

International Relation / Political Science (IRPS)

Academic year 2019 - 2020

Foreign Policy Analysis

RI-SP045- Autumn- 6 ECTS

Course Description

Introduction to the study of how states make and carry out policy pertaining to the "external" world. Theories of decision-making and its antecedents, of agenda structuring, and of interactions among policy makers. Approaches include rational choice analysis; cognitive, developmental, and social psychology; and organizational behavior. This course is both a survey of the FPA subfield and an introduction to how to reason, in written form, about FPA-related questions specifically and political science questions more generally.

> PROFESSOR

David Sylvan
david.sylvan@graduateinstitute.ch
 Office: MdP -- P2-637
 Phone: +41 22 908 59 42

[Office hours](#)

Tues. 15.00-16.00 & by appt.

> ASSISTANT

Alessandra Romani
alessandra.romani@graduateinstitute.ch
 Office: MdP -- P2, Level 6
 Phone: +41 22 908 45 23

[Office hours](#)

Syllabus

Course Requirements

This course provides a survey of one of the subfields of international relations: foreign policy analysis. Claims about foreign policy are presupposed implicitly in most statements about international relations by scholars, policy makers, or journalists, but are rarely questioned; the purpose of this course is to slow down and start to think more explicitly about those claims. As such, the course is a) an introduction to the various theories we have about how foreign policy is made; b) a way of learning how to theorize about foreign policy by extending theories to different "cases" in foreign policy or comparing them systematically; and c) to learn something about how to think in political science by constructing written arguments about particular foreign policy theories.

As the course description above indicates, students will be introduced to a wide variety of topics on how states make and carry out policy that pertains in one way or another to the "external" world (the scare quotes are because the distinction between external and internal is debatable). Specifically, we will cover four clusters of topics in the course: how state actors reason and make decisions (to the extent that they in fact decide to do or not do something, a factual matter that is anything but obvious); the background factors that contour and to some degree structure state actions/non-actions; the role that organizations play in modern (particularly post-1945) foreign policy making; and the role that

groups play. The idea is to walk through a set of ideas sufficiently so that students begin to understand the complexity of sentences such as "Russia did X" or "this was Trump's concern." Note: this syllabus is updated regularly throughout the semester; log in often to the course web site to see if the readings for the upcoming weeks have been revised.

Each week, there will be a handful of articles and/or book chapters to read, available for download either through standard journal portals or via login to the course moodle (to be discussed the first week in class). Students should come to class having done the readings and thought about them. In addition, there will be four extremely short (2 pages) papers to write and a take-home/open-book exam at the end of the semester. Each paper will count for 15% of the course grade (if there is improvement, I will count later papers more) and the final exam for 40%. Please note that for any given week, there will be anywhere from a few to over a dozen other readings on the syllabus. Those readings are optional and while I certainly do not expect you to go through them during the semester, my hope is that if your curiosity is piqued by one or more of the topics we cover, you'll go through the optional readings some months from now, say in the summer.

The way we develop and evaluate theories in international relations/political science is by thinking through concrete examples (and, of course, writing carefully about them, which is one of the reasons for the multiple small papers). However, since there are so many interesting examples in the field of foreign policy analysis, it would be helpful for us to have a common, albeit small, set of such examples to which we can refer. As a start, I suggest that everyone familiarize him/herself with the basic chronology of the 1914 crisis, the Cuban missile crisis, and the 2003 invasion of Iraq. Please note that although a plurality of the examples cited in the course will pertain to the United States, that is for purely practical reasons: the U.S. has a lot more written about its foreign policy than most other countries. But beyond that, this is not a course in the foreign policy of the United States or of any other country: it's a course on how to explain various features of foreign policy.

