign policy goals and citizen diplomacy is muted. There are few overt declarations of the linkage between particular issues of national interest to the US with the Peace Corps Volunteers. One possible explanation of this was that the US wanted to appear to be altruistic, rather than pursuing a foreign policy agenda in placing Peace Corps volunteers. On the part of the recipients, Searles writes that in some instances the "acceptance" of such volunteers was used as a strategy to hopefully unlock US foreign aid by demonstrating cooperation with a program that was important to the United States.

However, as Hoffman writes, "the Peace Corps was perhaps the most explicitly humanitarian means of foreign policy ever undertaken on a long-term basis." The establishment of the Peace Corps program, however, often brought about unintended issue linkages. Hoffman writes, For example, that even as the Peace Corps program was promoted as a way of showing the "different America", separate from the prior experience of imperialism. "International criticisms of American domestic policies strongly influence the emergence of the Peace corps, which sought to show that America was not at base a racist nation." The problems posed by US domestic policies extended to the placement of the diplomats from the new nations, the very nations that the US
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sought to place citizen diplomats in. It also complicated the US domestic political landscape with regard to race and equality and probably hastened the subsequent social changes that led to the Civil Rights Act.

The presence of the US Peace Corps volunteers in Ethiopia reflected a general rapprochement between the US and Ethiopia. The US viewed Ethiopia as "one of the most backward areas in the world;" this guided the US attitude and response to appeals by Ethiopia to the US "for political and military as well as economic support." Yet, the same National Intelligence Estimate (NIE) outlines the overall strategy from the perspective of ensuring "denial of the Horn of Africa to Soviet domination and minimization of Soviet influence" by cooperating with friendly nations to resolve conflicts, deny soviet domination and minimize Soviet influence, "strengthen US information and cultural exchange programs in the Horn of Africa."

The clearest articulation of the issue linkage between US foreign policy in minimizing the influence and expansion of Soviet influence and the Ethiopian education sector is made by the NIE. In paragraph 29, the NIE called for policy guidance to strengthen Ethiopia's orientation towards the west, continue to provide Ethiopia with: a) technical assistance, with emphasis on education and training programs, b) limited economic assistance, c) minimum military equipment and training of a kind sufficient for maintaining internal security and offering resistance to local aggression, making every effort to avoid a military build-up which would strain
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the Ethiopian economy, lead to commitments for indefinite US support, or increased tension within the area.\textsuperscript{43}

The previous discussion has demonstrated the problems of issue linkage and establishing clear pathways that demonstrate that the US and the recipient country link the issues explicitly, or that the issue linkage is clear to all the parties involved. Issue linkage, however, can be inferred in the US National Security Council (NSC) policy to strengthen US Information and cultural exchange programs in the Horn of Africa, and provision of technical assistance with emphasis on education and training programs and the subsequent involvement of the US Peace Corps in the education system in Ethiopia.

The overt issue-linkage between the US and Ethiopia is inferred; however, Lefebvre argues that "arms transfers have generally been considered a barometer of US interest in a particular recipient state and region of the world."\textsuperscript{44} Lefebvre finds that from 1953 until the termination of the US-Ethiopia military relationship in 1977, Addis Ababa stood at the top of Washington's arms client list for sub-Saharan Africa. During this time the United States provided Ethiopia with over $185 million worth of grant military assistance, approved $36 in FMS financing credits, concluded FMS cash agreements valued at about $135 million and spent approximately $22 million training 3,912 Ethiopian military personnel.\textsuperscript{45}

While this amounted to only 0.5 percent of US global security assistance budget, Ethiopia reportedly received 80 percent of the Military Assistance Program, 55 percent of the International Military Education and Training Program and 20 percent of Foreign military Sales financing to Africa in the same period. This figure remained at 45 percent

\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., para. 29.
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of all military assistance to Africa even as assistance elsewhere increased.⁴⁶ At the same time, the United States has, over the 25 years that the Peace Corps program has been operational in Ethiopia, assigned 3,244 PCVs to Ethiopia.

The importance of Ethiopia was described thus: "the basic strategic importance of the Horn is not the presence of copper deposits, the fate of democracy or the future of the Ethiopian monarchy; it is simple geography"⁴⁷ since it lay near the commercial shipping lanes from east to west, and within strategic access to Middle Eastern oil. Lefebvre further argues that "US political-military relations with the governments of Ethiopia and Somalia were based almost exclusively upon Washington's interest in having access to military facilities in the Red Sea region."⁴⁸ Lefebvre further asserts that linked issues such as arms with access. He writes that "the quid pro quo (arms-for-base-access) arrangements arrived at with Addis Ababa and Mogadishu emphasizes that, in the eyes of US defense planners, the principal assets these countries have to offer to the United States are geostrategic."⁴⁹

A plausible argument can be made that the US did not particularly care about the ability of Ethiopians to speak better English, but that the invitation of Peace Corps volunteers offered the US an opportunity to demonstrate benign intention, and providing the volunteers masked a more strategic, national interest goal of securing a foothold that allowed the US access to the Red Sea, refueling facilities and arms transfer foothold. This

---

⁴⁶ Ibid. 13, 14
⁴⁷ Ibid. 15
⁴⁸ Ibid. 18
⁴⁹ Ibid.
proximity is evident in the US selection of Djibouti, which neighbors Somalia, Ethiopia and Eritrea, as home to the largest contingent of US troops in Africa.

The Peace Corps is particularly keen on the safety of its volunteers. The gaps in Peace Corps service may well reflect periods when Ethiopia was politically unsound therefore required removal of American citizens from Ethiopia. Alternately, Ethiopia’s development indices did not change significantly enough to eliminate the need for Peace Corps Volunteers.\(^\text{50}\) Their presence in Ethiopia therefore was not just a question of social and economic development, rather, as Lefebvre has shown, Ethiopia served a geostrategic role in US national security and therefore, cooperation and placement of Peace Corps volunteers in Ethiopia was in the national interest of the United States. This may help explain the frequent return after the interruption of the program in Ethiopia.

Issue linkage is often presented as beneficial to the recipient country, and but often solicits minimal input of the target community. An example of this can be seen in the 2010 EPA and US Peace Corps Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed to support Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves in Ethiopia which “will result in increased promotion of clean cooking stoves and education related to air quality issues, partly as a response to the burden of disease associated with the use of solid fuels”\(^\text{51}\) and thereby


increase alternative energy use and reduce the incidence of illness associated with these biomass sources of energy.⁵²

Some issue linkage activities do not produce positive outcomes; lofty goals to link issues do not always align with the conditions on the ground. Burke, for example, writes of her experience as a Peace Corps volunteer:

soon realized that the teachers’ priorities were different than my aims or the aims of the Peace Corps. The teachers’ priorities were directed toward taking care of their families, their land, and maintaining their predominantly subsistence lifestyle. If there was time left after these priorities were taken care of, then they dedicated it to teaching. Usually I was on my own at the elementary school, teaching from US textbooks that had pictures of kites caught in power lines. While the people recognized that education was important, their everyday lives took precedent, and the agenda that I attempted to carry out as a Peace Corps Volunteer was not meaningful to their everyday lives.⁵³

*Ethiopia’s benefits: educational system reform and ESL learning*

While the US was pursuing its strategic interests in the Horn of Africa through military assistance to Ethiopia to the tune of 80 percent of its Foreign Military Sales to Africa, providing foreign aid and placing Peace Corps volunteers. Ethiopia was benefiting from the bilateral relationship. Ethiopia was one of the first countries to request for Peace Corps volunteers. Ethiopia has provided one of the clearest examples of how the PCVs can contribute to national development, or a government program critical to a sector of the economy. The Peace Corps Volunteers have been involved in Ethiopia since the inception of the Program in 1962 (with a 16-year absence after the fall of Mengistu Haile
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⁵² According to Damte and Kock, 90% of Ethiopia’s total domestic energy demand is met through biomass energy sources, with rural households using 99% biomass energy, which is also associated with 4.9% of “burden of disease.”

