

BA Thesis Course: EU crisis management operations

Instructor: Trineke Palm

t.p.palm@vu.nl

Office hours: by appointment

Course summary and objectives

This course aims to introduce students to the topic of EU crisis management operations whilst assisting them in the completion of their BA thesis. In the seminars an introduction to the challenges associated with the EU's CSDP-operations will be given. The main focus in this course will be on an empirical study of the EU's crisis management operations.

In 2003 the EU launched its first military operation, Operation Concordia in FYR Macedonia. It meant a big change. Until then the EU's foreign policy only consisted of non-military instruments, like trade, development aid and diplomacy. Since then seven other military operations were launched under CSDP and almost 20 civilian missions.

The military instrument is the "hard" end of foreign policy instruments. It challenged the EU's self-conception that was closely attached to the use of non-military foreign policy instruments. The development of the EU as an international security actor also raised questions of European integration. The military instrument has always been closely aligned to the idea of sovereignty and the defence of state territory. Have EU crisis management operations changed national foreign policies? Moreover, the relationship with other international security actors, like NATO and the UN changed as the EU became a more powerful partner/competitor.

Research on the EU's crisis management operations aims to explain their genesis (Gegout, 2005; Pohl, 2013), effectiveness (Peen-Rodt, 2011) or addresses the operational planning of those missions and their institutional set-up (Merlingen, 2012). Other research addresses the question what it tells us about the EU's international actorness/power (Björkdahl, 2011) and the relationship between/among EU institutions and with the EU Member States (Dijkstra, 2013; Gross 2009), and with other multilateral actors like the UN, NATO, AU (Howorth & John, 2005; Peters, 2011).

These different angles also involve different theoretical positions. We will discuss the main views in those debate as they have been put forward in the international relations literature (e.g. realism and constructivism) and EU integration literature (e.g. liberal intergovernmentalism and Europeanization).

Some of the issues that this course will address and that students will have the opportunity to explore in their thesis are:

- *Explaining the launch/development/character of EU crisis management operations (EU operation is Y)*
- *Explaining the impact of EU crisis management operations (EU operation is X)*

- *Comparison of EU crisis management operations with operations from other international security actors*

Students can choose a topic related to one of the issues outlined above and are guided in drawing up an appropriate research design. Throughout the course, we will pay attention to research methodology.

Schedule

Week	Date	Topic	Assignment per week	Deadline Assignments
1 (15)	7 april	<p>Seminar:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction of EU crisis management operations • How to write a thesis • Introduction to puzzle, RQ & Research Design <p><i>Literature:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Howorth, J. (2013). European security institutions 1945-2010. The weaknesses and strengths of Brusselization. In Biscop, S. & Whitman, R.G. (eds.), <i>The Routledge Handbook of European Security</i> (p.5-17). London: Routledge.(available online through university library) • Koenig, N. (2014). Between conflict management and role conflict: the EU in the Libyan crisis. <i>European Security</i>, DOI: 10.1080/09662839.2013.875532 <p>Homework: Webcourse C – Finding literature</p>		
2 (16)	14 april	<p>Seminar:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EU international actorness • Case selection & Case study <p>Presentations & Peer review on ass. 1</p> <p><i>Literature:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Björkdahl, A. (2011). 	Assignment 1: Introduction: statement of research problem and Research question situated within the State of the Art	13/4/2015 9.00

		<p>Normative and military power in EU peace support operations. In Whitman, R.G. (ed.), <i>Normative Power Europe. Empirical and theoretical perspectives</i> (p. 103-126). New York: Palgrave Macmillan. (available online through university library)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rynning, S. (2011). 'Realism and the Common Security and Defence Policy', <i>Journal of Common Market Studies</i>, 49(1):23-42. • Blatter, J. and M. Haverland (2012) <i>Designing Case Studies</i>. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. (available online through university library) Read Ch. 1. 		
3 (17)	21 april	<p>Seminar:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of EU Military Operations • Operationalization <p>Presentations & Peer review on ass. 2</p> <p><i>Literature</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gross, E. (2009). <i>The Europeanization of National Foreign Policy: Continuity and Change in European Crisis Management</i>. New York: Palgrave Macmillan (available online through university library) – read ch. 1 & ch. 3/4/5 • Schörnigh, N., H. Müller and A. Geis (2013). 'The empirical studie of democratic wars: methodology and methods'. In: Geis, A., H. Müller and N. Schörnig (eds.), <i>The militant face of democracy. Liberal forces for good</i> (p.24-47). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 	Assignment 2: Extensive Review of the State of the Art	20/4/2015 9.00
4 (18)	28 april	<p>Seminar:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EU crisis management in 		