It should be noted, for better or worse, that foreign policy analysis as an academic subfield has from its inception been focused on decisions. For this reason, some awareness of the general literature on decision making would be welcome (though it is absolutely neither required nor assumed in addition to the course readings, in particular those for class session 2); I would recommend that over the next year (i.e., going beyond the semester) students buy and read James G. March, *A Primer on Decision Making: How Decisions Happen*, New York: Free Press 1994. Similarly, and again for better or worse, foreign policy as an academic subfield has for the last several decades borrowed heavily from the subfield of political psychology; again, although I am neither assuming nor requiring any knowledge of that subfield beyond the required readings in the course, I would recommend that over the next year students buy and read Rose McDermott, *Political Psychology in International Relations*, Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P 2004. I would also recommend that, if you want to keep up on the field, you browse through recent issues of two journals: *Foreign Policy Analysis [FPA]* and *Political Psychology [PP]*.

Course Schedule

1. September 17

Course introduction; levels of analysis; FPA as a subfield; political psychology

J. David Singer, "The Level-of-Analysis Problem in International Politics," *World Politics [WP]* 14,1 (1961): 77-92. **NOTE:** this piece and the two others for this week should be read by the end of the semester.

Herbert A. Simon, "Human Nature in Politics: The Dialogue of Psychology with Political Science," *American Political Science R. [APSR]* 79,2 (1985): 293-304.

Jack S. Levy, "Psychology and Foreign Policy Decision-Making," in Leonie Huddy, David O. Sears, and idem., eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*, 2d edn. [hereafter *OH*], New York: Oxford UP 2013, ch. 10. **OPTIONAL:** Klaus Brummer and Valerie M. Hudson, "The Boundedness of Foreign Policy Analysis Theory?" *Global Society* 31,2 (2017): 157-66.

2. September 24

Reasoning/decisions 1: Optimizing vs. satisficing; prospect theory

Seden Akcinaroglu, Elizabeth Radziszewski, and Paul F. Diehl, "The Effects of Rivalry on Rivalry: Accommodation and the Management of Threats," *FPA* 10,1 (2014): 81-100. **OPTIONAL:** as I said in class, this approach is seat-of-the-pants common sense and therefore can be found in what we could call implicit analyses of foreign policy, e.g., Francis J. Gavin, "Strategies of Inhibition: U.S. Grand Strategy, the Nuclear Revolution, and Nonproliferation," *International Security [IS]* 40,1 (2015): 9-46. An interesting extension of the approach, which begins to undercut it much more than the authors realize, is Paul Bezerra et al., "Going for the Gold versus Distributing the Green: Foreign Policy Substitutability and Complementarity in Status Enhancement Strategies," *FPA* 11,3 (2015): 253-72.

K.P. Vijayalakshmi, "Poliheuristic Theory and Indian Foreign Policy Decision Making: Applicability and Limits," *Global Society* 31,2: 199-219. **OPTIONAL:** Alex Mintz, "The Decision to Attack Iraq: A Noncompensatory Theory of Decision Making," *J. of Conflict Resolution [JCR]* 37,4 (1993): 595-618. A much more abstract discussion (though with a bit more on satisficing itself) is Barry Schwartz, Yakov Ben-Haim, and Cliff Dacso, "What Makes a Good Decision? Robust Satisficing as a Normative Standard of Rational Decision Making," *J. for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 41,2 (2011): 209-27. A problematic summary is Alex Mintz and Karl DeRouen, *Understanding Foreign Policy Decision Making*, New York: Cambridge UP 2010, ch. 2. Other optional (and interesting) supplemental/background pieces here would be David P. Redlawsk and Richard R. Lau, "Behavioral Decision-Making," in *OH*, ch. 5; James F. Voss, "On the Representation of Problems: An Information-Processing Approach to Foreign Policy Decision Making," in Donald A. Sylvan and James F. Voss, eds., *Problem Representation in Foreign Policy Decision Making*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP 1998, ch. 2; Robert P. Abelson and Ariel Levi, "Decision Making and Decision Theory," in Gardner Lindzey and Elliot Aronson, eds., *Handbook of Social Psychology*, 3d edn., New York: Random House 1985, ch. 5; and Kai Oppermann, "Delineating the Scope Conditions of the Poliheuristic Theory of Foreign Policy Decision Making: The Noncompensatory Principle and the Domestic Salience of Foreign Policy," *FPA* 10,1 (2014): 23-41.