Mariam's regime); their primary involvement has been in secondary and higher education, and the teaching of English as a Second Language (ESL).

In 1960, 90 percent of the Ethiopian people were reported to be illiterate.\textsuperscript{54} Ethiopia had one of the earliest and most significant "project volunteers" where all 276 initial volunteers were placed in the Education sector.\textsuperscript{55} The issue of education in Ethiopia was always so important that at the time, the Ministry of Education was "directed personally by the Emperor Haile Selassie."\textsuperscript{56}

The need – and therefore the contribution of the Peace Corps to the Ethiopian educational system is reflected in Sullivan's finding that "the country claimed a force of 476 secondary school teachers" who were serving a school-going population of 8,000 students; the addition of the Peace Corps boosted the teaching force by approximately 58 percent.\textsuperscript{57} Over a third of Ethiopian Secondary School English teachers came from the Peace Corps, another third from Ethiopia and a third from European Volunteers. Peace Corps volunteers helped significantly shape the Ethiopian educational system.\textsuperscript{58}

By 1965, were about 500 volunteers working in Ethiopia alone.\textsuperscript{59} The Ethiopian program and request of Peace Corps volunteers continued until 1977, when it was suspended due to increasing political instability. The Peace Corps returned to Ethiopia.

\textsuperscript{54} Sullivan, The Story of the Peace Corps, 109.

\textsuperscript{55} Ibid. 110.

\textsuperscript{56} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{57} Ibid., 111.


between 1995 and 1999, leaving due to intensification of hostilities between Ethiopia and Eritrea (US Embassy). The current Peace Corps program eventually restarted in Ethiopia in 2007.60

Even in the absence of critical contributions of Peace Corps Volunteers in its education sector, in 2000, Ethiopia began implementing an English Language Improvement Program (ELIP) a component of the "Teacher Development Program" proposed by Ethiopia's Ministry of Education (MoE). The goal of ELIP was "to improve the quality of teaching in the Ethiopian education system by raising the level of English of all teachers".61 This program was implemented for the period between 2000 and 2008.

The return of the Peace Corps in 2007 eventually reinstated Ethiopia's relationship with the Ethiopian Ministry of Education. In 2011, 35 new Peace Corps Volunteers were sworn in by the US ambassador to serve in Ethiopia, with 50 percent of the new volunteers designated as "education volunteers" whose "primary role is to support existing efforts to strengthen English language teaching and learning in Colleges of Teacher Education (CTEs) and primary cluster schools."62 There is therefore a direct connection between the PCVs and national policy of improving teaching and learning of English. These volunteers were brought back following an agreement with the USAID in
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2010. Ethiopia's official languages are Amharic, English and Arabic; Ethiopia is also the headquarters of the African Union, and English is one of the six official languages of the African Union.

The case of Ethiopia, examined from a historical perspective of US national interests at the onset of the Peace Corps program, concern over the stability of the Horn of Africa, the desire to limit Soviet influence in the region and Ethiopia’s lack of resources to expand and modernize its education system created a confluence of convergence points that linked the issue of US national security to Ethiopia’s development of its education sector.

3. FPA: Tanzania’s infrastructure development

The case of the Peace Corps and their contribution to the national development of Tanzania can best be understood in the context of three issues: a) Tanzania’s post-independence Pan-African leadership, b) East African regional integration and c) Tanzania’s internal political culture of Ujamaa. Tanganyika attained independence in 1961 and united with Zanzibar, which became independent in 1963, in 1964, to form the United Republic of Tanzania. This section examines the Foreign Policy Approaches (FPA) and the impact of citizen diplomacy on infrastructure development in Tanzania.

Tanzania’s first president, Mwalimu Julius Nyerere, was one of the earliest Pan Africanists who became leaders of their countries. It was also associated with advocates such as W.E.B. Du Bois, Marcus Garvey, Kwame Nkrumah, Malcolm X and Jomo


Kenyatta. Pan-Africanism pursued a philosophy of "collective self-reliance" which was captured by Agyeman, writing that "power consolidation in Africa would compel a reallocation of global resources, as well as unleashing a fiercer psychological energy and political assertion among Diaspora Africans that would unsettle the social and political (power) structures of many a polity in the Americas, from Cuba through Brazil to the United States."65

Tanzania's national policy after independence, Tanzania was labeled "Ujamaa". It was a policy of collective self-reliance based on one party political system, institutionalization of social, economic and political equality through creation of a central democracy, collective local economic production, fostering self-reliance through economic and cultural attitudes, free and compulsory education including cultural education and national unity through the use of Swahili.66 After Uganda, Kenya and eventually Zanzibar became independent; Tanzania began pursuing a policy of regional integration which would culminate with the founding of the East African Community (EAC) with headquarters based in Arusha, Tanzania. This would denote the future trend of Tanzania with her neighbors, pursuing regional trade, integration and stability, gradual democratization and economic development.

Tanzania's immediate economic development needs revolved around creation of infrastructure that would allow it to accomplish its national and regional goals as previously outlined. Pan-African integration, regional trade and national cohesion continued to be the key drivers of its foreign policy. Foreign aid and external assistance


was primarily geared towards meeting Tanzania’s national, regional and Pan-African goals. The development of Tanzania’s infrastructure with the assistance of the Peace Corps can thus be seen in the context of Tanzania’s pursuit of Pan Africanism, regional integration, trade and national cohesion.

The Peace Corps program to different countries began in 1962, Tanganyika, like Ethiopia and despite its African socialist leanings, accepted volunteers in the same year. After 1964, the Peace Corps program was classified as sending volunteers to Tanzania. Tanzania is currently classified as a Highly Indebted Poor Country (HIPC). Tanzania is ranked 152nd by the UNDP in terms of Human Development Index, with a composite index of 0.523 and a GNI per capita in PPP terms at $1,328. Tanzania’s economic growth has been so marginal that in 2000, its GDP per capita was $482. At independence, Ndulu, Mutalemwa and the World Bank estimated that the GDP per capita income, measured in constant dollars at international prices in 1998, was $371.

