

2011

The impact of U.S. foreign aid on human rights conditions in post-Cold War era

Hyun Ju Lee
Iowa State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Political Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lee, Hyun Ju, "The impact of U.S. foreign aid on human rights conditions in post-Cold War era" (2011). *Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 12068.
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd/12068>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

The impact of U.S. foreign aid on human rights conditions in post-Cold War era

by

Hyun Ju Lee

A thesis submitted to the graduate faculty
in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of
MASTER OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Major: Public Administration

Program of Study Committee:
Robert B. Urbatsch, Major Professor
Mack C. Shelley
James M. McCormick
Frederick O. Lorenz

Iowa State University

Ames, Iowa

2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW	4
2.1 Human rights as a major determinant of U.S. foreign aid allocation	4
2.2 The consequences of U.S. foreign aid allocation.....	9
CHAPTER 3. THEORETICAL EXPECTATIONS	11
CHAPTER 4. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	17
4.1 Defining and measuring human rights, the dependent variable.....	17
4.2 The independent variables	19
4.2.1 U.S. foreign aid, the key explanatory variable.....	19
4.2.2 The control variables.....	21
4.3 Hypotheses	26
4.4 PCTS data and oil regression model.....	28
CHAPTER 5. EMPIRICAL ANALYSES AND FINDINGS.....	31
CHAPTER 6. DISCUSSION.....	35
CHAPTER 7. CONCLUSION.....	39
REFERENCES	41
APPENDIX A.....	46
APPENDIX B	47
APPENDIX C	48
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	49

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Factors Other Than Human Rights Potentially Determining U.S. Aid Allocation.....	6
Table 2. The Impact of U.S. Foreign Aid on Physical Integrity Rights, 1990-2009	34

ABSTRACT

During the Cold War, U.S. foreign aid was mainly used to fight against the potential Soviet military threat and to support allies. Containing Communism was the non-negotiable goal in U.S. foreign policy. With the end of the Cold War and the rising force of globalization, aid-providing developed countries in the West, including the United States, emphasized political conditionality attached to aid in order to encourage political reforms, such as democratic political process and securing human rights, in aid-recipient developing countries. This study uses pooled cross-sectional time series data covering 112 countries for the post-Cold War years of 1990-2009 to examine the effects of U.S. foreign aid allocation on human rights, especially physical integrity rights. The findings suggest that U.S. foreign aid [economic, military, and total aid] did have an impact on a government's respect for human rights in recipient countries, but that the association was negative: an increase in foreign aid from the United States is associated with less protection of human rights. Even though the good will of the chief administrators to promote human rights was explicit, implementations to achieve such a goal through foreign aid seem to fall far short of their promises.

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

The United States government has a variety of tools to promote its human rights policy. Three main options among these are quiet diplomacy, public condemnation, and the use of foreign aid (Apodaca 2006). Quiet diplomacy aims to maintain “friendly relations” with allies by creating conditions in which parties feel comfortable discussing, evaluating, and responding to problems in a calm way. By using quiet diplomacy, the U.S. government has the advantage of not publicly embarrassing human-rights-abusing countries; however, silence often conceals the government’s apathy and neglect of such issues (Apodaca 2006).

Public condemnation, on the other hand, refers to the open criticism of a country’s human rights practices, and raises the attention of the media and the public. One of the most important U.S. public diplomacy instruments is the Country Reports on Human Rights Practices – “a detailed chronicle of documented torture, state-sanctioned killings, censorship and other forms of political repression committed by foreign governments on their own citizens” (Hoffman 2011, 21). The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Trade Act of 1974 mandate the Secretary of State to submit to Congress the Country Reports about the condition of human rights in U.S.-aid-recipient countries and, also, in all countries that are members of the United Nations. While bringing the matter to the attention of the media and the public, public diplomacy can be successful if a human-rights victim is well-known. However, the majority of human-rights victims are unknown to the media and the public, thus often neglected (Apodaca 2006).

“U.S. human rights policy, however, assumes its most tangible consequence with the granting and restricting of economic and military foreign assistance” (Apodaca 2006, 18). Studies indicate that the denial of foreign aid is one of the most effective tools in human

rights policy not only because the target country responds to the threat, but also because, with the threat of aid termination, “the U.S. Congress can prod the White House into action on issues that it may be reluctant to address and send a strong signal to foreign governments about the seriousness with which the United States regards particular human rights issues” (Liang-Fenton 2004, 441). Therefore, the denial or restriction of U.S. foreign aid can be a valuable tool to promote international standards of human rights.

Since the allocation of U.S. foreign aid is theoretically important in securing human rights protections, this study analyzes how U.S. foreign aid allocation affects human rights practices in developing countries during the post-Cold War era. To accomplish such goal, this research uses quantitative analyses with pooled cross-sectional time series data on 112 developing countries from 1990 to 2009 and examines the relationship between U.S. foreign aid, the independent variable, and human rights, the dependent variable. Final results show that U.S. foreign aid [economic, military, and total aid] does have an impact on a government’s respect for human rights in recipient countries, but that the association is negative: an increase in foreign aid from the United States is associated with less protection of human rights.

In the following section, Chapter 2, the existing literature on the relationship between U.S. foreign assistance and human rights is examined in detail and evaluated critically. With the insights from the literature review, Chapter 3 draws a theoretical framework for the study. In Chapter 4, an empirical model is developed including discussions of the primary and secondary hypotheses for the research and the control variables that affect the determinants of human rights. This chapter also discusses the methodology employed in the study. In Chapter 5, the designed model is tested and findings are presented and analyzed. Chapter 6

further discusses the empirical results by qualitatively examining a few cases. Finally, in Chapter 7, the major findings are reviewed, and suggestions for future studies are presented.

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

In considering the relationship between U.S. foreign aid and human rights, the published research is divided into two main motifs. The difference between the motifs is entirely derived from the direction of causal relationship between them. One direction, which most of the studies about the relationship between U.S. foreign aid and human rights have examined, is whether human rights conditions in potential recipient countries play an important role in determining U.S. foreign aid allocation. The other direction, which has received little attention from scholars, is whether U.S. foreign aid has a strong influence on human rights practices in recipient countries.

2.1 HUMAN RIGHTS AS A MAJOR DETERMINANT OF U.S. FOREIGN AID ALLOCATION

In 1961, in an effort to improve how the U.S. government managed its foreign assistance programs as a means of foreign policy, Congress passed the Foreign Assistance Act (FAA), which separated military and non-military aid and resulted in the creation of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). However, Congressional interest in the allocation of foreign aid was sparked in the early 1970s when Nixon and Kissinger resisted linking foreign assistance to human rights, preferring realpolitik policies (Callaway and Matthews 2008). As a consequence, gradual amendments to the 1961 FAA followed and were overtly designed to link U.S. foreign aid to human rights conditions in recipient

countries.¹ That is to say, the U.S. Congress has mandated that foreign aid should be directed to regimes that respect human rights and fundamental freedoms. This has become the prevalent rhetoric in U.S. foreign policy.

In this stream, the majority of published research analyzes the role of human rights in the distribution of U.S. foreign assistance.² As these studies elaborate more on the relationship between human rights and U.S. foreign policy practice, the effects of additional variables are probed in determining factors for U.S. foreign aid allocation. Table 1 shows a list of the factors proposed as potential determinants of U.S. foreign aid allocation, other than human rights.

There are two characteristics in the majority of this literature examining the role of human rights in U.S. foreign aid allocation. First, some of these studies have focused on differences across presidential administrations (Stohl, Carleton and Johnson 1984; Carleton and Stohl 1985; Poe 1992; Poe and Sirirangsi 1994; Apodaca and Stohl 1999; Callaway and Matthews 2008).³ However, findings from these studies show that there are no significant differences among the administrations although presidencies obviously vary in both ideological and foreign policy preferences. Apodaca and Stohl (1999), for example, who examined the relationship between the allocation of economic and military aid and also

¹ The 1973 Foreign Assistance Act, the 1974 Foreign Assistance Act, the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976, and the International Financial Institutions Act of 1977 were designed to link foreign aid to human rights (see Carleton and Stohl 1985).

² This motivational research has attracted the attention of numerous scholars. See Schoultz 1981; Stohl, Carleton and Johnson 1984; Cingranelli and Pasquarello 1985; Carleton and Stohl 1987; McCormick and Mitchell 1988, 1989; Hofrenning 1990; Poe 1992; Poe and Sirirangsi 1994; Meernik, Krueger and Poe 1998; Apodaca and Stohl 1999; Blanton 2000, 2005; Lai 2003; Neumayer 2003; Callaway and Matthews 2008; Gibler 2008; Demirel-Pegg and Moskowitz 2009.

³ Apodaca and Stohl (1999) found that human rights considerations depended upon the administration and the type of aid. Among the listed studies, it is the only study that used *Presidential Administration* as an independent variable in a designed model. This is the reason that only the study by Apodaca and Stohl (1999) is listed in Table 1 under *Presidential Administration*, which is one of potential determinants of U.S. aid allocation.