Barbara Vis and Dieuwertje Kuijpers, "Prospect Theory and Foreign Policy Decision-making: Underexposed Issues, Advancements, and Ways Forward," *Contemporary Security Policy* 39,4 (2018): 575-89. **OPTIONAL:** Kai He and Huiyun Feng, *Prospect Theory and Foreign Policy Analysis in the Asia Pacific: Rational Leaders and Risky Behavior*, Routledge 2013, chs. 1-2; Rose McDermott, *Risk-Taking in International Politics: Prospect Theory in American Foreign Policy*, Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P 1998, ch. 2; a more recent piece by McDermott sums up a broader literature and poses interesting questions: "Prospect Theory in Political Science: Gains and Losses from the First Decade," *PP* 25,2 (2004): 289-312; Janice Gross Stein, "The Micro-Foundations of International Relations Theory: Psychology and Behavioral Economics," *International Organization [IO]* 71,S1: S249-63; Wendy Trott, "Prospect Theory: Contributions to Understanding Actors, Causes and Consequences of Conflict in Africa," *Stability: International J. of Security and Development* 2,2 (2013): Art. 43; Mark Travers, Leaf Van Boven, and Charles Judd, "The Secrecy Heuristic: Inferring Quality from Secrecy in Foreign Policy Contexts," *PP* 35,1 (2013): 97-111; and Jeffrey D. Berejikian and Bryan R. Early, "Loss Aversion and Foreign Policy Resolve," *PP* 34,5 (2013): 649-71. See also a very nice overview article by one of the two inventors of prospect theory: Daniel Kahneman, "A Perspective on Judgment and Choice: Mapping Bounded Rationality," *American Psychologist* 58,9 (2003): 697-720.

NOTE: A fairly new research program, which does not fit into any of the above categories, is "construal theory." For optional readings, see Ronald R. Krebs and Aaron Rapport, "International Relations and the Psychology of Time Horizons," *International Studies Q. [ISQ]* 56,3 (2012): 530-43; and Aaron Rapport, *Waging War, Planning Peace: U.S. Noncombat Operations and Major Wars*, Cornell UP 2015: introduction AND ch. 4. A further related issue (via the idea of probability) is a now-famous assessment of the success (or, to be exact, the failure) rate of predictions by "experts": Philip E. Tetlock, *Expert Political Judgment: How Good Is It? How Can We Know?* Princeton: Princeton UP 2005, ch. 2.