Tanganyika received 35 Peace Corps volunteers in 1962. In that same year, the then Chief Minister of Tanganyika "was enthusiastic in accepting for his country the first Peace Corps project to be announced." Tanzania’s need was evident and identified thus: "this new African nation has a critical need for a feeder road system, but actual

---


construction cannot begin until appropriate surveys have been made. Tanganyika can produce only two people trained in land survey work in the next five years. Its government has asked the Peace Corps to supply the surveyors and civil engineers needed to assist in surveying a feeder road system.71 The construction of a transportation system meant "greater economic opportunity" for the individual African, "for it puts him within reach of the local market."72

The construction of feeder roads was, in the words of the Tanganyika Minister for Finance, "a key element in the development plan of the country" and the assignment of Peace Corps had the impact that "the Government of Tanganyika is now redrafting its development plan to include the Peace Corps project."73 The project was further outlined as comprising of "three parts: (a) feeder road surveys; (b) engineering on main territorial roads and (c) geological survey mapping."74 In September 1961, four civil engineers, six geologists and 20 road surveyors, all volunteers from the Peace Corps, arrived in Tanzania and began working on their assignments. They were assigned to work with Tanganyikan apprentice surveyors to assist in maintenance, grading and surveying of main territorial arteries.75

The Peace Corps volunteers were instrumental in developing the first significant transportation infrastructure projects in Tanzania. Sullivan writes that "for two years, this

71 Ibid., 7.
72 Ibid., 32.
73 Ibid.
74 Ibid.
group of Peace Corps civil engineers were in the front rank of all major highway construction in Tanganyika.”\textsuperscript{76} It is not quite evident that the Peace Corps influenced the perception of the locals towards the United States more than other avenues; Sullivan writes that while the average Tanzanian was pro-American, “the view is somewhat distorted due to the image of America represented by the local movie houses in the capital city, Dar es Salaam, which portray the idea that America is still the land of cowboys and Indians, Chicago gangsters, and adulterous wives.”\textsuperscript{77} The work of the volunteers was recognized by the Tanzanian government to the extent that “when the corps was attacked by a member of parliament, Premier R. M. Kawawa immediately came to its defense. He praised the work being done by a group of American engineers and geologists and reaffirmed his government’s hope of obtaining more corpsmen.”\textsuperscript{78}

Peace Corps volunteering in Tanzania not only developed critical national infrastructure, it also fostered public debate about the value of volunteering as part of national policy and provided external reinforcement and validation of the goal of \textit{Ujamaa}, that is, collective self-reliance. The fact that foreigners could volunteer their time for free to assist Tanzanians meet their development goals was a powerful indicator of the validity of the Ujamaa philosophy.

This growing congruence of Tanzania’s national goals – in terms of infrastructure and national philosophy – was demonstrated in the 1964 Congressional budget justification presentation to the US Congress by the Peace Corps. In that presentation, a Tanzanian newspaper editor is quoted as reflecting that "if they (the volunteers) are

\textsuperscript{76} Sullivan. \textit{The Story of the Peace Corps}. 148.

\textsuperscript{77} Ibid., 144.

\textsuperscript{78} Madow. \textit{The Peace Corps}. 132.
willing to offer their services for our benefit, why shouldn't our young men also go into the villages and into the fields and volunteer for service in the national projects?" The volunteers in Tanzania appear to have impressed their hosts. "Adapting themselves quickly to their new life, they have made friends in all sections of the community." Despite this obvious early romanticism with the nobility of the Peace Corps goals, volunteers and even the significant national policy and infrastructure areas in which the volunteers were working in, there were political concerns with the program. The Peace Corps volunteer program was phased out in 1969 before resuming in 1979. Before being phased out, the last eight volunteers had been working as water technologists. The reason for phasing out the program was

was basic distrust with all US ventures, particularly those connected with the United States government. Suspicion of the large nonprofit foundation programs, Rockefeller and Ford, was almost as great. Tanzanian government representatives did not trust the motives of United States emissaries; there was the assumption that an American was a C.I.A. agent. There was also growing discontent with US policy in Vietnam. Similarly, the growing expertise within the country and increasing numbers of volunteers from other politically neutral countries may have diminished the need for volunteers.


80 Ibid. 31.


83 Ibid.
The Peace Corps Volunteers returned to Tanzania in 1979 after the signing of a treaty between the US (Ambassador to Tanzania) and the Tanzanian Minister of Manpower Development.\(^8^4\) Since then, the US Agency for International Development's program in Tanzania averages about $20 million per year. "The Peace Corps program, revitalized in 1979, provides assistance in education through the provision of teachers. The Peace Corps is also assisting in health and environment sectors."\(^8^5\) Other area that the Peace Corps currently works in is in soil conservation techniques and increasing co-existence with wildlife.\(^8^6\) The Peace Corps program in Tanzania not only provided Tanzania with the training that facilitated the development of infrastructure necessary to Tanzania's regional cooperation and pursuit of its national goals, it also potentially changed Tanzania's trajectory towards alignment with the Soviet Union.

The Peace Corps volunteer projects in Tanzania appear to have focused on the value of the long-term view of the ability to, in the long-run, affect and change foreign policy. In the case of Tanzania, because of the principles of Ujamaa, the low rates of literacy and participation, the socialist model of democracy and the absence of pluralist foreign policy making, the Peace Corps program helped build institutions and infrastructure that would moderated Tanzania's foreign policy behavior with regard to the Pan-Africanist movement, regional integration, trade and interdependence.

This may well have changed Tanzania's socialist trajectory due to the progressive regional integration with Kenya and Uganda, which were pro-western countries, through

---


\(^{8^6}\) Ibid. 144.
Membership of the G77 and the Non-Aligned Movement and pursuit of Pan Africanism. By cooperating regionally through building infrastructure for transportation and trade, and by supporting and validating the community-building aspect of Ujamaa, promoted by the volunteering Peace Corps, the Peace Corps may have further helped lay the foundation for pluralist and participatory democracy that Ujamaa put into practice.

Conclusion

This chapter has comprehensively discussed the qualitative impact of volunteering based on three models: the interpersonal model, the issue linkage model and the national policy model, using these approaches to examine the overall qualitative impact of citizen diplomacy on state behavior. It looked at how the evolution of citizen diplomacy accelerated from the occasional self-appointed diplomat to special envoys, to the age of "mass citizen diplomacy" with the onset of programs such as the Peace Corps, the Volunteer Service Overseas, among others. This brand of citizen diplomacy has gained importance particularly even after the collapse of the Cold War and as the war on terrorism and ideological struggles have become more prominent.

The chapter the impact of citizen diplomats on national policies and perceptions of Americans as they serve as up to 50 per cent of the educational labor force (secondary school teachers), making contact with millions of foreign publics and in some cases, being called upon to "Americanize" the educational systems of former colonies and move them away from a British orientation. The chapter also looked at qualitative impacts of citizen diplomacy as expressed by the elites of the recipient countries including opinion leaders, the media and government officials.
Target communities and individuals working with the citizen diplomats have gone on to become important figures in their countries (presidents, ministers, among others), positively reflecting on the impact of the Peace Corps years on their career progression, and the steps that elites often take in establishing bilateral relations based on their prior experience. The section concluded that there are many positive changes that communities bring to their communities, although these do not necessarily influence the country's foreign policy but are instrumental in shaping the positive view of the United States among the citizens and their leaders. The chapter also highlighted how, at the onset, placement of citizen diplomats was targeted at countries that already had good relations with the US or had a positive view of President Kennedy.

This analysis recognizes that there are other ways to understand what happened in Peru, in Ethiopia and in Tanzania, and that there are many other factors that determine the placement of citizen diplomats. Yet, the analysis provided in these case studies is plausible qualitatively for the trends we see in voting. There are subtle and overt ways in which citizen diplomacy shaped the interest of states and statesmen, the interests of countries and communities. The quantitative methods used to arrive at these conclusions allow researchers to pose plausible scenarios which are often confirmed through quantitative data analysis; the chapter's findings are consistent with the quantitative findings. These qualitative findings also point the scholarship in the direction of the need for a richly descriptive process-tracing of the decision-making in these states, in order to better understand how citizen diplomacy affects the foreign policy behaviors of countries. The next – and final – chapter will summarize the conclusions of the dissertation and propose avenues for future research.
CHAPTER VII
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

There remain important questions about what values citizen diplomats impart, the extent to which these values are transmitted from the grassroots to the national levels, and whether the values reflect already existing positive relationships between the sending and receiving country, rather than causing mutual attraction between them. The two previous chapters have addressed this issue from a quantitative and a qualitative perspective.