Table 1. Factors Other Than Human Rights Potentially Determining U.S. Aid Allocation
(adapted from Demirel-Pegg and Moskowitz 2009)

<i>Potential Determinant</i>	
Level of economic development	Apodaca & Stohl (1999); Blanton (1994); Cingranelli & Pasquarello (1985); Lai (2003); McKinlay & Little (1979); Meernik, Krueger & Poe (1998); Poe (1992); Poe & Meernik (1995); Poe & Sirirangsi (1994); Gibler (2008); Demirel-Pegg & Moskowitz (2009)
Life expectancy	Blanton (1994); Gibler (2008)
Strategic importance/ power political interests/ security considerations	Lai (2003); Lebovic (1988); McKinlay & Little (1977, 1979); Poe (1992); Poe & Sirirangsi (1994)
Population	Blanton (1994); Lai (2003); McKinlay and Richard (1977); Poe (1992); Poe & Sirirangsi (1994); Demirel-Pegg & Moskowitz (2009)
Leftist ideology	Blanton (1994); Poe & Meernik (1995)
Sharing borders with a communist state/ competition with communism	McKinlay & Little (1977, 1979); Meernik, Krueger & Poe (1998); Poe & Meernik (1995); Poe & Sirirangsi (1994)
Location within Central America	Apodaca & Stohl (1999); Poe & Meernik (1995)
Volume of trade with the USA	Blanton (1994); Poe & Meernik (1995); Gibler (2008); Demirel-Pegg & Moskowitz (2009)
NATO membership	Poe & Meernik (1995)
Alliance with USA	(Lebovic 1988); Meernik, Krueger & Poe (1998); Gibler (2008)
Free market interests; business/ industry groups	Meernik, Krueger & Poe (1998)
Level of democracy	Blanton (2000, 2005); Lai (2003); Meernik, Krueger & Poe (1998); Gibler (2008); Demirel-Pegg & Moskowitz (2009)
US military presence	Apodaca & Stohl (1999); Poe (1991)
Aid received in previous year	Apodaca & Stohl (1999); Lai (2003); Gibler (2008); Demirel-Pegg & Moskowitz (2009)
Presidential administration	Apodaca & Stohl (1999)

human rights performance in the presidential administrations from Jimmy Carter through Bill Clinton, concluded:

Rhetoric notwithstanding, we found that, on a worldwide scale, the amount of economic aid allocated was remarkably consistent between administrations. Using the Carter administration as our referent, we found no statistically significant differences in the amount of aid allotted to each country among the administrations. (Apodaca and Stohl 1999, 195)

In addition, after examining the motivation of the U.S. foreign assistance programs through the George W. Bush administration, Callaway and Matthews (2008, 63) said in their conclusion that all U.S. leaders have realized that “[T]he security of a nation’s people and territorial integrity cannot be downgraded in importance in an effort to correct another nation’s human suffering.” This demonstrates that human rights considerations are neither the only nor the primary consideration in the allocation of U.S. foreign aid.

The other characteristic of this motivational literature is found in the research model. A two-step analysis of U.S. foreign aid disbursement is the most prevalent model in the literature (Cingranelli and Pasquerllo 1985; Carleton and Stohl 1987; Mitchell and McCormick 1988; Poe 1992; Poe and Sirirangsi 1994; Meernik, Krueger and Poe 1998; Blanton 2000; Apodaca and Stohl 1999; Gibler 2008). Cingranelli and Pasquarello (1985), who opened up a new research agenda, claimed that the process of U.S. aid allocation consists of two stages: the gatekeeping stage and the level stage. In the initial stage, the gatekeeping stage, the decision to grant or deny aid is considered by including both recipient countries and non-recipient countries, and in the second stage, the subsequent decision over the amount allocated is considered for recipient countries only. Looking specifically at Latin

American countries, Cingranelli and Pasquarello (1985) found a positive relationship between respect for human rights and U.S. economic aid at the second stage. Their study was soon called into question by Carleton and Stohl (1987) and McCormick and Mitchell (1988) based on sampling issues. Carleton and Stohl (1987) argued the results of Cingranelli and Pasquarello's study were not robust to the exclusion of outliers. McCormick and Mitchell (1988) also showed that the relationship between human rights and U.S. foreign aid was substantially weaker when El Salvador, which was considered as an outlier in the Cingranelli and Pasquarello's study, was included. Most of the disagreement occurred when the level of aid, at the second stage, was considered.

Attempting to clear up some of the ambiguities, Poe (1992) examined only economic aid, conducted a more inclusive statistical analysis of the two-stage aid process, and stated that human rights considerations were important determinants of the level of aid allocation during the Carter and Reagan administrations. However, Meernik, Krueger and Poe (1998) found that once the decision to grant aid was made, human rights conditions did not play a role in the amount of aid disbursed and, further, those countries with the worst human rights records received more aid. Although the findings of Apodaca and Stohl (1999) were more broadly positive on both stages, their conclusions were that human rights only mattered for economic aid and that human rights were not the most important consideration in U.S. aid allocation. More recently, Gibler (2008) found that the decision to give or deny aid was partly based on human rights conditions in recipient countries, but human rights records did not have an impact on the amount of aid distributed. Once the decision was made to grant aid, the amount was decided based on the need of the recipient countries (Gibler 2008). In sum, the existing studies ultimately demonstrate that human rights practices are not the primary

consideration in the distribution of U.S. foreign aid. The studies also establish that human rights conditions matter more at the initial stage, when determining whether to grant aid or not.

Then what are the consequences of U.S. foreign aid distribution, given the fact that human rights conditions in potential recipient countries do not play an important role in the allocation of U. S. foreign aid?

2.2 THE CONSEQUENCES OF U.S. FOREIGN AID ALLOCATION

The second motif in the existing literature is whether the distribution of U.S. foreign aid has a strong impact on human rights practices in recipient countries. As a first attempt to answer this question systematically, Regan (1995, 624) evaluated 32 developing countries from Asia and Latin America, and found that “the effectiveness of U.S. economic aid as a tool to shape the human rights policies of the recipient countries has been nil.” Meyer (1996), who used a sample of approximately 50 developing countries to examine correlations between multinational corporations (MNCs) and human rights levels for two years of data, found that while levels of foreign direct investment (FDI) had consistent, strong, and positive relationships, U.S. economic aid had inconsistent, weak, and positive relationships in predicting levels of human rights. However, in their response to the Meyer study, Smith, Bolyard and Ippolito (1999) showed some contradictory effects of both FDI and U.S. economic aid on human rights practices in recipient countries. These earlier studies were expanded by Richards, Gelleny and Sacko (2001), who evaluated the relationship between foreign economic capital and respect for human rights in 43 developing countries for the years 1981, 1984, 1987, 1990, 1993, and 1995. They also broadened the measure of foreign

economic capital by including FDI, portfolio investment, debt, and official development assistance, and found that “official development assistance was the only FEP [Foreign Economic Penetration] indicator that was not a statistically significant indicator of a government’s respect for either physical integrity rights or political rights and civil liberties” (Richards, Gelleny and Sacko 2001, 232).

In contrast to most studies, Gibler (2008) argued that U.S. foreign economic aid did affect human rights policies in non-recipient countries but in an indirect way. He claimed that while the observed U.S. aid disbursements clearly had no relationship with respect for human rights, U.S. aid would alter human rights policies of non-recipient countries, which were not eligible for aid based on their human rights abuses, because they would consider their opportunity cost, or loss of potential income, in expectation to receive future aid (Gibler 2008). However, in a more comprehensive study of the relationship between U.S. foreign aid and human rights, Callaway and Matthews (2008) found that U.S. foreign assistance had a deleterious effect on human rights. They included a historical overview and case studies in a qualitative analysis, and in a quantitative analysis they conducted pooled cross-sectional time-series analysis that covered the time period from 1976 to 2003 and across most nations. They further concluded that military aid was more detrimental to human rights conditions than was economic aid (Callaway and Matthews 2008). Thus, these empirical studies are conflicting and inconclusive regarding the consequences of U.S. foreign aid allocation on human rights practices in recipient countries. In sum, these contradictory findings within the literature show different perspectives on how human rights conditions in recipient countries are affected by U.S. foreign assistance.

CHAPTER 3. THEORETICAL EXPECTATIONS

As discussed above, the first set of the literature review shows that human rights practices in potential recipient countries do not play an important role in the disbursement of U.S. foreign aid. Also, the few studies of the consequences of U.S. foreign aid show that the impact of U.S. foreign aid allocation on human rights conditions in aid-recipient countries is indeterminate.

This research is differentiated from previous studies in two important ways. First, the study exclusively examines the years from 1990 to 2009, the post- Cold War era, regarding the consequences of U.S. foreign aid allocation in human rights conditions in 112 developing countries. The other is to employ two meaningful but previously neglected control variables – Foreign Direct Investment [FDI] and oil rents per capita – in order to incorporate the characteristics of economic globalization, which has accelerated with the end of the Cold War, into a designed model.

The allocation of foreign aid has been influenced by both the domestic and international political and economic environment, while the importance of its use as a foreign policy tool remains unmoved. During the Cold War, U.S. foreign aid was mainly used to fight against the potential Soviet military threat and support allies. Containing Communism was the non-negotiable goal in the U.S. foreign policy before the end of the Cold War. With the collapse of the bipolar configuration of the Cold War, reflecting the Soviet (East, Communism)-U.S. (West, Democracy) confrontation, the world system has been restructured as well as the structure of the aid system.