		<p style="text-align: center;">comparison</p> <p><i>Literature</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ehrhart, H. and Petretto, K. (2012). The EU, the Somalia Challenge, and Counter-piracy: Towards a Comprehensive Approach? <i>European Foreign Affairs Review</i> 17(2), 261–284. • Peters, I. (2011). Strategic culture and multilateralism: the interplay of the EU and the UN in conflict and crisis management, <i>Contemporary Security Policy</i>, 32(3), 644-666. DOI: 10.1080/13523260.2011.623065 • Ojanen, H. (2006). The EU and NATO: two competing models for a Common Defence Policy. <i>JCMS</i>, 44(1): 57-76. DOI:10.1111/j.1468-5965.2006.00614 		
5 (19)	5 may	No class – work on ass. 3		
6 (20)	12 may	Peer groups to present & discuss progress. Peer reviews of ass. 3	Assignment 3: Theoretical framework	11/5/2015 – 9.00
7 (21)	19 may	<p>Seminar:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research methods & techniques: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Elite/expert interviews ○ Finding & Analyzing documents <p>Peer groups to present & discuss progress. Peer reviews of ass. 4</p>	Assignment 4: Data, Operationalization, Methodology	18/5/2015 – 9.00
8 (22)	26 may	No class – work on ass. 5		
9 (23)	2 june	Peer groups to present & discuss progress. Peer review of ass. 5		
10 (24)	9 june	Peer groups to present & discuss progress. Peer review of ass. 5	Assignment 5: Analysis and interpretation	9/6/2015 – 9.00

11 (25)	16 june	Peer groups to present & discuss progress. Peer review of ass. 6	Assignment 6: Conclusions and implications	15/6/2015 – 9.00
12 (26)	23 june	Individual appointments		
13 (27)	30 june	Opdracht 7: Final version Bachelor-thesis		

Grading

- Participation 20%: presence, participation, quality of participation. It includes close reading of the obligatory literature, presenting your drafts and acting as discussant for others (for grading of peer reviews see appendix in study guide).
- Building Blocks (ass. 1-6) 30%: all assignments have equal weight
Each assignment also includes improvements of previous assignments.
- Final bachelorthesis 50%

The Bachelorthesis is a practicum, which means that there is no resit.

All componets of the grading have to be 6 or above.

What can you expect?

The supervisor

- Acts as teacher & expert – primarily during the first four weeks, introducing you into the main debates and relevant literature
- Acts as coach – giving written feedback on the assignments.
 - will further elaborate on this feedback during class when necessary
 - will not respond to emails with substantive questions, but will respond to those questions in class, when necessary
- Acts as reviewer/assessor – grading the assignments and final thesis, on the basis of the formal requirements.
- Will give different types of feedback, at different levels of abstraction, ranging from quite abstract comments on structure to very specific ones on a particular sentence. Depending on the way you deal with those comments another step in finalizing the thesis can be taken.

The very specific comments are easy to deal with, but they are not sufficient to pass the course. The more abstract comments will require a greater effort, but they are necessary to be dealt with.

Please note that feedback is given only on sections/parts that are included in the drafts/assignments, i.e. there is no feedback on chapters that are not there.

What is expected of you?