Chapter 5 addressed the contributions of citizen diplomacy to foreign policy and soft power strategies from a qualitative approach, finding correlation between citizen diplomacy and voting in congruence with the US at the UN General Assembly in 75 percent of the models. Chapter 6 discussed the qualitative approaches to understanding the impact of citizen diplomacy through the interpersonal model, the foreign policy model and the issue linkages model.

This chapter will consider the findings in the context of the entire research, provide conclusions, and articulate the place of this research in the greater foreign policy debate. The chapter proceeds as follows: it briefly recaps the findings of the qualitative chapter, and then suggests a cautionary note in how the findings can, and should be interpreted. It then proposes eight key conclusions and follows these up with implications for foreign policy and the greater theoretical question of soft power. The chapter then considers different avenues for future research.
Qualitative findings: a review

The qualitative chapter, through the three models and their examples, found that countries, especially the US, have often linked development assistance in the form of the Peace Corps to strategic and national security strategies. In the process; the country in the dyadic relationship benefits and in the case of Ethiopia, this was through the reform of its education system and provision of high school and college teachers. The chapter also found that the Peace Corps volunteers have affected national policy through their work in development of infrastructure such as the road system in Tanzania, and increasingly, to combat health issues such as HIV/AIDS transmission in Sub-Saharan Africa.

By applying foreign policy strategies to countries’ socio-economic development and domestic priorities, the US has affected national and regional outcomes. These outcomes include allowing Tanzania to draw parallels between US foreign policy strategies (citizen diplomat volunteering) to validating Tanzania’s collective self-reliance model, paving way for regional trade, regional integration and interdependence, changing Tanzania’s trajectory from socialist-leaning to an eventual path to democratization.

Other areas where the Peace Corps has succeeded in helping countries meet their social, economic and health goals and objectives, include Ethiopia, Malawi and Senegal, where the citizen diplomats were integral in setting up educational systems at the high school level, and also teaching in colleges. In other countries such as Honduras and Uruguay, among others, citizen diplomats have been instrumental in the agricultural sector. In Malawi, South Africa and other countries affected by the HIV/AIDS scourge, citizen diplomats have worked in the health-care sector, providing testing, counseling and other outreach services, often overcoming cultural barriers to effect necessary change. At
a glance, these do not appear linked with US foreign policy goals; however, the recipient countries value the citizen diplomat contributions and view their work as a positive contribution by the US.

The US government pays attention to the impact of citizen diplomacy. Successive presidents have frequently attempted to increase the size and often the scope of the Peace Corps. For example, on taking office, President Obama promised to double the Peace Corps size to 16,000 volunteers serving per year.87 Like many other federal agencies, the Peace Corps is required to justify its budgetary allocation each year. Part of this justification is outlining the achievements of the agency, based on the three (expanded) goals in its mission. The budgetary allocations based on Congressional hearings are illustrative of the achievements of the Peace Corps, its work, its scope, and the importance of the agency to US foreign policy.

In foreign travels, US presidents routinely meet with Peace Corps volunteers. On 20th February, 2008, President Bush, the First Lady, the Secretary of State and the US Ambassador to Ghana met with Peace Corps volunteers in Ghana, to "thank them for their service and discuss their projects around the country."88 If citizen diplomats of the Peace Corps' work were unimportant, the president would not meet with them.


A cautionary note

The Peace Corps, the premiere citizen diplomat placement organization, is not a perfect organization. The previous two chapters have shown that there are correlations between citizen diplomacy and foreign policy behavior. Yet, there are good reasons to be cautious. As Madow notes, "Peace Corps was called 'Kennedy's Kiddie Korps', a "haven for draft dodges", another "giveaway program" and "abroad, it was viewed in some quarters as an intervention by a foreign power and a manifestation of imperialism." 89

Former President Eisenhower was reported consider the Peace Corps a “a juvenile experiment devised to spend money wastefully” and Senator Barry Goldwater predicted that it would be a “bunch of beatniks who wouldn’t work.” 90 Concerns remain that as a soft power strategy, recipient communities are not sufficiently politically engaged to an extent that they can significantly influence the foreign policy of the host governments towards the United States. Some have argued that engaging in community development projects is outside the domain of formal diplomacy. Other criticisms have suggested disconnects between the stated purposes of program and host country understanding of why Peace Corps are there.

However, this criticism makes the findings of the significance of citizen diplomacy and the inference that citizen diplomacy has a soft power effect all the more surprising. Citizen diplomacy can be quite effective as a tool for soft power, if the intentions, outcomes and processes were better managed through communication of the purposes and aligning these purposes with the need. The fact that citizen diplomacy


90 Ibid. 131.
affects foreign policy is quite interesting and important; the rest of the chapter will discuss the importance and implications of the findings for soft power and foreign policy.

**Summary of findings**

The overall objective of this research is to determine the effect of citizen diplomacy on foreign policy behavior. The research has determined these effects by running regression statistics on four models based on all the variables hypothesized to be important, factors of bilateral attraction, host country factors and temporal and regional factors. This research falls under a growing body of literature on soft power. Soft power is growing in importance as a foreign policy strategy, and it is important to determine its effectiveness and also set out credible analytical tools and measurement parameters. Until this research, save for the Congressional budget justifications and internal Peace Corps evaluations, there has been few empirical tests of the independent effects of citizen diplomacy on foreign policy. This research has made a number of important findings.

The quantitative data found that citizen diplomacy is positively correlated with congruent voting at the US in more than 75 percent of the models in which its effect was examined. As hypothesized, it was positively correlated and statistically significant at the 99 percent confidence level in half of the models, a finding that shows that countries should pay attention to aspects of soft power such as citizen diplomacy.

The other important finding regarding citizen diplomacy and voting at the UN General Assembly is that voting on key UN General Assembly votes differs from voting on all UN General Assembly votes. In the case of citizen diplomacy, seven of the twelve models with statistically significant coefficients are on key UN General Assembly votes,
while the remaining five are on all UN General Assembly votes. This suggests that countries signal their support for US foreign policy objectives through their congruent voting on issues important to the US at the UN General Assembly. It also implies that the US, by monitoring how countries vote on different issues can manipulate or intensely lobby countries that are less likely to vote in congruence, by offering them incentives or disincentives.

The results also demonstrated that countries in different regions vote differently, with the highest congruence in voting with the US occurring in Europe and Asia, North America and South America, followed by Oceania. Over time, countries vote less with the US at the UN as shown in seven of the eight models, with six of the seven models statistically significant at the 99 percent confidence level. This finding is important because in the context of citizen diplomacy and positive relations with other countries, the US faces challenges of maintaining support for its foreign policy.

- Fragile, failing and failed states pose not only a danger to regional stability and to global security; they also vote less with the US at the United Nations General Assembly. This finding holds true in five of eight models, where state fragility correlates negatively with congruence in voting with the US at the UN. Given this finding, it is important for the US and other countries around the world to take note and work diligently to resolve state failure, which has been on the increase since 1990. Military expenditure is also statistically significant in explaining how countries vote with the US at the UN General Assembly being positively correlated.

Interestingly, spending on education is not statistically significant. US aid correlates with congruent voting at the UN, but the coefficient is negatively signed,
implying that foreign aid does not lead to more congruent voting with the US at the UN. In the five of eight models where the coefficient is statistically significant, it is only so at the 90 percent level of confidence. It is evident that countries do not consider aid as a payoff to congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly.