With the demise of the bipolar system, OECD [Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development] countries have repeatedly stated that “the allocation of

foreign aid should be linked to political reform and respect for basic human rights in recipient countries” (Carey 2007, 447). Since foreign aid flows are the main source of external finance in many developing countries, Carey (2007) argued that making the aid allocation connected to human rights conditions in aid-recipient countries could be a powerful tool to improve the protection of universal human rights. Also, it has been argued that the United States is freed from using its foreign aid to contain Communism, and now it can pursue the promotion of democracy and human rights around the world by using the foreign aid allocation (Lai 2003). Does such political conditionality attached to aid with the end of Cold War influence human rights practices in aid-recipient countries?

Aid conditionality refers to the attachment to aid of certain conditions that have to be met by a recipient country in order to have an aid agreement or continue to receive aid, which means that aid can be used “as a policy instrument to push for particular changes in developing countries” (Carey 2007, 449). It signifies the usefulness of aid to donor countries because they have the power to terminate or reduce aid in order to pursue their foreign policy goals (Baehr 1994). With the end of Cold War, aid conditionality has been extended from the economic arena to the political arena as a main concept in foreign aid. After a decade of economic conditionality, which pushed economic reforms (structural adjustment) in aid-recipient countries, “the end of the Cold War, the collapse of single-party regimes, and the emergence of democratization movements in developing countries legitimized the use of political conditionality” (Carey 2007, 449). That is, aid allocations could be subject to conditions on human rights and democratic political processes, pushing political reforms. The reason that political conditionality did not surface earlier was because during the decolonization period, too much emphasis was placed on national sovereignty and on the

ideological struggle between the capitalist West and the socialist East (Burnell 1997). Therefore, donor countries did not push for political reforms such as human rights and democracy in the developing countries during the Cold War. In this context, the most important aspect is the end of the Cold War. With a tangible victory for the capitalist West in the end of the Cold War, it has now become easier for donor countries, the West, to attach political conditions to their aid (Carey 2007).

These changes apparently appeared in U.S. foreign aid policies. With the end of the Cold War, promoting political, economic, and social transitions in former socialist bloc countries quickly gained prominence. Furthermore, Lancaster and Van Dusen (2005, 12) pointed out that:

[T]he spread of democracy in developing countries during the 1990s – especially in sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America – gave rise to the use of aid to promote democratic institutions. The many civil conflicts that persisted in Africa and elsewhere and caused so much death, destruction, and displacement promoted the use of aid not just provide relief but to support post-conflict transitions. ... In all cases, the use of diplomacy alone could not bring about the necessary changes sought by the United States. Foreign aid, focused on development institutions and development processes, became a major tool to pursue national objectives.

The end of the Cold War did change the direction of U.S. foreign aid allocation, from using its aid to contain Communism to using it to promote political reforms around the world.

Thus, this research exclusively examines the effects of U.S. foreign aid allocation on human rights practices in aid-recipient countries after the end of the Cold War when political conditionality, meaning stipulations requiring human rights and democratic political

processes, has been emphasized in the distribution of foreign aid. Thus, this research concentrates on the human rights aspect of political conditionality, focusing on the physical integrity rights, which mean being free from torture, political imprisonment, disappearance, and extrajudicial killings.

Two novel control variables are included in this study – FDI and oil rents per capita – in order to incorporate the characteristics of economic globalization in the end of the Cold War. Globalization, a strong international force of development around the world, has emerged in new international system with the demise of the Cold War. It is succinctly defined by McCormick (2000, 131):

Globalization refers to the political, economic, and social forces that are drawing peoples together regardless of national boundaries with the end of the Cold War. With the force of globalization accompanied by the collapse of the Cold War, FDI has come to play a major role in the international economy. The most profound effect has appeared in developing countries, where yearly FDI flows have increased from an average of less than \$10 billion in the 1970's to a yearly average of less than \$20 billion in the 1980's, to explode in the post-Cold War era from \$35.1 billion in 1990 to \$115.9 billion in 1995 to \$256.5 billion in 2000 and \$330.1 billion in 2005.⁴ Such a rapid increase of FDI flows captures fast-growing economic globalization in the international system after the end of the Cold War. Within developing countries for their development, political and economic reforms in their governments have been required to accommodate more FDI. Such prerequisites for FDI

⁴ These numbers, measured in constant dollar, are from UNCTAD*stat* (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development), available online at <http://www.unctad.org/Templates/Page.asp?intItemID=1584&lang=1>.

encourage good governance in the governments, which may cause changes in governments' policies toward human rights practices.

Besides FDI, Oil rents have an impact on governments' behavior according to the "Resource Curse" theory. "Resource curse" refers to a much-remarked-upon phenomenon that countries with abundant natural resources (oil, rubber, diamonds, and minerals) often underperform economically relative to those without such resources. In common sense, countries with rich endowments of natural resources should be prosperous; yet, relevant studies have shown that countries with abundant natural resources have been negatively associated with economic progress (Sachs and Warner 2001). In fact, exporting natural resources produces tangible revenues for a state. However, such large windfall revenues influence the government's behavior, with its national politics extremely focused on grabbing the rents earned by natural resources, making public-good production inefficient (Lane and Tornell 1995). After the end of the Cold War, with the force of economic globalization, such government behaviors – rent seeking and corruption – were identified as the main reasons for poor economic performances in developing countries. This makes it difficult for a country with abundant natural resources to be accepted as a qualified aid recipient when good governance became a crucial parameter for successfully receiving development assistance.

Political conditionality attached to aid, pushing political reforms such as human rights and democracy, with the force of economic globalization requiring good governance, may encourage improvement of governments' behaviors toward human rights in developing countries. With changes in the international political and economic system as well as the structure of aid system after the end of the Cold War, the study anticipates that the allocation

of U.S. foreign aid [economic, military and total aid] is positively associated with respect for physical integrity rights in developing countries.

CHAPTER 4. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

4.1 DEFINING AND MEASURING HUMAN RIGHTS,

THE DEPENDENT VARIABLE

Vasak (1977) categorized universal human rights into three subcategories: first, second, and third generation rights. First-generation rights are civil and political rights. Such rights mainly deal with personal liberties and protecting an individual's rights from a country's violations. The first-generation rights include the right to life and equality, the right of freedom to exercise religion and speech, the rights not to be tortured or killed, the rights to be protected from arbitrary arrest and detention, the right to assemble into political parties, and the right to vote in fair elections (Findley, et al. 2010). Second-generation rights are social, economic, and cultural rights. These rights concern the basic necessities of life, which include the right to employment, private property, education, and healthcare. Third-generation rights are those rights that go beyond the first- and second-generation rights, mainly based on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). The third generation rights include the right to self-determination, development, a healthy environment, and participation in common heritage (Vasak 1997).

This research focuses on a critical subset of human rights, physical integrity rights, which is an individual's fundamental rights that protect individuals from torture, extrajudicial killing, disappearance, and political imprisonment from arbitrary power of the state (Findley, et al. 2010). Physical integrity rights are mainly considered in the research because their violation offends the widely shared norms of appropriate government conduct for basic

human rights. This study specifically examines how physical integrity rights in recipient countries are affected by the distribution of U.S. foreign aid.⁵

There are three common measures of government human rights practices used in studies of human rights and foreign aid. All of these measures are standards-based measures that construct a set of human right criteria for different levels and then use these criteria to rate governments' human rights practices (Callaway and Matthews 2008). The first common measure is the Freedom House index of political rights and civil liberties, which are mainly derived from the UDHR. It rates states based on the extent that their governments provide citizens with political rights and civil liberties, using a seven point ordinal scale for each category of rights (political and civil). However, Capellán and Gomez (2007) point out that most human rights researchers consider the Freedom House measure as an indicator of democracy rather than of human rights.

Another common measure of human rights is the Cingranelli and Richards (CIRI) human rights index.⁶ The CIRI human rights dataset contains “both disaggregated measures of specific human rights practices, which can either be analyzed separately or combined into valid and reliable indices, as well as two already-aggregated indices” (CIRI Human Rights Data Project 2011). From the CIRI dataset, four common individual human rights scores are included for physical integrity rights. They are torture, extrajudicial killing, political imprisonment, and disappearance. Their coding index is based on a nine-point scale ranging from 0 (absolutely no respect for rights) to 8 (full respect for rights) (Cingranelli and Richards 2011).

⁵ Physical integrity rights are also referred in the literature as personal integrity rights, life integrity rights, and security rights.

⁶ The dataset is available online at http://ciri.binghamton.edu/myciri/my_ciri_login.asp.

Finally, the third common measure of government human-rights practices is the Political Terror Scale (PTS).⁷ Unlike the previous measure, the PTS has a five-category scale which is designed to measure physical integrity rights. It captures political terrors such as torture, extrajudicial killing, political imprisonment, and threats against relatives occurring within a state (Callaway and Matthews 2008). Both the CIRI and the PTS measure are based on the yearly reports of governmental human rights practices from the U.S. State Department Country Reports on Human Rights Practices and Amnesty International's Annual Reports for each country. However, while the CIRI rankings are measured in terms of government respect for human rights, the PTS is constructed in terms of government violations of human rights. That is, higher values of the CIRI indicate a better situation for human rights, while higher values of the PTS measure indicate worse human rights.

For this research, since both the CIRI and the PTS human rights measure can be strong indicators of physical integrity rights, both measures are utilized to examine the impact of U.S. foreign aid on human rights conditions in recipient countries during the post Cold-War years from 1990 to 2009.