The student

- is responsible for the progress and quality of the thesis,
- is interested in the topic of EU crisis management operations
- is able to find relevant literature next to the literature that is discussed in the first five weeks
- is able to gather and analyze empirical data
- is able to write a coherent academic text
- is able to give feedback on the work of others
- is able to give an update of his/her progress and makes clear what particular elements he/she needs feedback on

Assignments

Opdracht 1: Introduction: statement of research problem and Research question situated within the State of the Art (week 2) (1.000 woorden)

Korte review van tijdens de bijeenkomsten behandelde en zelfstandig door studenten gezochte en gelezen literatuur: belangrijkste auteurs, debatten en resultaten tot nu toe. Wat zijn interessante vragen en problemen om te onderzoeken? Welke vraag of probleemstelling gaat u onderzoeken? Wat is daarvan de wetenschappelijke (en maatschappelijke) relevantie?

Opdracht 2: Extensive Review of the State of the Art (week 3) (1.500 woorden)

Uitgebreide review van tijdens de bijeenkomsten behandelde en zelfstandig door studenten gezochte en gelezen literatuur: belangrijkste auteurs, debatten en resultaten tot nu toe.

Opdracht 3: Theoretical framework (week 5) (1.500 woorden)

Welke theoretische concepten, relaties en assumpties worden benut om de vraagstelling te kunnen beantwoorden? Presenteer een samenhangend raamwerk waarin logisch en consistent wordt uitgelegd wat de theoretische fundering is voor het onderzoek dat gaat volgen. Geef aan hoe met dit raamwerk de probleemstelling kan worden beantwoord. Preciseer ook hoe het zich verhoudt tot bestaande theoretische benaderingen: waarop bouwt het voort, waarin wijkt het af en waarom?

Opdracht 4: Data, Operationalization, Methodology (eind week 6) (1.000 woorden)

Preciseer de mogelijke data, bestaande onderzoeksresultaten, cases en onderzoeksmethoden die nodig zijn om een wetenschappelijk verantwoord antwoord op uw vraag of probleemstelling te kunnen geven. Houd daarbij rekening met de beschikbaarheid (toegankelijkheid), de tijdsinvestering (haalbaarheid) en de moeilijkheidsgraad.

Honours studenten gebruiken ten minste twee verschillende onderzoeksmethoden.

Opdracht 5: Analysis and interpretation (week 10) (2.000 woorden)

Presenteer de empirische resultaten van eigen en/of bestaand onderzoek met gebruikmaking van een beperkt aantal overzichten zoals tabellen en/of figuren. Bespreek de belangrijkste bevindingen uitvoerig en vergelijk de resultaten van verschillende onderzoekers. Indien de eigen resultaten afwijkend zijn dient dit verklaard te worden. Relateer de eigen bevindingen aan de hypothesen: worden ze bevestigd of niet en waarom is dit zo? Hoe luidt op basis van de resultaten het antwoord op de onderzoeksvraag? In hoeverre is dit conform de verwachtingen?

Opdracht 6: Conclusions and implications (week 11) (1.000 woorden)

Bespreek de belangrijkste aannames en bevindingen van het onderzoek. Geef aan hoe het antwoord op de onderzoeksvraag zich verhoudt tot de bestaande onderzoeken: wat voegt het toe? Bespreek ook de bredere maatschappelijke en wetenschappelijke implicaties van de bevindingen.

Opdracht 7: eindopdracht: de finale versie (week 13) (8.000 woorden - honours: 10.000 woorden – exclusief titelpagina, inhoudsopgave, bibliografie en appendices). Herschrijf en bewerk de concepthoofdstukken op basis van de feedback. Versterk de State of the Art en het theoretische hoofdstuk met literatuur die u eerder over het hoofd mocht hebben gezien. Verwijder alle zij-paden en minder relevante uitwijdingen. Zorg voor een goed lopend, consistent, overtuigend en leesbaar betoog. Pas de Style Guide foutloos toe.

Becijfering peer reviews (onderdeel van het participatiecijfer)

Structuur: de review loopt alle punten na die worden genoemd in de opdrachten in Bijlage 2. Bijvoorbeeld bij opdracht 1 is de structuur van de review:

- Belangrijkste auteurs, debatten en resultaten tot nu toe.
- Wat zijn interessante vragen en problemen om te onderzoeken?
- Welke vraag of probleemstelling gaat u onderzoeken?
- Wat is daarvan de wetenschappelijke (en maatschappelijke) relevantie?