The relationship between immigration into the US and foreign policy was hypothesized to lead to positive consideration for the US. The research found that immigration to the US does not lead countries to vote more in congruence with the US. In three of the eight models with immigration as a test variable, the coefficient is statistically significant at the 95 percent confidence level, and positively signed. Foreign direct investment into the US is a more significant predictor of congruent voting behavior. It is statistically significant in three of the eight models.

We can conclude that countries with trade and investment relations with the US are more likely to support the US foreign policy agenda than those in which the FDI is weaker. The mixed findings here can help explain why the US-China trading relationship is robust and why the US continues trading with Gulf Oil states, or Venezuela. The importance of the economy to the US may often trump other soft power and mutual attraction considerations. The economic relationship points to such considerations, over and above issues of human rights, foreign aid, among other variables.

Discussion and conclusions
This chapter will articulate eight key points derived from the previous two chapters’ findings. The crux of these eight points is that countries care about how they are perceived by other countries and adjust their foreign policy behavior accordingly.
Countries signal their intentions towards major powers, especially the US, on issues of importance. Citizen diplomacy is an important predictor of foreign policy behavior. In addition, foreign countries recognize the importance of US citizen diplomacy.

Non-traditional instruments of soft power are growing in importance as the world becomes more globalized. While soft power is an important strategy in foreign policy, isolating independent effects of individual components of soft power can be quite challenging. Soft power as a current and future strategy in foreign policy requires more research to determine its effect on inter-state politics. Finally, the research findings show that studying citizen diplomacy among other soft power strategies is important for major powers and rising powers in order to best determine how to best leverage soft power.

*States care about how other states view them*

Contrary to the long-held Realist view that self-help and anarchy lead states to unilaterally pursue their self-interest with hard power, countries care about how they are perceived by other countries. To the extent that they can, they align their preferences with those of others. This is shown by the key UN General Assembly voting in congruence with the US on key votes. The floor of United Nations General Assembly Countries is one of the most visible forums at which states can signal their intentions and support for the US, by voting for different resolutions.

States differentiate between the key UN General Assembly votes, defined as votes in which the US has lobbied intensively or has a significant interest in achieving a particular outcome, and all the rest of the UN General Assembly votes. This voting reflects country interests, which are arrived at through bilateral and multilateral
exchanges such as trade, military and security cooperation, and, as this research has shown, through other non-traditional, soft power strategies such as citizen diplomacy. And as previously shown, citizen diplomacy is positively correlated with congruent voting with the US at the United Nations General Assembly.

One conclusion on states’ voting behavior is that states are cognizant of the importance of key UN General Assembly votes, and recognize that the US government and Congress, in allocation of other benefits such as aid, military aid and formulation of preferential trade policies and incentives — for example the AGOA Act — take into consideration states’ foreign policy behaviors as expressed through UN General Assembly voting. On the other hand, all UN General Assembly votes allow states to signal to the US, to other states and to their domestic audiences their sovereignty and ability to stake a position contrary to that of the US despite strong bilateral relationships.

Such votes can give political cover to elites and government principals in their interaction with domestic audiences, while allowing states to signal their congruence with the US on key issues. Therefore, all UN General Assembly votes can be considered a “foreign policy dance” where states exercise more leeway in their vote and allows them to signal to other actors such as regional blocs. In their votes, states juggle their national interests with bilateral, regional and global interests, and their behavior.

Perception and signaling through voting at the UN General Assembly can reflect mutual attraction. Countries can arrive at mutual attraction through perceived benefits; if a country votes in congruence with the US at the UN and the vote aligns with its interests, then it is likely to be more rewarded for its vote. Such reward can be in form of traditional, military or other assistance, or through the placement of citizen diplomats.
Citizen diplomacy therefore can be used as a way of signaling bilateral cooperation between the US and the recipient country, demonstrating attraction to both countries and to other areas the hegemon may seek to influence.

In this context, citizen diplomacy becomes an important calculation among states. As a hegemon, the United States signals its commitment to the social and economic development of states in the UN system by placing citizen diplomats and by providing other avenues of assistance such as foreign aid and military aid. At the national policy level, the recipient states are able to obtain free labor, which has often built and altered their national infrastructure and been instrumental in putting systems in place, as was the case in Ethiopia's educational system. The elites in the recipient states are able to signal to their constituents that they pursue independence while leveraging US support for their local development and also build relationships with the US. The citizen diplomats provide invaluable services that the recipients might otherwise not have access to and also create person-to-person relationships such as the case of Peru's Alejandro Toledo.

Key and all UN General Assembly votes are different

The US and countries with which the US is in a dyadic relationship know this too, and vote differently. This is an important finding: countries behave differently given the foreign policy interests of the other country, in this case the US. The US has an overriding interest to attract support for its global agenda, from democratization to war against terrorism, free trade, capitalism or the elimination of nuclear weapons. One tool that solves these overriding interests is citizen diplomacy.
Countries that, for example, do not possess nuclear weapons can vote with the US on its preferred position since their net opportunity cost is almost non-existent; Kiribati is quite unlikely to achieve nuclear fission any time soon, yet the US considers how countries vote on key issues such as nuclear proliferation, human rights, among others, in allocating aid and in strengthening bilateral relationships. The consideration for the voting pattern may also reflect the desire to be perceived as having support for US foreign policy positions and its position on a key issue. The calculated benefit of the various votes is a key consideration of how states will vote. States therefore can signal the level of agreement with the US even when their cost for supporting key issues is almost negligible.

By looking to the US and determining its foreign policy preferences and priorities — as identified by the key votes’ designation, states can adjust their own foreign policy preferences and align them with those of the US. This gives credence to two important concepts: there is mutual attraction between the two states in the dyadic relationship, and further, that as institutionalists argue, complete and prior information regarding other actors in international studies are instrumental in determining whether states get cooperation or not. Mutual attraction is the central element of soft power; that one state can get another to align its preferences with that of the more powerful state is shown by congruent voting with the US, more so on key UN General Assembly votes.

*Citizen diplomacy matters and predicts foreign behavior*

Citizen diplomacy serves dual socio-economic development and foreign policy purposes. For the receiving nation, there are dual benefits of socio-economic development and
signaling foreign policy achievements through friendship with the hegemon. The benefits of citizen diplomacy to the socio-economic development within the different preferences in the dyadic relationship were especially evident in the post-independence era, when African governments were left with little trained manpower. Examples of this include Tanzania’s lack of trained road surveyors, Congo Kinshasa’s lack of trained African doctors and engineers and Ethiopia’s education system being half-staffed by Peace Corps volunteers. The US sending volunteers to work in different sectors either for free or very little cost made citizen diplomacy attractive to the receiving nations and to the US since it could exert its influence in a benevolent way.

For the receiving nations, it offered an opportunity to recruit experienced workers for free – or for a very minimal cost, compared to the departing colonial expatriates – and to achieve the double political coup of elites being able to claim freedom from the colonial powers and forging new relations with non-imperial powers such as the United States or the Soviet Union. The work of citizen diplomacy is sometimes adjusted to fit global needs, for example the Bush Administration’s use of the Peace Corps to contain and reverse the effects of HIV/AIDS.