4.2 THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

4.2.1 U.S. FOREIGN AID, THE KEY EXPLANATORY VARIABLE

The key explanatory variable is U.S. foreign aid per capita rates using constant 2009 dollar amounts. This research focuses, first, on U.S. economic and military assistance separately and, second, on the total U.S. foreign assistance, and their respective effects on

⁷ The dataset is available online at <http://www.politicalterrorsscale.org/>.

human rights conditions in 112 developing countries.⁸ The data is taken from *U.S. Overseas and Loans and Grants, U.S. Bureau of Census International Database*, commonly known as the Greenbook, provided annually by the USAID.⁹ As discussed above, with changes in the structure of aid allocation due to the end of the Cold War, it is expected that U.S. foreign aid has a positive impact on governments' practices for physical integrity rights in recipient countries. The variables [U.S. economic, military, and total aid] are transformed with a natural logarithm to normalize their distributions.

The aid variables are lagged at one year in order to eliminate the potential impact of reverse causality in a designed model. There is no conclusive discussion in the earlier literature regarding how long foreign aid takes to affect human rights conditions in recipient countries. Regan's (1995) study used a one-year lag, while the Meyer (1996, 1998) studies and the Callaway and Matthews (2008) study included a three-year lag in their empirical models. Regan (1995) reasoned that using a lag of more than one year could make the causal inference more difficult and raise the cost of losing data. Since this research examines the post-Cold War period, merely 20 years, a one-year lag is chosen for the model.¹⁰

⁸ Developing countries include low-income and middle-income countries, measured and grouped by the World Bank. Myanmar (Burma) and Somalia are the only two countries dropped from the data due to the lack of data availability. The income groups are: low income, \$995 or less; lower middle income, \$996 - \$3,945; and upper middle income, \$3,946 - \$12,195. This data is available online at <http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog>. Also, the list of developing countries is shown in Appendix A.

⁹ The data is available online at <http://gbk.eads.usaidallnet.gov/about/>.

¹⁰ However, the models with lag of two and three years were also preformed, and the direction of the regression coefficients of foreign aid [economic, military and total aid] remained the same as the model with a lag of one year.

4.2.2 THE CONTROL VARIABLES

A number of control variables are included in this research in order to discern the relationship between U.S. foreign aid allocation and human rights conditions.¹¹ These control variables are *the level of democracy, leftist government, GDP per capita, FDI, oil rents per capita, population size, international and internal armed conflict, and British colonial heritage*, which may independently influence human rights practices in aid-recipient countries. According to the individual variables' characteristics, the control variables are categorized into two different groups. *The level of democracy, leftist government, and international and internal armed conflicts* fall into the category of political/strategic explanation variables. *GDP per capita, oil rents per capita, FDI, and population size* are socioeconomic explanation variables.

Political/Strategic explanation variable: The level of democracy

In the literature, the level of democracy is positively associated with human rights conditions (Henderson 1991; Poe and Tate 1994; Poe, Tate and Keith 1999; Cingranelli and Richards 1999; Callaway and Matthews 2008). The more democratic a country is, the less the country is abusive to citizens. Democracy is thought to empower people in a regime while reducing their government oppression, and thus the empowered citizens are able to fight against any forms of violations exercised by their government (Cingranelli and Richards

¹¹ A dummy variable, British colonial heritage, that was positively associated with human rights practices in the earlier literature, was considered for inclusion among the control variables. However, since this was based on the thought that British colonial influence is strongly associated with the development of democracy and democratic ideas (see Mitchell and McCormick 1988), which are measured directly here, this variable was omitted later. Also, the number of international NGOs' activities was considered as other control variable in order to examine their impact on a country's human rights practices. But due to the lack of available panel data, this must be left to a future study.

1999). The end of the Cold War promoted the spread of democracy in the globe, especially among the nations where the Soviets' involvement and influence were diminished (Cingranelli and Richards 1999). A greater number of democratic regimes was expected to arise in the new international order established owing to the demise of the Cold War. The Polity IV measure of democracy is employed for this research since the Freedom House measure is correlated with the human rights measures as mentioned in the above section 4.1.¹² The Polity IV democracy ratings emphasize “the institutional attributes of democracy rather than actions of the states” (Callaway and Matthews 2008, 88). This measure of democracy is based on an eleven-point scale ranging from 0 (the least democratic) to 10 (the most democratic).¹³

Political/Strategic explanation variable: Leftist government

This control variable is about regime ideology, specifically the presence of a leftist government. The measure of leftist government is employed from the Database of Political Institutions (DPI). The DPI defines and refers to “Left” governments as “communist, socialist, or social democratic” governments while “Right” governments as “conservative or Christian democratic” governments. This variable is coded 1 for a “Right” regime, 2 for a “Central” regime, and 3 for “Left” regime (Beck et al. 2001). Findings about the impact of leftist government on human rights have conflicting results. Poe and Tate (1994) found that

¹² The Polity IV dataset is from *Integrated Network for Societal Conflict Research (INSCR) Data Page*, and is available at <http://www.systemicpeace.org/inscr/inscr.htm>.

¹³ *Polity*, an alternative measure of democracy, is also commonly used. *Polity* measures difference between institutionalized democracy (0-10) and institutionalized autocracy (0-10), which both are derived from coding of competitiveness of political participation, the regulation of participation, the openness and competitiveness of executive recruitment, and constraints on the chief executive. See the Polity IV Project Dataset Users' Manual, available only at <http://www.systemicpeace.org/inscr/p4manualv2009.pdf>. For this study, the democracy measure is used to capture “institutionalized democracy.”

leftist government was statistically significant, with a positive coefficient, in analysis using the State Department measure while statistically insignificant, with a negative coefficient, in the model based on Amnesty International Reports. However, in a follow-up article, Poe, Tate, and Keith (1999) found that regardless of the source of independent variable, the presence of leftist government was less associated with personal integrity abuse. After the Cold War, this might be different. The demise of the Soviet Union enables countries with a leftist ideology, especially the socialist bloc, to interact with Western regimes, and thus the oppressive behaviors of these leftist governments might change.

Political/Strategic explanation variable: International and internal armed conflict

Earlier studies suggest that the presence of either international armed conflict and/or armed internal conflict has a detrimental impact on physical integrity rights (Poe and Tate 1994; Poe, Tate and Keith 1999; Cingranelli and Richards 1999; Callaway and Matthews 2008). In general, it is difficult to consider human rights in times of conflict because a government more likely wants to use repressive means to fight its opposition in order to maintain its power. One corollary of the post-Cold War breakup of the Soviet Union was the increase in interstate and intrastate conflicts among and within the newly formed states. With the increase of such conflicts, a corresponding increase in human rights violation was expected (Cingranelli and Richards 1999). The UCDP [Uppsala Conflict Data Program]/PRIO [Peace Research Institute, Oslo] dataset in version 4-2009 is employed to indicate the presence of armed conflict in states. In the UCDP/PRIO dataset, the armed conflict includes four types of conflict: extrasystemic, interstate (international), internal, and

internationalized internal armed conflict.¹⁴ This variable is coded 0 if there is no international or internal armed conflict present in a given year and 1 if there is.

Socioeconomic explanation variable: GDP [Gross Domestic Product] per capita

Previous research shows that economic development was negatively associated with a government's human rights (Henderson 1991; Mitchell and McCormick 1988; Poe and Tate 1994; Neumayer 2005). Mitchell and McCormick (1988, 478) found that economic development had a negative impact on human rights practices in developing countries because to develop while maintaining control, poor countries, where "substantial social and political tensions created by economic scarcity" already existed, were more apt to use repression on their citizens. The end of the Cold War reinforced such impact. Growing economic globalization with the demise of the Cold War created a great deal of pressure on the Eastern-bloc and Third World countries to establish themselves and on their economies to compete in the new international system. Real GDP per capita (constant price: chain series) is employed from Penn World Table, created by the Center for International Comparisons at the University of Pennsylvania.¹⁵ Due to the skewed nature of income distribution, figures of GDP per capita are logged.

¹⁴ According to the UCDP/PRIO dataset codebook, extrasystemic armed conflict is defined as a conflict between a state and non-state group(s) outside its own territory, interstate armed conflict is between states, intrastate (internal) armed conflict is between a state and internal opposition group(s), and internationalized internal armed conflict is between a state and internal opposition group(s) with intervention from other states. This data is available at <http://www.prio.no/CSCW/Datasets/Armed-Conflict/>.

¹⁵ The Penn World Table provides purchasing power parity and national income accounts for 188 countries for the years 1950-2004. This data is available online at http://pwt.econ.upenn.edu/php_site/pwt_index.php.

Socioeconomic explanation variable: FDI [Foreign Direct Investment]

Kim and Trumbore (2010) studied the relationship between “one aspect of economic globalization” and human rights conditions. They used FDI, specifically transnational mergers and acquisitions, as one aspect of economic globalization, and found that FDI has a positive relationship with physical integrity rights, empowerment rights, workers’ rights, and women’s economic rights especially in developing countries (Kim and Trumbore 2010). With the force of economic globalization, the end of the Cold War might enhance such relationship by encouraging good governance to accommodate more FDI. The variable is taken from UNCTAD*stat* provided by United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD).¹⁶ This research employs the natural logarithm of FDI figures in *Inward and outward foreign direct investment stock, annual, 1980-2009*.