3. October 1

Reasoning/decisions 2: Analogies and cases; precedents; narratives

Juliet Kaarbo and Daniel Kenealy, "Precedents, Parliaments, and Foreign Policy: Historical Analogy in the House of Commons Vote on Syria," *West European Politics* 40,1 (2017): 62-79. **OPTIONAL:** Yuen Foong Khong, *Analogies at War: Korea, Munich, Dien Bien Phu, and the Vietnam Decisions of 1965*, Princeton: Princeton UP 1992, chs. 1-2, 8-9 (note: this is a classic study, but it's getting a bit frayed at the edges); Yaacov Y.I. Vertzberger, *The World in their Minds: Information Processing, Cognition, and Perception in Foreign Policy Decisionmaking*, Stanford: Stanford UP 1990, ch. 6; Dwain Mefford, "Analogical Reasoning and the Definition of the Situation: Back to Snyder for Concepts and Forward to Artificial Intelligence for Method," in Charles F. Hermann, Charles W. Kegley, Jr., and James N. Rosenau, eds., *New Directions in the Study of Foreign Policy*, New York: HarperCollins Academic 1987, ch. 12; Richard E. Neustadt and Ernest R. May, *Thinking in Time: The Uses of History for Decision-Makers*, New York: Free Press 1988, chs. 3, 5; Sébastien Barthe and Charles-Philippe David, "Kosovo 1999: Clinton, Coercive Diplomacy and the Use of Analogies in Decision Making," *Whitehead J. of Diplomacy and International Relations* 8,2 (2007): 85-101; Darren C. Brunk, "Curing the Somalia Syndrome: Analogy, Foreign Policy Decision Making, and the Rwandan Genocide," *FPA* 4,3 (2008): 301-20; Asaf Siniver and Jeffrey Collins, "Airpower and Quagmire: Historical Analogies and the Second Lebanon War," *FPA* 11,2 (2015): 215-31; and Charles-Philippe David and Karine Prémont, "Bad Analogical Reasoning and Post-War Operations in Iraq After 2003," WPSA paper 2015. A related, but now slightly out of date (for FPA; not in other fields) research program is represented by "case-based reasoning": see Dwain Mefford, "Case-Based Reasoning, Legal Reasoning, and the Study of Politics," *Political Behavior* 12, 2 (1990): 125-58; see also James P. Bennett, "Data Stories: Learning about Learning from the U.S. Experience in Vietnam," in Donald A. Sylvan and Steve Chan, eds., *Foreign Policy Decision Making: Perception, Cognition, and Artificial Intelligence*, New York: Praeger 1984, ch. 9. An optional classic (though technical) is Itzhak Gilboa and David Schmeidler, *A Theory of Case-Based Decisions*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP 2001. An interesting technical piece is Bettina von Helversen and Jorg Rieskamp, "Models of Quantitative Estimations: Rule-Based and Exemplar-Based Processes Compared," *J. of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 35,4 (2009): 867-89. An extension to "motivated stereotypical images" (also see the references on motivated reasoning for class number 5) is Richard K. Hermann, "Perceptions and Image Theory in International Relations," in Huddy, Sears, and Levy, *OH*.

Philip A. Schrodtt, *Patterns, Rules and Learning: Computational Models of International Behavior*, 2d edn., Vinland, KS: Parus Analytical Systems 2004, ch. 3. **OPTIONAL:** An optional follow-up piece is Philip A. Schrodtt, Valerie M. Hudson, and Christian Cantir, "Personality, Popularity, and Prosperity: Exploring Covariates of Israeli Foreign Policy Behavior (1979-2008) Using Discrete Sequence Pattern Recognition," APSA paper 2009; see also Pascal Vennesson and Amanda Huan, "The General's Intuition: Overconfidence, Pattern Matching, and the Inchon Landing Decision," *Armed Forces and Society* 44,3 (2018): 498-520.

Jelena Sobotić, "Narrative, Ontological Security, and Foreign Policy Change," *FPA* 12,4 (2016): 610-27. **OPTIONAL:** Cheng-Yun Chang, "Were Those Decisions Righteously Made? The Chinese Tradition of Righteous War and China's Decisions for War, 1950-1979," *FPA* 13,2 (2017): 398-415; Kai Oppermann and Alexander Spencer, "Telling Stories of Failure: Narrative Constructions of Foreign Policy Fiascos," *J. of European Public Policy* 23,5 (2016): 685-701; Michael D. Jones and Mark K. McBeth, "A Narrative Policy Framework: Clear Enough to be Wrong?" *Policy Studies J.* 38,2 (2010): 329-53. This piece is general and not about foreign policy per se; it is useful to couple it with the Iran hostage piece by Scott (even though that itself is not on the making of foreign policy): Catherine V. Scott, "Bound for Glory: The Hostage Crisis as Captivity Narrative in Iran," *ISQ* 44,1 (2000): 177-88; and with the little snippet of Kennedy trying to figure out what Khrushchev was doing in Cuba: William Taubman, *Khrushchev: The Man and His Era*, Norton 2003: pp. 529-32. Do we use implicit narratives? Consider János László, Réka Ferenczhalmi, and Katalin Szalai, "Role of Agency in Social Representations of History," *Societal and Political Psychology International R.* 1,1 (2010): 31-43. A recent literature on "strategic narratives" (e.g., Alister Miskimmon, Ben O'Laughlin, and Laura Roselle, eds., *Forging the World: Strategic Narratives and International Relations*, Ann Arbor: UMichigan P 2017) appears to be applicable to FPA but in fact glosses over most of the actual mechanisms by which policies are formulated (or even by which narratives are put together in the first place) and is in the end yet another attempt to dress policy journalism in theoretical clothing.