Kritiek en Suggesties voor verbeteringen: Per onderdeel wordt gesteld wat de sterke en zwakke punten zijn. Tevens wordt aangegeven hoe deze punten verbeterd zouden kunnen worden. Bijvoorbeeld bij opdracht 1 bij punt 1 zou het commentaar kunnen zijn:

- belangrijkste auteurs, debatten en resultaten tot nu toe.

De tekst bespreekt slechts drie auteurs waarbij bovendien één auteur veel meer aandacht krijgt dan de andere twee. Uit mijn zoekopdracht blijkt dat belangrijke auteurs onbesproken blijven (noem voorbeelden). Tevens worden de auteurs los van elkaar behandeld. Het is beter om ze te groeperen per theoretische benadering. Tenslotte dient duidelijker te worden ingegaan op de verschillende antwoorden die auteurs per benadering hebben gegeven. Hoe en waarom verschillen deze?

Bespreking tijdens de bijeenkomst: tijdens de bijeenkomst worden de verbeterpunten door de reviewer toegelicht op een manier die ook leerzaam is voor andere studenten. De discussie helpt de student met de voortgang en verbetering van de thesis.

Omvang: minimaal 1 pagina (tenzij voor tevoren anders afgesproken)

Becijfering peer reviews	
10	Alle onderdelen uit de opdracht worden besproken op minimaal 1 pagina en voorzien van kritiek en suggesties voor verbeteringen op een manier waar de student mee verder kan en die goed aansluit op de eerdere besprekingen. De discussie tijdens de bijeenkomst op basis van deze review helpt de student uitstekend met de voortgang en verbetering van de thesis.
8	Alle onderdelen uit de opdracht worden besproken op minimaal 1 pagina en voorzien van kritiek en suggesties voor verbeteringen. Deze zouden nog iets concreter mogen zodat de student er beter uit kan opmaken welke verbeteringen nodig zijn. De discussie tijdens de bijeenkomst op basis van deze review helpt de student grotendeels met de voortgang en verbetering van de thesis.
6	De meeste onderdelen uit de opdracht worden besproken op minimaal 1 pagina maar een paar onderdelen zijn wel erg beknopt gehouden terwijl er best meer over te zeggen valt. De discussie tijdens de bijeenkomst op basis van deze review is wat kort en oppervlakkig en waardoor de student maar ten dele geholpen is met de voortgang en verbetering van de thesis. De discussie tijdens de bijeenkomst bevestigt dit.
4	Slechts enkele onderdelen uit de opdracht worden besproken op minder dan 1 pagina en deze zijn bovendien erg beknopt gehouden zodat de student hier onvoldoende aan heeft. De discussie tijdens de bijeenkomst bevestigt dit.
2	De feedback is zo beknopt dat het de student geen houvast biedt om verbeteringen te maken. De discussie tijdens de bijeenkomst bevestigt dit.

Additional optional literature

The literature in the schedule is obligatory. Below some suggestions for further reading:

General overview

- Cameron, F. (2007) *An introduction to European Foreign Policy*. Routledge.
- Grevi, G., D. Helly and D. Keohane (2009). *European Security and Defence Policy. The First Ten Years (1999-2009)*. Paris: EUISS.
- Keukeleire, S. and T. Delreux (2014) *The foreign policy of the European Union*. Palgrave Macmillan. 2nd edition
- Mérand, F. (2008). *European Defence Policy: beyond the nation state*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (available online through university library)
- Merlingen, M. (2012). *EU security policy. What it is, how it works and why it matters*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- Norheim-Martinsen, P.M. (2012). *The European Union and military force. Governance and Strategy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (available online through university library)

EU and other crisis management actors

- Charbonneau, B. (2009). What is so special about the European Union? EU-UN cooperation in crisis management in Africa. *International Peacekeeping*, 16(4), 546-561. DOI:10.1080/13533310903249110
- Howorth, J. and T.S. John (2005). *Defending Europe: the EU, NATO and the quest for European autonomy*. (available online through university library)
- Whitman, R.G. (2004). NATO, the EU and ESDP: an emerging division of labour. *Contemporary Security Policy*, 25(3), 430 – 451. DOI: 10.1080/1352326042000330592