Socioeconomic explanation variable: Oil rents per capita

Ross (2008) argued in his article, “Oil, Islam, and Women,” that gender inequality in Middle East had much to do the oil-based economy, but relatively little to do with Islam. Based on earlier studies of the “resource curse” and his new findings, he claimed that oil not only hinders democracy but also broadens the gender inequality gap in a society (Ross 2008).¹⁷ Oil-production tends to remove incentives to reform, and oil-producing countries care less about improving individual rights as they fight to control resource rents (Harford and Klein 2005). With the force of economic globalization with the demise of the Cold War, the curse of oil might continue to have its influence over many oil-producing countries. Ross

¹⁶ This data is available at <http://www.unctad.org/Templates/Page.asp?intItemID=5742&lang=1>.

¹⁷ “Resource curse” is explained in Chapter 3.

(2008) calculated oil rents per capita, a country's total rents from oil and gas (i.e., the value of production minus the county-specific extraction costs, including the cost of capital) divided by its midyear population.¹⁸ The logged oil rents per capita are utilized for this research.

Socioeconomic explanation variable: Population size

Population size has had an impact on human rights conditions in previous studies (Henderson 1991; Poe and Tate 1994; Poe, Tate, and Keith 1999; Callaway and Matthews 2008). Henderson (1991) developed an argument that as the level of population increased, government tendencies to use repression to manage the pressure on resource allocation also increased. Given the fact that the distribution of world population is skewed, this research uses the logged total national population obtained from the World Bank.¹⁹

4.3 HYPOTHESES

The primary purpose of this research is to measure the impact of U.S. foreign aid [economic, military, and total assistance] on human rights [physical integrity rights] practices during the post-Cold War period in aid-receiving developing countries, which makes the primary hypothesis. In addition, in order to obtain further insight in this relationship, secondary hypotheses regarding control variables are stated to examine the impact of each control variable on human rights practices in recipient countries. The hypotheses are as follows:

¹⁸ This data is from *Michael L. Ross Dataverse*, and available at <http://dvn.iq.harvard.edu/dvn/dv/mlross>. The data is available for 169 countries for the years from 1960 to 2006.

¹⁹ This data is available at <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.POP.TOTL>.

*Primary Hypothesis**Key Explanatory Variable*

H1: U.S. foreign aid [economic, military, and total aid] has a positive impact on physical integrity rights practices in developing countries during the post-Cold War period, *ceteris paribus*.

*Secondary Hypotheses**Political/Strategic Explanation Variables*

H2: The greater the level of democracy in a country, the more likely that country respects physical integrity rights in aid-receiving developing countries during the post-Cold War period, *ceteris paribus*.

H3: With the end of the Cold War, leftist governments are positively associated with physical integrity rights, *ceteris paribus*.

H4: The presence of international and internal armed conflicts in a country is negatively associated with respect for physical integrity rights during the post-Cold War period in developing countries, *ceteris paribus*.

Socioeconomic Explanation Variables

H5: GDP per capita, as an indicator of economic development in developing countries, is negatively correlated with respect for physical integrity rights during the post-Cold War period, *ceteris paribus*.

H6: A high level of FDI is positively associated with respect for physical integrity rights during the post-Cold War period in developing countries, *ceteris paribus*.

- H7: Oil rents per capita in developing countries are negatively correlated with respect for physical integrity rights during the post-Cold War period, ceteris paribus.**
- H8: A high level of population is negatively associated with respect for physical integrity rights in aid-receiving developing countries during the post-Cold War period, ceteris paribus.**

4.4 PCTS DATA AND OLS REGRESSION MODEL

This research utilizes Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression to assess pooled cross-sectional time series (PCTS) data for 112 developing countries over a 20-year period, from 1990 to 2009.²⁰ There are some statistical challenges to analyzing PCTS data with OLS regression. Besides a general problem, multicollinearity, PCTS are not only susceptible to autocorrelation due to the time series nature of the data but also to heteroskedasticity because of the cross-national, spatial, nature of the data (Beck and Katz 1995, 1996). The main reason for this study employing an OLS regression model is that the bias in results using PCTS data is associated “with the error terms, or residuals, and not the coefficients” (Callaway and Matthews 2008, 93). In addition, previous studies that examined the relationship between U.S. foreign aid and human rights used OLS regressions to analyze panel data (Poe and Tate 1994; Poe, Tate, and Keith 1999; Callaway and Matthews 2008).

Multicollinearity refers to a strong correlation between independent variables, which makes none of them have unique explanatory power to predict the dependent variable

²⁰ The statistical analyses for this study are conducted with Stata 9.2 (Stata Corporation) statistical software package.

(Agresti and Finlay 2009). To test for the presence of multicollinearity, a correlation matrix was generated for the independent variables. Correlation exceeding 0.6 or greater indicates the presence of multicollinearity and requires further investigation (Bohrnstedt and Knoke 1994). The generated correlation matrix for the independent variables of this research suggests that there is no need to have concern regarding multicollinearity among the independent variables.²¹ Heteroskedasticity, on the other hand, refers to a violation of the basic assumption of linear regression in which the error term is assumed to be homoskedastic – constant across observations. The presence of heteroskedasticity may bias estimates of standard errors for the regression coefficients and thus produce misleading results (Lewis-Beck 1980). A Breusch-Pagan/Cook-Weisberg test was conducted to detect the presence of heteroskedasticity in each model in the study. All models narrowly passed the heteroskedasticity test.²² Finally, like heteroskedasticity, autocorrelation refers to a violation of the assumption that the errors are uncorrelated and independent, and when it is present, estimates of standard errors for the regression coefficients are reduced and, thus, also produce misleading parameter estimates for the model (Ostrom 1990). Consequently, Prais-Winsten regressions, in which an AR (1) specification is included in the regression in order to correct autocorrelation, are employed, while panel-corrected standard errors are utilized to correct the heteroskedastic error terms (Beck and Katz 1995, 1996).

The empirical model of physical integrity rights is represented by a multiple regression equation expressed as a linear function of the independent variable, U.S. foreign aid, and control variables. The designed model for this research is outlined as follows:

²¹ A summary of the data and the correlation matrix are provided in Appendix B and C. None of the correlations among independent variables is 0.6 or greater.

²² The chi-square test for heteroskedasticity was performed by using Stata's `hettest` procedure.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Government Violation/Respect for Physical Integrity Rights}_{ti} = & a \\ & + \beta_1 \text{ U.S. Foreign Aid [Economic, Military, and Total Aid] Per Capita}_{(t-1)i} \\ & + \beta_2 \text{ Democracy}_{ti} + \beta_3 \text{ Leftist Government}_{ti} + \beta_4 \text{ Armed Conflict}_{ti} \\ & + \beta_5 \text{ GDP Per Capita}_{ti} + \beta_6 \text{ FDI}_{ti} + \beta_7 \text{ Oil Rents Per Capita}_{ti} + \beta_8 \text{ Population Size}_{ti} + e_{ti} \end{aligned}$$

Where:

t_i = country i at time t

a = intercept for equation

β_n = regression coefficient for variable n

e_{ti} = error term for country i at time t

CHAPTER 5. EMPIRICAL ANALYSES AND FINDINGS

The results from the PCTS analysis on the relationship between U.S. foreign aid and physical integrity rights in 112 developing countries during the post-Cold War period, 1990 to 2009, are presented in Table 2. Model A, B, and C represent the economic aid, military aid, and total aid models respectively for all countries in the sample. Each model includes two different human rights measures— (1) the CIRI human rights indicator and (2) the PTS. In all regressions, the parameter of the Wald chi-square test is highly significant, which indicates the model as a whole is significantly different than zero. The R-squared is between 0.43 and 0.45, which indicates about 44 percent of the dependent variable is explained by the variation in the independent variables. The rho parameters confirm serial correlation as a problem in the data.

Since the CIRI indicator measures a government's respect for physical integrity rights, while the PTS measures a government's violation of physical integrity rights, the direction of the regression coefficients of the two, (1) and (2), should be opposite, and that is shown consistently in the results regardless of the models. However, the CIRI human rights measure is used as a basis to explain the estimated regression coefficients because interpreting high values in the scale as better human rights seems intuitive.

All the key explanatory variables, U.S. economic, military, and total foreign aid, after controlling for the political/strategic and socioeconomic factors, have a negative impact on physical integrity rights in developing countries during the post-Cold War years from 1990 to 2009. The coefficients for economic aid (Model A(1)), military aid (Model B(1)), and total aid (Model C(1)) indicate that one unit increase of foreign aid decreases the respect for

physical integrity rights by 0.139, 0.037, and 0.132 respectively.²³ While economic aid and total aid are statistically significant in Model A and Model C, military aid is not significant in Model B. Although these results are supportive of the critics' perspective regarding the effect of foreign assistance on human rights conditions (Callaway and Matthews 2008), the results are against the primary hypothesis of this study that during the post- Cold War period, U.S. foreign aid is positively associated with human rights conditions in aid-receiving developing countries.