Through citizen diplomacy, leaders can convincingly lay claim to the friendship factor of the citizen diplomacy. As previously shown, leaders in foreign countries pay attention to the work of citizen diplomats and often arrange elaborate reception and departure ceremonies for the volunteers. These ceremonies give stature to leaders who may be faced with difficult social, economic and political conditions with their publics. US leaders also pay attention to citizen diplomacy, through Congressional budget justifications, congressional testimonies and oversight, confirmation of Peace Corps
directors and meetings with citizen diplomats while they are serving in foreign countries. Even as a signaling strategy for either country – benign care and non-imperial assistance to countries in need by the US and support of US foreign policy positions during votes with the US and other public expressions of mutual friendships, citizen diplomacy becomes one of the tools that any state has in its arsenal to carry out foreign policy.

The importance of citizen diplomacy can also be seen in state-to-state relations: France in the 1960's was reported to pressure Guinea to expel American Peace Corps Volunteers who were working in its education system since France was not keen on losing influence in Guinea. This friction in the sphere of interest/influence further demonstrates that even other countries pay attention to citizen diplomacy and the potential for erosion of their entrenched interests.

*Citizen diplomacy can be perceived as a threat*

Countries recognize the importance of citizen diplomacy and their actions sometimes confirm the perceived impact that citizen diplomats can have. This recognition leads to states constraining them, imposing tough conditions and oversight on the citizen diplomats, or allowing the actions of such citizen diplomacy to be carried out. When foreign countries exercise sovereignty, they can use citizen diplomats as leverage to express displeasure with the United States by asserting non-interference in the internal activities of the country, embarrass the sending government or welcome citizen diplomats to express solidarity with the US.\(^1\) Even weaker nations have demonstrated the

---

\(^1\) Peace Corps volunteers have been thrown out of several countries for a variety of reasons, including suspicion of spying for the US (or suspected affiliation with the CIA), apprehension by host governments against their work (for example, in the case of Tanzania in
inviolability of their sovereignty and self-determination by detaining or expelling citizen diplomats, as was the case in Haiti after the 2010 earthquake when it expelled a religious organization accused of engaging in human trafficking.\(^{92}\)

Citizen diplomacy often has negative consequences, for the sending nation and the receiving nation. For the sending nation, citizen diplomats have often been bundled out unceremoniously and branded “CIA cover agents” (in Turkey) or, “imperialists” (Bolivia), among others. While this study assessed the most widely recognized citizen diplomacy organization, the US Peace Corps represents only a narrow spectrum of citizen diplomacy. Other citizen diplomacy tracks include funding, religion (and associated missionary work), research, training and education (for example, service learning, study abroad and student exchanges) and to some extent business.\(^{93}\)

Other closely associated forms of citizen diplomacy, outside the main areas of operation — agriculture, health, education and small business — have included working for non-governmental organizations as foreign staff in support of domestic operations (for example, CARE, OXFAM, Medecins sans Frontieres, United Nations agencies such as the World Food Programs, among others); or monitoring and assisting nations as they increase civic education, conduct democratic elections and put in place institutions that support democratization. The importance of the work of these individuals and groups often leads to diplomatic standoffs arising from accusations of interfering with the


activities of a sovereign nation. Apart from Bolivia's *Blood of the Condor* incident targeting citizen diplomats, the most illustrative cases of the opposition to the perceived influence of citizen diplomacy can be located in Russia and Egypt.

**Russia**

The conflictual relationship between NGOs and the government in Russia has not been the subject of extensive study. However, news media and reports from Russia have often highlighted the importance of NGOs – or more accurately, the threat they pose to the governments of the countries in which they operate. Some of the NGOs are backed by or funded by the US, for example Golos.

In the 2012 elections, the Russian courts fined Golos 30,000 rubles for being a "representative(s) of foreign countries" seeking to "influence the course of the election campaign" in Russia. To demonstrate the significance that NGOs can portend for bilateral relationships, the US government, through the National Security Council spokesperson, expressed its objection to governmental suppression of the work of the NGO: "The United States has supported and will continue to support those citizens and non-governmental organizations working for free and fair elections in Russia."94

Interestingly, according to Proskuryakova, current Russian president Vladimir Putin differentiates between local and international organizations; Proskuryakova writes that Putin's government worked more closely with the International NGOs that influence

---

European policy, such as Make Poverty History. In recognition of their potency, Putin in 2006 stated that NGOs "must not be used by some states as an instrument of foreign policy on the territory of other states." The assault was not just over NGOs; it was also over "rights' groups" which were seen to "threaten Russia's Sovereignty or independence." The result of the conflict with NGOs was muzzling the NGOs, in order to prevent color revolutions in Russia such as those that had taken place in Ukraine and Georgia with US backing.

Egypt

One of the most illustrative cases of the importance of citizen diplomacy is the case of the Republican Institute (RI), and the National Democratic Institute (NDI). The latter defines itself as a "nonprofit, nonpartisan organization working to support and strengthen democratic institutions worldwide through citizen participation, openness and accountability in government." The NDI has a strong relationship with the US government as is evident from its funding. Although its membership remains private, more importantly, the work of NDI attracts US government attention to the extent that the

---


US Secretary of State comments on exclusions or inability of the organization to fulfill its mandate abroad.

The National Democratic Institute's work is funded by the National Endowment for Democracy, US Agency for International Development, US Department of State (Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs and Middle East Partnership Initiative) and foreign governments including Australia, Belgium, Czech Republic, Canada, Denmark, the European Union, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Bahrain, Namibia, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, UK and Yemen. Multilateral organizations such as the Organization of American States, OSCE, UNDP, UN Democracy Fund, World Bank Group, World Food Program and private foundations also provide funding to NDI.\(^\text{106}\)

The case of Egypt is interesting, given the 2011 Arab Spring that toppled longtime Egyptian dictator, Hosni Mubarak. The appearance was that Egypt was advancing towards democratic rule, despite the control that the military has continued to assert. In December 2011, Egyptian security forces confiscated computers, records and funds from the National Democratic Institute, International Republican Institute (IRI), Freedom House and the Konrad Adenauer Foundation.\(^\text{101}\) Eventually, the Egyptian judiciary announced that charges would be filed against fifteen employees, including five
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Americans for "managing an unlicensed nongovernmental organization and receiving foreign funds without the approval of the Egyptian government."#102

As "norms entrepreneurs", international and local Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) can influence the conduct of government, specifically by funding citizen groups to advocate for increased democratization, agitation for human rights, justice and inclusion, and in some cases, monitoring electoral fraud and governance standards. NGOs and INGOs are avenues through which governments can attempt to further influence other governments. Hard power and soft power pursuits support the US government's attempts to influence other nations either through sheer power, or by influencing other nations to want the same outcomes, such as democracy, individual freedoms and respect for human rights.

Since the US through its executive leadership has continuously professed its goals to encourage freedom and democratization, it is unsurprising that it supports the National Democratic Institute and the International Republican Institute in their work towards the spread of democratic norms. Likewise, the support of theoretical propositions advanced by the Democratic Peace Theory support the US’ position and objectives of spreading democracy through the support of NGOs and the involvement of formal state apparatus when such work, staff and values are threatened.

The case of Russia, but more importantly the case of Egypt demonstrates that states value the work of non-state actors and recognize that they have an impact on bilateral relations. It also illustrates that government, especially the US government, is supportive of the initiatives, even by private entrepreneurs, who in the course of their

work advance US government preferences. This is illustrated by the recent Atlantic and The National Interest reports that the United Arab Emirates had shut down the National Democratic Institute. Citizen diplomats matter; citizen diplomats’ work matters too.

*Other soft power variables matter*

Aspects of soft power have been leveraged for longer periods than the notion of soft power has been in the public domain. Before 1990, citizen diplomats were serving in different countries, religious exchanges were on-going, as were research, education, training and provision of grants; citizens of far-off countries were watching Rambo movies. Soft power’s primary utility has been to elevate the debate on the utility of alternative approaches, rather than singular reliance on military and economic resources.

