When Do States Say Uncle? Network Dependence and Sanction Compliance

Shahryar Minhas & Cassy Dorff

shahryar.minhas@duke.edu & cassy.dorff@duke.edu

Duke University

September 30, 2013

Motivating Question

- When and why do states comply with economic sanctions?
- In this presentation we have demonstrate the necessity of incorporating network dynamics into predictive models of sanction compliance.
- We show that the connectivity between target and sender states–in terms of cultural similarities, geographical proximity, and alliance patterns–plays an important and previously overlooked role on sanction outcomes.

Sanctions and domestic factors

Previous literature has suggested sanctions "work" by destablizing leaders and other domestic factors

- Marinov 2005
- Lektzian and Souva 2003

In addition, such work has often utilized a duration modeling approach to capture the time dependent nature of sanciton dynamics:

- Bolks Al-Sowayel 2000
- McGillivray and Stam 2004

While domestic conditions are important, another vein of literature suggests cross-cutting relationships and network dynamics should play a key role in understanding sanction outcomes

- Martin, 1993; Drezner, 2000; Bapat and Morgan, 2009, Cranmer and Heinrich 2013.

The importance of multilateral coordination and network dynamics are intuitive given the broader work on networks in international relationships

- Hoff and Ward 2004
- Cranmer and Desmarais 2012

NETWORK GRAPH HERE. Say we are combining duration $+$ network effects $+$ consideration of domestic factors.

Bridging the Gaps

We suggest that present duration approaches fail to incorporate the network pressures instrinstic to international sanction processes.

- Target states face a network of sanctioners, not just an individual sender state. We present a duration model that incorporates the interdependent nature of the international system.
- In addition, we explore how network pressures inform sanction compliance, as well as interact with the domestic institutions of the target state.

Network Pressure Hypotheses

- **H1** Connectivity: The relationships between senders and receivers influences sanction compliance:
    - More proximate relationships translates to greater potential for pressure, which will lead to a shorter duration
- **H2** Network Members: Higher number of sender states leads to greater potential for pressure, which will shorten the duration of the sanction

Institutions Hypothesis

Sanctions impose costs on groups within the country. Affected
groups will try to lobby the government to reach an
accommodation with sanctioning states, and the power of these
groups will be stronger in democracies.

- **H3** Target states with stronger democratic institutions that
  are under the pressure of sanctions will more quickly comply
  than those with less democratic institutions.

Conceptualizing Networks

Two types of network effects that we want to capture:

- Relationships between sender(s) of the sanction and a target state
  - Alliances
  - Distance
  - Trade
  - Religion
- Pressures from overall network structure
  - Number of senders
  - How many sanctions targetstate has received

Constructing Network Measures

A network chart, with one target and four senders, network
measures meant to capture the relationship between
a little bit of math

Data

Sanction data from Threat and Imposition of Sanctions developed by Morgan (2009), covers sanction cases from 1945 to 2005

The focus of this study is compliance to economic sanctions

We define compliance as:

- Complete/Partial Acquiescence by Target to threat
- Negotiated Settlement
- Total/Partial Acquiescence by the Target State following sanctions imposition
- Negotiated Settlement following sanctions imposition

$$Compliance_{i,t} = No.\ Senders_j + Constraints_{i,t} + Distance_{j,t} +$$
$$GDP\ Capita_{i,t-1} + Internal\ Conflict_{i,t} + Trade_{j,t} +$$
$$Ally_{j,t} + IGOs_{j,t} + Sanc.\ Rec'd_{i,t} + Religion_{j,t} +$$
$$Constraints_{i,t} * No.\ Senders_j + \epsilon_{i,t}$$

where i represents the target state, j represents the relationship
between the set of senders and i, and t the time period

Table: Model 1: Network Effects

	β	$\sigma_{\hat{\beta}}$	P-value
Number of Senders	0.600	0.177	0.001
Distance	-264.0	13.00	0.020
Polcon	-2.660	1.190	0.025
GDP per Capita (lagged)	-0.001	0.001	0.390
Internal Conflict	0.039	0.100	0.690
Trade Network	0.615	0.987	0.530
Ally Network	1.370	0.568	0.016
IGO Network	-0.023	0.014	0.110
Recieved Sanctions	-0.098	0.107	0.360
Religious Similarity	-1.250	0.500	0.012

Results

Table: Model 2: Network Effects & Institutions

	β	$\sigma_{\hat{\beta}}$	P-value
Number of Senders	1.200	0.412	0.004
Distance	-251.0	112.0	0.024
Polcon	-0.669	1.74	0.700
GDP per Capita (lagged)	-0.001	0.001	0.350
Internal Conflict	0.0469	0.099	0.630
Trade Network	0.638	0.965	0.510
Ally Network	1.420	0.579	0.014
IGO Network	-0.023	0.014	0.140
Recieved Sanctions	-0.119	0.106	0.260
Religious Similarity	-1.340	0.493	0.007
Senders $*$ Polcon	-1.620	1.040	0.120

GRAPHICS HERE