Turning to the political/strategic explanation variables, democracy is statistically significant in all models, and has a positive impact on the realization of physical integrity rights during the 20-year period of the post-Cold War, which is accordance with the expectation. Leftist government, however, is negatively associated with physical integrity rights and is statistically significant only in Model A(1) and Model C(1), which is against the third hypothesis of the study. This is also contrary to the findings by Callaway and Matthews (2008), who examined the relationship between U.S. aid and human rights for the years from 1976 to 2006. The strongest predictor within the political/strategic explanation variables is the presence of armed conflicts, including both international and internal armed conflicts, in the post-Cold War era. It has the largest coefficients, in absolute value, in each model, and is also statistically significant in all regressions (p values in all models are virtually equal to zero), regardless of the type of aid. When the presence of armed conflicts, the level of respect for physical integrity rights decreases by 1.95 in Model A(1), 1.96 in Model B(1), and 1.94 in

²³ Although the allocation of military aid seems to have a much lesser negative impact on physical integrity rights by simply looking at the coefficients, this is misleading, because the amount of total military aid is approximately a quarter of each of total economic aid and total aid.

Model C(1), which confirms that countries with violent conflicts are more likely to decrease in respect for physical integrity rights, as stated in the fourth hypothesis.

The remaining control variables are socioeconomic explanation variables. GDP per capita, as an indicator of the level of economic development, is negatively associated with physical integrity rights during the post-Cold War years, as hypothesized. Its relationship with physical integrity rights is statistically significant except in Model B(1). Unlike findings from the previous study by Kim and Trumbore (2010), who examined the impact of FDI on human rights for the years from 1981-2006, FDI has a negative impact on human rights conditions in developing countries during the post-Cold War period. The level of FDI is insignificant statistically in all models and also against the sixth hypothesis. It does not seem that FDI flows encourage governments in developing countries to establish good governance, which may cause changes in governments' policies toward human rights practices. Turning to other socioeconomic explanation variables, oil rents per capita is also negatively associated with physical integrity rights in recipient countries, but as expected. Fighting over resource rents negatively affects a government's human rights practices. One curious result is that its impact on human rights is statistically significant in the models with the CIRI indicator, Models A(1), B(1), and C(1), but not in those with the PTS, Models A(2), B(2), and C(2). Finally, population size is statistically significant in all estimations (p values in all models are less than 0.05). As hypothesized in H8, a higher level of population is associated with a lower level of respect for physical integrity rights in this sample. Population size is the strongest predictor within the socioeconomic explanatory variables with the regression coefficients of -0.587, -0.548, and -0.588, saying that as logged

population increases by one unit, the level of respect for physical integrity rights decrease by slightly over half a point in the models using the CIRI indicator.

Table 2. The Impact of U.S. Foreign Aid on Physical Integrity Rights, 1990-2009

Independent Variables	Model A		Model B		Model C	
	(1) CIRI	(2) PTS	(1) CIRI	(2) PTS	(1) CIRI	(2) PTS
Economic Aid _(t-1)	-0.139*	0.075*				
	(0.057)	(0.033)				
Military Aid _(t-1)			-0.037	0.069		
			(0.088)	(0.046)		
Total Aid _(t-1)					-0.132*	0.078*
					(0.058)	(0.033)
Democracy	0.112**	-0.058**	0.108**	-0.056**	0.112**	-0.058**
	(0.015)	(0.010)	(0.015)	(0.010)	(0.015)	(0.010)
Leftist Government	-0.136*	0.026	-0.127	0.020	-0.139*	0.028
	(0.069)	(0.037)	(0.072)	(0.377)	(0.069)	(0.037)
Armed Conflicts	-1.949**	0.693**	-1.956**	0.687**	-1.942**	0.693**
	(0.188)	(0.103)	(0.189)	(0.102)	(0.187)	(0.101)
GDP per Capita (ln)	-0.119*	0.057*	-0.104	0.048*	-0.117*	0.057*
	(0.052)	(0.023)	(0.055)	(0.225)	(0.052)	(0.022)
FDI (ln)	-0.047	0.036	-0.050	0.035	-0.044	0.034
	(0.031)	(0.020)	(0.031)	(0.020)	(0.031)	(0.020)
Oil Rent per Capita (ln)	-0.116**	0.012	-0.106**	0.007	-0.115**	0.012
	(0.028)	(0.016)	(0.027)	(0.015)	(0.278)	(0.016)
Population (ln)	-0.587**	0.264**	-0.547**	0.250**	-0.588**	0.266**
	(0.042)	(0.032)	(0.039)	(0.030)	(0.041)	(0.031)
Constant	15.662**	-2.240**	14.695**	-1.821**	15.634**	-2.273**
	(0.646)	(0.527)	(0.601)	(0.481)	(0.641)	(0.525)
No. of Observations	828	848	828	848	828	848
No. of Countries	112	112	112	112	112	112
R-Squared	0.439	0.440	0.434	0.438	0.439	0.441
Wald chi-square	1538.64	382.08	1387.85	392.67	1519.80	404.83
Rho	0.377	0.576	0.383	0.585	0.375	0.570

Note: Models were estimated using ordinary least squares regression with correction for serial autocorrelation within panels (assumed first-order process) and heteroskedastic disturbances between them (using Stata's xtpcse procedure). Estimates are Prais-Winsten regression coefficients with panel-corrected standard errors (PCSEs) in parentheses. The null hypothesis of the Wald chi-square test is that all coefficients are jointly equal to zero. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. In addition, the robustness of the models is tested by serially omitting each control variable. All models with the PTS seem robust, while models with the CIRI indicator seem a little sensitive to the test: the direction of the coefficient on the key explanatory variable changes when population, the control variable, is removed from the regressions.

CHAPTER 6. DISCUSSION

This research attempts to examine the effects of U.S. foreign aid on human rights conditions in recipient countries during the post-Cold War era by utilizing pooled cross-sectional time series data on 112 developing countries from 1990-2009. Since none of the studies that have examined the consequences of U.S. foreign aid exclusively did so for the post-Cold War years, this research is designed to accomplish such a goal. Furthermore, the end of the Cold War is recognized as an unprecedented event that has a profound impact on the international political and economic system as well as domestic configurations. The collapse of the Cold War also changes the structure of foreign aid system, in which donor countries, including the United States, now start to attach political conditions to their foreign aid, pushing political reforms. Such changes in foreign aid allocation make it possible to expect a positive impact of U.S. foreign aid on human rights practices in aid-receiving developing countries during the post-Cold War era. However, the findings of the study are not supportive of the primary hypothesis. Rather, the analysis shows that the distribution of U.S. foreign aid [economic, military and total aid] has a detrimental impact on physical integrity rights in developing countries in the post-Cold War period of 1990-2009. This unexpected result allows a different perspective on the U.S. foreign aid and human rights policy.

“The allocation of foreign aid is influenced by the evolving, continuing, and paradoxical values, ideals, and beliefs of the various policy makers” (Apodaca 2006, xiii). Even though, as a result of the end of the Cold War, the world system has been restructured and thus the structure of aid system has been changed, the reformulation of priorities for foreign assistance and the degree of commitment to the human rights policy by U.S.

administrations in the post-Cold War period might not be much different than in the Cold War era.

George H. W. Bush's presidency coincided with an era of immense changes in world politics with the passing of the Cold War. The Bush Sr. administration had the opportunity to implement American ideals of human rights and democracy and also the support of Congress to redefine U.S. foreign policy. In fact, Congress successfully redirected U.S. foreign aid to support the transition of the former Soviet satellite countries.²⁴ However, "Bush mismanaged the opportunity to redirect America's foreign policy toward human rights concerns due to his renowned lack of vision and his desire to remain convivial with foreign nations regardless of their human rights records" (Apodaca 2006, 134).

Clinton came to office with the promise, made during his campaign for president, that human rights would finally be a cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy, which was strongly reminiscent of the Carter administration (McCormick 2000). With the demise of the Soviet Union, the traditional rationales for aid were no longer valid. For the new purposes of U.S. aid distribution, "USAID emphasized the direct economic benefits to the United States when pushing for foreign aid allocation from Congress" (Apodaca 2006, 156). Enhancing U.S. commercial interests became the primary foreign policy goal of the Clinton administration. "Thus, despite Clinton's rhetoric heralding the importance of human rights, policies during his two terms in office failed to live up to his claims. Instead of making human rights promotion a cornerstone of his foreign policy, Clinton was willing to forgo improvements in

²⁴ Congress passed the East European Democracy Act (SEED; PL 101-513) and the Freedom Support Act (PL 102-511). However, due to the federal deficits, these new programs made the amount of foreign aid to Latin America, Asia, and Africa be reduced.

human condition for economic and political gains,” which is reminiscent of Carter’s paradox (Callaway and Matthews 2008, 60-61).

With the terrorist September 11 attacks, the United States once again had an enemy. Unlike the enemy of the Cold War, the Soviet Union, or Communism, the post-September 11 enemy was a more ambiguous entity, “evil.” With the tragedy of the September 11 attacks, the use of foreign aid increased because the George W. Bush administration had a clear purpose for aid, namely to fight the war on terrorism. However, the respect for human rights, both internationally and domestically, decreased. While foreign aid was clearly recognized as an effective tool of U.S. foreign policy under the Bush Jr. administration, “it [was] not used as leverage to entice improvement in human rights conditions. In fact, it is given with no strings attached to some of the most egregious violations of human rights worldwide in the name of national security” (Callaway and Matthews 2008, 63).