While these traditional tools are indispensable – perhaps except in the case of Costa Rica – bilateral interstate relations can often be best explained through the lens of soft power. Denmark may have more military capabilities than Uganda, but the primary means of leverage between the two countries is not fear of a military strike: rather, it arises from Denmark’s ability to provide financial resources to Uganda, or withhold them if Uganda’s preferences do not by and large align with those of Denmark.

Non-traditional hard-power instruments of power, that is, soft power – given its different variables and modes of expression – is a useful, strategic force in foreign policy and has been shown to influence how states behave towards the US.
Citizen diplomacy’s effect on foreign policy: an empirical challenge

“The shape of the world a generation from now will be influenced far more by how well we communicate the values of our society to others than by our military or diplomatic superiority.” – Senator J. William Fulbright, 1964

The findings of this research have led to the conclusion that citizen diplomacy is an important predictor of foreign states’ behavior towards the US at the UN General Assembly. However, as the quantitative section demonstrated, citizen diplomacy is not the only soft power variable that is either positively correlated with foreign policy behavior, or statistically significant as an explanan. There are a number of positive correlations between other varied soft power variables. Isolating and measuring the effect of citizen diplomacy can be quite challenging. Other variables affect the behavior of states towards the US and other states. As the research stands, conclusions can be drawn on the correlation between citizen diplomacy and foreign policy behavior.

It is empirically difficult to isolate the effects of citizen diplomacy and assert without reservation that citizen diplomacy causes, for example, 10 or 20 per cent of congruent voting with the US at the UN general Assembly. In addition, mutual attraction should not only be measured by the congruence in voting with the US; the effects of citizen diplomacy may be more in-country, for example the agitation for greater personal freedom, civil and women’s rights, thereby leading to higher levels of democratization. These are equally important outcomes.

A more specific test of the impact of citizen diplomacy on foreign policy behavior should seek to interrogate the individuals who work directly with the citizen diplomats.
and determine whether their attitudes towards the United States change as a result of citizen diplomacy. Such a test should also investigate the voting patterns of individuals who have worked directly with citizen diplomats in order to draw analyses and correlate voting with citizen diplomacy. A parallel inquiry should interrogate the motivations of elites and government officials to determine their considerations when selecting foreign policy behavior towards the US and other countries. A comparison of the two studies could accurately determine whether foreign policy behavior is influenced by elites' attitudes and experiences, the extent to which such elites pay attention to their domestic audiences, and the extent to which domestic audiences affect the foreign policy choices of their elites, if they affect them at all.

Soft power in foreign policy: benefits for great and rising powers

Citizen diplomacy originated as an idea. John F. Kennedy expressed his belief that young men and women from the United States could help foreign countries increase their technical capabilities, increase foreign nations' understandings of the United States, and increase Americans' understanding of foreign peoples. The “idea” then led to the Peace Corps, and to citizen diplomacy and a belief that individuals can change the way the United States is perceived by and perceives others through interpersonal interactions.

Studying and understanding countries’ current foreign policy behavior towards the US portends invaluable benefits towards rising powers in the management of world affairs. In a constantly changing global reality, the assumption that the old is relevant can impede progress and paradigm changes in international relations. Bilateral and multilateral relationships are changing. This change has reflected the rise and increasing
relevance of norms, institutions and individuals (hence the importance of realist, liberal and constructivist approaches to international relations). Ideas are important in fostering global changes.

Using the example of decolonization, Jackson writes that "social and political ideas can become institutionalized as normative frameworks of human relations...within which utilitarian interests and purposive activities are played out" even as actors attempt to maximize self-interest. Within the rules, deviations that do not necessarily minimize the strength of ideas altering relations between individuals and states often occur.¹⁰³

That statesmen can learn to navigate bilateral and multilateral relations between their countries and others differently from the traditional hard power approach is articulated by Hall, who argues that "the concept of policymaking as social learning (has) been applied with some success to the process of foreign policymaking."¹⁰⁴ The navigation of these relationships is not implicit in leadership, or in the conduct of government; indeed, determining the best political decisions and policy choices is driven by precedent, uncertainty and the pursuit of power.

According to Heclo and Wildavsky, "politics finds its sources not only in power but also in uncertainty – men collectively wondering what to do. Governments not only 'power'...they also puzzle. Policy making is a form of collective puzzlement on society's behalf; it entails both deciding and knowing...much political interaction has constituted a
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process of social learning expressed through policy. The puzzlement then leads to
selection of strategies, some which work and some that do not, for example, the US
government supported Bay of Pigs' invasion of Cuba in 1962 with the intention to change
the government, which had little success.

The importance of ideas is further emphasized by Robert Lieberman. Lieberman
argues that ideas "can fill this explanatory gap" of the policy choices that governments
select. Lieberman further argues that ideas
constitute much of the substantive raw material upon which institutional theory
feeds—the goals and desires that people bring to the political world and, hence, the
ways they define and express their interests; the meanings, interpretations, and
judgments they attach to events and conditions; and their beliefs about cause-and-
effect relationships in the political world and, hence, their expectations about how
others will respond to their own behavior.

The belief then that citizen diplomacy can change the way states interact is not new. In
fact, ideas such as the Concert of Europe; Metternich's Congress of Vienna; Wilson's
League of Nations; Hitler's appeasement in his conquest of parts of Europe; the United
Nations; the SALT and START arms reduction treaties constituted changes of ideas other
than military means of expanding influence. The idea of diplomacy conquering military
force is expressed by Heffermehl, who quotes Napoleon Bonaparte and Victor Hugo. The
spirited Bonaparte was quoted as saying that "there are only two forces in the world, the
sword and the spirit. In the long run, the sword will always be conquered by the spirit."
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Victor Hugo said "there is one thing stronger than all the armies in the world, and that is an idea whose time has come."\(^{107}\)

Great Powers have often recognized the benefits of global engagement other than through war. This is evident through the actions of past Great Powers such as Germany and their leaders (Klaus von Metternich, Otto von Bismarck) and the US (Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman) in pursuing the course of peace where their hard-power capabilities were assigned them hegemonic power status. The pursuit of soft power strategies such as citizen diplomacy is therefore in line with the arrayed tools of statecraft. As the United States has found in the new millennium, the power of ideas can attract – and repel – friends and foes, and is therefore worthy of pursuit through the activities of citizen diplomacy.

This in no way suggests that the utility of hard power is past its time: quite to the contrary. While soft power is growing in importance, hard power is still a primary strategy in the conduct of foreign policy. As Thomas Hobbes observes,

> the laws of nature, as justice, equity, modesty, mercy, and, in sum, doing to others what we would be done to, of themselves, without the terror of some power to cause them to be observed, are contrary to our natural passions, that carry us to partiality, pride, revenge and the like. And covenants, without the sword, are but words and of no strength to secure a man at all.\(^{108}\)

---

**The United States is a unique power**

The US is, rightfully, an unusual power. It is a hegemon of unprecedented proportions without serious competition. It is a military power that spends more on its defense than
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the next 20 countries. It is an economic power with approximately triple the size of the nearest rival economy. It is a cultural power whose brands such as Coke, Nike, the Statue of Liberty are global icons, as is Hollywood, democracy, Peace Corps, baseball and football. The US did not rise to its current powerful status through conquest of territory and colonialism, much like most of the former European Great Powers did, yet its influence stretches across all the continents. The US is an empire without imperial ambitions, but often has military presence and bases in every strategic region of the world, but still does not consider itself an empire. According to the former President G. W. Bush, "America has never been an empire. We may be the only great power in history that had the chance and refused, preferring greatness to power and justice to glory."109

The argument against the US empire is one of never having occupied significant territory (save that of the American Indians, Germany and Japan post-World War II), unlike the British, Spanish or the Ottoman Empires that preceded it. Yet, the US is an ideological empire; its influence is driven by ideas such as democracy. The US therefore behaves unlike most other empires, on the one hand favored by geography (distance from any other proximal lands) and time (distance from the empire-building periods through conquest of foreign territory). The notion of freedom has generally been incompatible with the European-type territorial expansion and subduing of “inferior civilizations.”