Explaining the launch of EU crisis management operations

- Gegout, C. (2005). Causes and consequences of the EU's military intervention in the Democratic Republic of Congo: a realist explanation. *European Foreign Affairs Review*, 10, 427-443.
- Pohl, B. (2013). The logic underpinning EU crisis management operations, *European Security*. 22(3), 307-325. DOI: 10.1080/09662839.2012.726220

EU international actorness and EU crisis management operations

- Freire, M.R. and L. Simao (2013). The EU's security actorness: the case of EUMM in Georgia. *European Security*, 22(4): 464-477. DOI: 10.1080/09662839.2013.808191
- Martin, M. and M. Kaldor (2010). *The European Union and human security: external interventions and missions*. London: Routledge.
- Greiçevci, L. (2011). EU actorness in international affairs: the case of EULEX Mission in Kosovo. *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, 12(3): 283-303.
- Hyde-Price, A. (2013). Realism. A dissident voice in the study of CSDP. In Biscop, S. and Whitman, R.G. (eds.), *The Routledge handbook of European security* (p.18-27). London: Routledge.

The relationship between EU Institutions & Member States in CSDP

- Chappell, L. (2012). *The Common Security and Defence Policy: converging security and defence perspectives in an enlarged EU*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan. (available online through the university library)
- Dijkstra, H. (2013). *Policy-making in EU Security and Defense. An Institutional Perspective*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. (available online through university library)
- Jakobsen, P.V. (2009). Small states, big influence: the overlooked Nordic influence on the civilian ESDP, *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 47(1), 81-102.
- Wong, R. (2005). The Europeanization of Foreign Policy. In Hill, C and Smith, M. *International Relations and the European Union*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

CSDP & CFSP

- Koutrakos, P. (2013). *The EU Common Security and Defence Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (available online through university library) – ch. 8
- Del Biondo, K., S. Oltch and J. Orbie (2013). Security and Development in EU External Relations: Converging, but in which direction? In Biscop, S. and Whitman R.G. (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of European Security* (p.126-142). London: Routledge.(available online through university library)

Impact of CSDP operations

- Ginsberg, R.H. and S.E. Penska (2012). *The European Union in global security: the politics of impact*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. (available online through university library) - Read ch. 3 on the external effects of CSDP missions
- Peen Rodt (2011). Taking Stock of EU Military Conflict Management. *Journal of Contemporary European Research*, 7(1), 41-60.

Methodology

- Della Porta, D. and M. Keating (2008). *Approaches and methodologies in the social sciences. A pluralist perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (available online through university library)
- Dexter, L.A. (2006). *Elite and specialized interviewing*. Colchester: ECPR Press.
- Fang Hsieh, H. and S.E. Shannon (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277-1288.
- George, A.L. and A. Bennett (2005). *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Gerring, J. (2007). *Case study research: principles and practices*. New York: Cambridge University Press. (available online through university library)
- Weiss, R. (1994). *Learning from strangers: the art and method of qualitative interview studies*. New York: Maxwell Macmillan International.
- Rohlfing, I. (2012). *Case Studies and Causal Inference. An Integrative Framework*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. (available online through university library)
- Bowen, G.A. (2009). Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27 – 40.

Useful websites;

- Exploring EU Foreign Policy - <http://www.eufp.eu/>
- European Council and Council Documents - <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/documents?lang=en>
- EEAS - <http://www.eeas.europa.eu/csdp/>
- European Parliament - <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/committees/en/sede/home.html#menuzone>

Plagiarism

The BA thesis should be your own original piece of work, which means that you should not have handed it in before for other courses. It also means that you do not present the work of others as your own. PLAGIARISM IS NOT ALLOWED. Plagiarism includes copying whole paragraphs from the texts of others, or, even worse, handing in a complete paper that is not yours. However, you also plagiarize if you 'forget' to indicate that a particular quotation is indeed just that, a quotation, and not your own words. This equally applies if you 'translate' it into your own words: then you should not put that between quotation marks but still give the appropriate source. The Department of Political Science of the VU has a very strict policy on plagiarism, with severe sanctions.