As discussed above, the collapse of the Cold War was a chance for the United States to promote universal human rights, since the traditional *realpolitik* rationale for foreign aid allocation was absent and political conditionality had emerged among the developed, donor, countries. However, rhetoric aside, promoting human rights in the world never became a major concern of U.S. foreign aid allocation in the post-Cold War period. It has always been secondary in the list of U.S. foreign-policy goals. Some of the consequences of aid allocation have drawn attention of the world. With recent unrest in Middle East, U.S. foreign policy has been the target of criticism over its long support of authoritarian regimes, which are the center of civic uprisings in Middle East. These criticisms are especially pointed over America’s weakness in pressing such regimes because of their role in national political interests. Egypt is one prominent example.

While Ban Ki-Moon, UN Secretary-General, criticized about the situation in Egypt that attacks on demonstrators were not acceptable, the White House, after asking for restraint in anti-government protestors for over a week, announced that the president “deplored” the violence against peaceful protesters in Egypt²⁵ (MediaCorp 2011). Apodaca (2006, 184) explained that “[T]he human rights violations in Egypt, similar to many others perpetrated in the pro-American countries of the Middle East, were no longer an important issue when the U.S. foreign policy of Middle Eastern friendship and stability was concerned.”

For the post-Cold War period, U.S. foreign aid had a negative impact on human rights conditions in aid-receiving developing countries. Repeated rhetoric notwithstanding, the lack of implementation in the U.S. human rights policy seems clear when examined via the different presidential administrations above. This is also accordance with the empirical study of Apodaca and Stohl (1999). U.S. leaders’ emphasis on the importance of human rights in their rhetoric does not guarantee implementation of the policies that advance human rights protections in the face of *realpolitik*. Implementation seems a very important key to achieve such a goal in *realpolitik*.

²⁵ Egypt, which became the second-largest recipient of America aid in 1979 after it agreed to make peace with Israel, receives around \$1.5 billion in military aid from Washington each year.

CHAPTER 7. CONCLUSION

With the end of the Cold War, the major rationale for U.S. foreign aid, to contain Communism, seemed lost. With the new world order, the expectation of promoting ideological values such as democracy and human rights seemed well-founded. Such expectation is attached to the allocation of foreign aid as the name of political conditionality, which emphasized political reforms in recipient countries as a prerequisite for receiving aid. However, the empirical findings of this research suggested that U.S. foreign aid, regardless of the type of aid, had a detrimental impact on citizens' physical integrity rights in 112 aid-receiving developing countries during the post-Cold War period of 1990-2009. In short, the consequences of U.S. foreign aid distribution is associated with poor human rights conditions. As an effort to find reasons, the studies of human rights considerations in the presidential administration in the post-Cold War years are reviewed. In sum, as an effective tool of the U.S. foreign policy, foreign aid has been used to accomplish the national interest such as furthering commercial objectives and the war on terrorism rather than promoting universal human rights. Even though the good will of the chief administrators to promote human rights is explicit, faithful implementation to achieve such a goal through foreign aid always falls far short of their promises.

The results of this study have provided additional insight into the relationship between U.S. foreign aid and human rights. More importantly, it has illustrated the effects of U.S. foreign aid on human rights during the post-Cold War period. Pushing political reforms by attaching political conditionality to aid, which was driven by the end of the Cold War, did not change the negative impact of U.S. foreign aid on human rights conditions in developing countries. Then, the question in terms of future research is what other factors after the end of

the Cold War influence this relationship. One prominent phenomenon that draws attention to this relationship is nongovernmental organizations' (or NGOs') involvement in securing universal human rights in the international community. Furthermore, NGOs' activities supported by bilateral or multilateral aid of developed countries may lead down to change human rights conditions in developing countries. This is left for future research.

REFERENCES

- Agresti, Alan, and Barbara Finlay. *Statistical Methods for the Social Sciences*. Fourth. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2009.
- Apodaca, Clair. *Understanding U.S. Human Rights Policy: A Paradoxical Legacy*. New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2006.
- Apodaca, Clair, and Michael Stohl. "United States Human Rights Policy and Foreign Assistance." *International Studies Quarterly* 43 (1999): 185-198.
- Baehr, Peter R. *The Role of Human Rights in Foreign Policy*. London: Machmillan, 1994.
- Beck, Nathaniel, and Jonathan N Katz. "Nuisance vs. Substance: Specifying and Estimating Time Series Cross Section Models." *Political Analysis* 6, no. 1 (1996): 1-34.
- Beck, Nathaniel, and Jonathan N Katz. "What to do (and not to do) with Time-Series Cross-Section Data." *American Political Science Review* 89, no. 3 (1995): 634-647.
- Blanton, Shannon Lindsey. "Foreign Policy in Transition? Human Rights, Democracy, and U.S. Arms Exports." *International Studies Quarterly* 49, no. 4 (2005): 647-667.
- Blanton, Shannon Lindsey. "Impact of Human Rights on U.S. Foreign Assistance to Latin America." *International Interactions* 19, no. 4 (1994): 339-358.
- Blanton, Shannon Lindsey. "Promoting Human Rights and Democracy in the Developing World: U.S. Rhetoric versus U.S. Arms Exports." *American Journal of Political Science* 44, no. 1 (2000): 123-131.
- Bohrnstedt, George W, and David Knoke. *Statistics for Social Data Analysis*. 3rd Edition. Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1994.
- Burnell, Peter. *Foreign Aid in a Changing World*. Bristol, PA: Open University Press, 1997.
- Callaway, Rhonda L, and Elizabeth G Matthews. *Strategic US Foreign Assistance: The Battle Between Human Rights and National Security*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2008.
- Capellan, Joel A, and Simonpeter Gomez. "Foreing Aid and Human Rights: The Latin American Experience." *Revista De Ciencia Politica* 27, no. 1 (2007): 67-87.
- Carey, Sabine C. "European Aid: Human Rights Versus Bureaucratic Inertia?" *Journal of Peace Research* 44, no. 4 (2007): 447-464.

- Carleton, David, and Michael Stohl. "The Foreign Policy of Human Rights: Rhetoric and Reality from Jimmy Carter to Ronald Reagan." *Human Rights Quarterly* 7, no. 2 (1985): 205-229.
- Carleton, David, and Michael Stohl. "The Role of Human Rights in U.S. Foreign Assistance Policy: A Critique and Reappraisal." *American Journal of Political Science* 31, no. 4 (1987): 1002-1018.
- Cingranelli, David L, and David L Richards. "Respect for Human Rights after the End of the Cold War." *Journal of Peace Research* 36, no. 5 (1999): 511-534.
- Cingranelli, David, and David Richards. *CIRI Human Rights Data Project*. 2011.
<http://www.humanrightsdata.org>.
- Cingranelli, David, and Thomas Pasquerllo. "Human Rights Practices and the U.S. Distribution of Foreign Aid to Latin American Countries." *American Journal of Political Science* 29, no. 3 (1985): 539-563.
- Demirel-Pegg, Tijen, and James Moskowitz. "US Aid Allocation: The Nexus of Human Rights, Democracy, and Development." *Journal of Peace Research* 46, no. 2 (2009): 181-198.
- Findley, Mike, Darren Hawkins, Rich Nielsen, Dan Nielson, and Sven Wilson. "To Empower or Impoverish? The Sector-by-Sector Effectiveness of Foreign Aid." *AidData Oxford Conference*. 2010.
- Gibler, Douglas M. "United States Economic Aid and Repression: The Opportunity Cost Argument." *The Journal of Politics* 70, no. 2 (2008): 513-526.
- Harford, Tim, and Michael Klein. "Aid and the Resource Curse." *Public Policy Journal* (The World Bank) Note Number 291 (April 2005).
- Henderson, Conway W. "Conditions Affecting the Use of Political Repression." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 35, no. 1 (1991): 120-142.
- Hoffman, Adonis. "The Rights of Spring: People Over Pragmatism in Human Rights." *Journal of International Affairs* 11, no. 2 (March 2011): 20-23.
- Hofrenning, Daniel. "Human Rights and Foreign Aid: A Comparison of the Reagan and Carter Administrations." *American Politics Research* 18, no. 4 (1990): 514-526.
- Kim, Dong-Hun, and Peter F Trumbore. "Transnational Mergers and Acquisitions: The impact of FDI on human rights, 1981-2006." *Journal of Peace Research* 47, no. 6 (2010): 723-734.