Due to these spatial and geographical separations and its history, the US to a large extent developed a unique character of statehood and of cultural traditions. True to its uniqueness, its foreign policy approach has included but also defied most traditional forms of statecraft. The strategies for US statecraft have also included funding non-profit

and quasi-governmental organizations which in theory are independent of government activity, control and interest, for example the National Democratic Institute and the International Republican Institute, both of which receive funding from the State Department's United States Agency for International Development. Such funding is not common among many world governments and may be enabled by the character of the US nation as a democratic country.

Other aspects of the unique character of the US are seen in the leveraging of citizen diplomacy for the purposes of advancing state interests. While the Peace Corps was not the first citizen diplomacy program (the United Kingdom's Volunteer Service Overseas started in 1958), the massive support of the executive arm of the US government, funding by Congress and visibility across the globe has made it a key feature of US presence abroad.

The US, true to its unique character, utilizes these diplomats in addition to pursuing other strategies — economic, immigration, trade, foreign aid, military alliances, military aid and the undeniable global hard power capabilities to maintain its presence globally. Other countries, including prior hegemons, have often leveraged only some of the tools available to them, or were not benevolent global powers, mainly due to their path to power (for example, Britain was a colonial power, with hardly a flattering record for mutual attraction). The US, in this respect, is a uniquely benevolent power.

Avenues for further research
Soft power, as a contemporary and future strategy in the conduct of foreign policy and study of international relations, requires more study, as well as more specification of
terms and measurement. It offers an opportunity to create a robust research agenda that may lead to a better understanding of how countries will deal with the challenges of limitations of hard power. The ideas espoused by soft power have not even approached the threshold of paradigm change. However, it is important to review the process of a paradigm changes, and the potential that soft power holds and probability of a new paradigm in studying state behavior and understanding foreign policy.

Thomas Kuhn's *Structure of Scientific Revolutions* is perhaps the most well-regarded foundation of explanations regarding how new paradigms come into being. In Chapter 6, Kuhn articulates how paradigm changes occur through *discovery* brought about by encounters between "normal science" with *anomaly*; i.e. the existing paradigm can no longer adequately explain phenomena. When "normal" science discovers anomalies, such anomalies can remain unacknowledged, ignored or denied. Awareness and intrigue of the area of anomaly is then explored, and when theory or paradigms are reviewed and re-examined so that the anomaly becomes the 'expected', a paradigm change can be said to have taken place.

Of course there are questions on whether social sciences can be considered to be as scientific, for example in their measurements, in the same way as natural sciences.110 Debate on whether social sciences are actually sciences will not be the subject of this argument; however, it is well established that social sciences can be subjected to the same empiricism as natural sciences.111

---


Coleman, Skogstad and Atkinson write of three orders of paradigm and policy change: changes in the settings of policy instruments, the replacement of one policy instrument with another, and a dramatic departure in policy goals, based on a new theoretical and ideological framework or paradigm, and typically involves state and societal actors.\footnote{William Coleman, Grace Skogstad and Michael M. Atkinson. "Paradigm shifts and policy networks: Cumulative Change in Agriculture." \textit{Journal of Public Policy}, 16 (1996): 274.}

Foreign policy behavior towards the US is an important beginning in the research into the soft power paradigm. There are other areas of inquiry, for example, how to measure the mutual attraction of one country towards another, where neither of the two countries is a great power, middle power or a rising power. For example, how can the mutual attraction and/or soft power effects be measured between territorially contiguous countries? How can soft power and mutual attraction be measured between non-territorially contiguous countries with obvious power differentials be measured? Is soft power subject to the relationship between great powers and all other countries, or is mutual attraction detectable and measurable between any dyadic pairs of countries? These are important questions that further research can delve into and provide answers to. For this research, the soft power variable of citizen diplomacy influences the foreign policy behavior of countries in dyadic relationships with the United States.

\textbf{Conclusions and implications}

The correlation between citizen diplomacy and congruent voting with the US at the UN General Assembly has been argued quantitatively and quantitatively. Citizen diplomacy, \textit{empiricist philosophy of social science.} (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979), among others.
whose practice is not entirely new, is growing in stature and significance as a soft power and foreign policy strategy. Now we can also confidently state that there is a correlation between citizen diplomacy and foreign policy behavior of states. Nations and international organizations, from the United States to Canada to the United Kingdom and the United Nations, have successfully leveraged private citizens' altruism in order to further their strategic interests, interests that quite often cannot be achieved through traditional hard power approaches, or through traditional diplomacy approaches.
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## Appendix I - Variables, Variable Groups and Coding

The following are the study variables, their coding in the dataset and sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coding</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All UN Key Votes</td>
<td>KEYUNGA</td>
<td>Gartzke &amp; Strehnev, Dreher, Strum &amp; Vreeland</td>
<td>Congruence in voting w/US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. All UNGA Votes (votes only)</td>
<td>ALLUNGA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Congruence in voting w/US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Citizen Diplomats (Peace Corps)</td>
<td>PCV</td>
<td>State Dept.</td>
<td>Citizen Diplomacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI from USA</td>
<td>FDOIOUT</td>
<td>State Dept.</td>
<td>FDI from the US to the dyadic country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI into the USA</td>
<td>FDI2USA</td>
<td>State Dept.</td>
<td>FDI from the dyadic country to the US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Aid</td>
<td>NETUSODA</td>
<td>State Dept.</td>
<td>Net US Foreign Aid given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration to US (Green Card)</td>
<td>IMMIGRATE</td>
<td>State Dept.</td>
<td>Legal Permanent Residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Aid in $millions</td>
<td>MILAID$(M)</td>
<td>State Dept.</td>
<td>Military assistance form the US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Democratization</td>
<td>DEMOC</td>
<td>Polity IV</td>
<td>Level of democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education expenditure (% of GDP)</td>
<td>EDU%GDP</td>
<td>State Dept.</td>
<td>Country expenditure on education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita</td>
<td>GDPPC</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>GDP per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Globalization</td>
<td>GLOBEX</td>
<td>KOF</td>
<td>KOF globalization index data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Expend. as % of GDP</td>
<td>MILITARY</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
<td>Country expenditure on military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Fragility Index</td>
<td>FRAGILE</td>
<td>Polity IV</td>
<td>State fragility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: Africa dummy</td>
<td>AFRICA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Countries in Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: Asia dummy</td>
<td>ASIA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Countries in Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: Europe Dummy</td>
<td>EUROPE</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Countries in Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: North America dummy</td>
<td>NAMERICA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Countries in North America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: Oceania dummy</td>
<td>OCEANIA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Countries in Oceania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region: South America dummy</td>
<td>SAMERICA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Countries in South America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Observation</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Regional &amp; Temporal factors</td>
<td>Host country variables</td>
<td>Bilateral attraction factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
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</tr>
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