- Lai, Brian. "Examining the Goals of US Foreign Assistance in the Post-Cold War Period, 1991-1996." *Journal of Peace Research* 40, no. 1 (2003): 103-128.
- Lancaster, Carol, and Ann Van Dusen. *Organizing U.S. Foreign Aid: Confronting the Challenges of the Twenty-first Century*. Washington, D.C., 2005.
- Lane, Philip R, and Aaron Tornell. "Power Concentration and Growth." Harvard Institute for Economic Research Discussion Paper 1720, 1995.
- Lebovic, James H. "National Interests and US Foreign Aid: The Carter and Reagan Years." *Journal of Peace Research* 25, no. 2 (1988): 115-135.
- Lewis-Beck, Michael S. *Applied Regression: An Introduction*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1980.
- Liang-Fenton, Debra, ed. *Implementing U.S. Human Rights Policy*. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2004.
- McCormick, James. "Human Rights and the Clinton Administration: American Policy at the Dawn of a New Century." In *Universal Human Rights?*, by Robert G Patman, 114-134. New York, N.Y.: St. Martin's Press, Inc., 2000.
- McCormick, James M, and Neil Mitchell. "Human Rights and Foreign Assistance: An Update." *Social Science Quarterly* 70, no. 4 (1989): 969-979.
- McCormick, James M, and Neil Mitchell. "Is U.S. Aid Really Linked to Human Rights in Latin America?" *American Journal of Political Science* 32, no. 1 (1988): 231-239.
- McKinlay, Robert D, and Little Richard. "A Foreign Policy Model of U.S. Bilateral Aid Allocation." *World Politics* 30, no. 1 (1977): 58-86.
- Mearsheimer, John J. "Why We Will Soon Miss the Cold War." *Atlantic Monthly* 266, no. 2 (1990): 35-42.
- MediaCorp. *Channelnewsasia.com*. February 3, 2011.
http://www.channelnewsasia.com/stories/afp_world/view/1108622/1/.html.
- Meernik, James, Eric L Krueger, and Steven C Poe. "Testing Models of U.S Foreign Policy: Foreign Aid during and after the Cold War." *Journal of Politics* 60, no. 1 (1998): 63-85.
- Meyer, William H. *Human Rights and International Political Economy in Third World Nations: Multinational Corporations, Foreign Aid, and Repression*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publisher, 1998.

- Meyer, William H. "Human Rights and MNCs: Theory Versus Quantitative Analysis." *Human Rights Quarterly* (18) 2 (1996): 368-397.
- Mitchell, Neil J, and James M. McCormick. "Economic and Political Explanations of Human Rights Violations." *World Politics* 40, no. 4 (1988): 476-498.
- Neumayer, Eric. "Do International Human Rights Treaties Improve Respect for Human Rights?" *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 49, no. 6 (2005): 925-953.
- Neumayer, Eric. "Is Respect for Human Rights Rewarded? An Analysis of Total Bilateral and Multilateral Aid Flows." *Human Rights Quarterly* 25, no. 2 (2003): 510-527.
- Ostrom, Charles W. *Time Series Analysis: Regression Teaching Techniques*. 2nd Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1990.
- Patman, Robert G, ed. *Universal Human Rights?* New York, NY: St. Martin's Press, Inc., 2000.
- Poe, Steven C. "Human Rights and Economic Aid Allocations under Ronald Reagan and Jimmy Carter." *American Journal of Political Science* 36, no. 1 (1992): 147-167.
- Poe, Steven C, and C. Neal Tate. "Repression of Human Rights to Personal Integrity in the 1980s: A Global Analysis." *American Political Science Review* 88, no. 4 (1994): 853-872.
- Poe, Steven C, and James Meernik. "US Military Aid in the 1980s: A Global Analysis." *Journal of Peace Research* 32, no. 4 (1995): 399-411.
- Poe, Steven C, and Rangsim Sirirangsi. "Human Rights and U.S. Economic Aid During the Reagan Years." *Social Science Quarterly* 75, no. 3 (1994): 494-509.
- Poe, Steven C, Neal Tate, and Linda Camp Keith. "Repression of the Human Right to Personal Integrity Revisited: A Global Cross-National Study Covering the Years 1976-1993." *International Studies Quarterly* 43, no. 2 (1999): 291-313.
- Regan, Patrick M. "U.S. Economic Aid and Political Repression: An Empirical Evaluation of U.S. Foreign Policy." *Political Research Quarterly* 48, no. 3 (1995): 613-628.
- Richards, David L, Ronald D Gelleny, and David H Sacko. "Money with a Mean Streak? Foreign Economic Penetration and Government Respect for Human Rights in Developing Countries." *International Studies Quarterly* 45, no. 2 (2001): 219-239.
- Ross, Michael L. "Oil, Islam, and Women." *American Political Science Review* 102, no. 1 (2008): 107-123.

Sachs, Jeffrey D, and Andrew M Warner. "The Curse of Natural Resources." *European Economic Review* 45, no. 4-6 (2001): 827-838.

Schoultz, Lars. *Human Rights and United States Policy Toward Latin America*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 1981.

Smith, Jackie, Melissa Bolyard, and Anna Ippolito. "Human Rights and the Global Economy: A Response to Meyer." *Human Rights Quarterly* 21, no. 1 (1999): 207-219.

Stohl, Michael, David Carleton, and Steven E Johnson. "Human Rights and U.S. foreign assistance from Nixon to Carter." *Journal of Peace Research* 21, no. 3 (1984): 215-226.

Vasak, Karel. "A 30-Year Struggle: The sustained efforts to give force of law to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights." *UNESCO Courier*, November 1977: 29-32.

APPENDIX A

Countries included in study

Low Income	Lower Middle Income	Upper Middle Income
Afghanistan	Angola	Algeria
Bangladesh	Armenia	Algeria
Benin	Bhutan	Argentina
Burundi	Bolivia	Azerbaijan
Cambodia	Cameroon	Belarus
Central African Republic	China	Bosnia-Herzegovina
Chad	Congo, Republic of	Botswana
Comoros	Cote d'Ivoire	Brazil
Eritrea	Djibouti	Bulgaria
Ethiopia	Ecuador	Chile
Gambia	Egypt	Colombia
Ghana	El Salvador	Costa Rica
Guinea	Georgia	Cuba
Guinea-Bissau	Guatemala	Dominican Republic
Haiti	Guyana	Fiji
Kenya	Honduras	Gabon
Kyrgyz Republic	India	Iran
Laos	Indonesia	Jamaica
Liberia	Iraq	Kazakhstan
Madagascar	Jordan	Lebanon
Malawi	Lesotho	Libya
Mali	Moldova	Lithuania
Mauritania	Mongolia	Macedonia
Mozambique	Morocco	Malaysia
Nepal	Nicaragua	Mauritius
Niger	Nigeria	Mexico
Rwanda	Pakistan	Namibia
Sierra Leone	Papua New Guinea	Panama
Solomon Islands	Paraguay	Peru
Tajikistan	Philippines	Romania
Tanzania	Senegal	Russia
Togo	Sri Lanka	South Africa
Uganda	Sudan	Turkey
Zambia	Swaziland	Uruguay
Zimbabwe	Syria	Venezuela
	Thailand	
	Tunisia	
	Turkmenistan	
	Ukraine	
	Uzbekistan	
	Vietnam	
	Yemen	

APPENDIX B

Summary Statistics					
Variable	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
CIRI	2121	4.022	2.074	0	8
PTS	2206	2.910	0.986	1	5
Econ Aid (ln)	2240	1.474	1.130	0	5.832
Milt Aid (ln)	2240	0.310	0.694	0	5.401
Total Aid (ln)	2240	1.556	1.161	0	6.046
Democracy	2170	4.105	3.587	0	10
Leftist Gov't	1115	2.283	0.905	1	3
Armed Conflicts	2240	0.204	0.403	0	1
GDP (ln)	2205	7.763	1.162	0.289	9.895
FDI (ln)	2109	7.268	2.205	0.131	13.105
Oil Rents (ln)	1904	1.814	2.435	0	8.408
Population (ln)	2240	16.145	1.510	12.656	21.010

APPENDIX C

Correlation Matrix

	Econ Aid	Milt Aid	Total Aid	Democracy	Leftist Gov't	Armed Conflict	GDP	FDI	Oil Rents	Population
Econ Aid	1									
Milt Aid		1								
Total Aid			1							
Democracy	0.079	-0.001	0.085	1						
Leftist Gov't	-0.074	-0.129	-0.098	-0.355	1					
Armed Conflict	0.005	-0.028	0.004	-0.188	0.022	1				
GDP	-0.119	0.125	-0.087	0.325	-0.236	-0.204	1			
FDI	-0.135	0.114	-0.099	0.245	-0.129	-0.168	0.454	1		
Oil Rents	-0.296	-0.038	-0.288	-0.179	0.106	0.024	0.240	0.413	1	
Population	-0.256	-0.051	-0.247	-0.015	0.003	0.140	0.074	0.582	0.372	1

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my major professor, Dr. Robert Urbatsch, for great support of my research, his patience, enthusiasm, and immense knowledge. His guidance helped me during all the time of research and writing of this thesis. Without his knowledge and help, this study would not have been successful.

I also thank the members of my graduate committee for their encouragement, insightful comments, and hard questions. Dr. Mack Shelley, who was there from the beginning of my graduate study, encouraged me to enroll in the MPA program, has guided me all through the program, and has taught me the fundamentals of statistics for social science. Dr. James McCormick, who graciously accepted to join my committee despite his busy schedule as the chairman of Department of Political Science, has with his insights helped me deepen knowledge about my research topic. Dr. Frederick Lorenz, who accepted to be on the committee as my minor professor of Statistics, has taught me the applications for social science.

My special thanks go to Joyce Wray, the Political Science staff assistant, for her all assistance; Dr. Ellen Pirro for her encouragement; Jeong Ju Moon and Jie Zhang, my colleagues, for their friendship while walking the MPA program together; and Dr. Hyun Jung Kim, who is my sister in Christ, for her unending support and prayers.

Last but not least, thanks to my family for unwavering support, and the one above all of us, the omnipresent God, for his unfailing love, thank you so much Dear Lord and please continue to have your way in me.