NOTE: a now badly out-of-date but still elegant (and of course optional) piece is Hayward R. Alker, Jr., James Bennett, and Dwain Mefford, "Generalized Precedent Logics for Resolving Insecurity Dilemmas," *International Interactions [II]* 7,2 (1980): 165-206. Optional piece on the issue of learning: Guy Ziv, "Simple vs. Complex Learning Revisited: Israeli Prime Ministers and the Question of a Palestinian State," *FPA* 9,2 (2013): 203-22.

4. October 8

Reasoning/decisions 3: Crises; emotions; physiology

Ole R. Holsti, "Crisis Decision Making", in Philip E. Tetlock et al., eds., *Behavior, Society, and Nuclear War*, vol. 1, New York: Oxford UP 1989, ch. 1. **OPTIONAL:** Note that the Holsti piece is quite old; I am assigning it because of its synoptic, rather than its comprehensive, nature; for a much more up-to-date piece with interesting discussions of the latest literature, see Elizabeth A. Stanley, "War Duration and the Micro-Dynamics of Decision Making Under Stress," *Polity* 50,2 (2018): 178-200; see also Uri Bar-Joseph and Rose McDermott, "Personal Functioning Under Stress: Accountability and Social Support of Israeli Leaders in the Yom Kippur War," *JCR* 52,1 (2008): 144-70; Dominic D.P. Johnson, *Overconfidence and War: The Havoc and Glory of Positive Illusions*, Cambridge MA: Harvard UP 2004, ch. 1 and Appendix; and Eric K. Stern, *Crisis Decisionmaking: A Cognitive Institutional Approach*, Stockholm: Swedish National Defence College 2003, chs. 1-2. See also Janice Gross Stein, "Threat Perception in International Relations," and Stephen Benedict Dyson and Paul 't Hart, "Crisis Management," both in Huddy, Sears, and Levy, *OH*. An interesting question is how much the issue of stress can be separated from the short-term features of crises; in this regard, see Roni Porat, Eran Halperin, and Daniel Bar-Tal, "The Effect of Sociopsychological Barriers on the Processing of New Information About Peace Opportunities," *JCR* 59,1 (2015): 93-119; and also Eran Halperin and Ruthie Pliskin, "Emotions and Emotion Regulation in Intractable Conflict: Studying Emotional Processes Within a Unique Context," *Advances in Political Psychology [APP]* 36,S1 (2015): 119-50.

Jonathan Renshon, Julia J. Lee, and Dustin Tingley, "Emotions and the Micro-Foundations of Commitment Problems," *IO* 71,S1 (2017): S189-218. **OPTIONAL:** Lucile Eznack, "Crises as Signals of Strength: The Significance of Affect in Close Allies' Relationships," *Security Studies [SS]* 20,2 (2011): 238-65. Eznack has a lengthier and more developed analysis in her monograph *Crises in the Atlantic Alliance: Affect and Relations Among NATO Members*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan 2012; also see Peter K. Hatemi et al., "Fear as a Disposition and an Emotional State: A Genetic and

Environmental Approach to Out-Group Political Preferences," *American J. of Political Science [AJPS]* 57,2 (2013): 279-93; Todd Hall and Keren Yarhi-Milo, "The Personal Touch: Leaders' Impressions, Costly Signaling, and Assessments of Sincerity in International Affairs," *ISQ* 56,3 (2012): 560-73; Rose McDermott, "Emotions and War: An Evolutionary Model of Motivation," in Manus I. Midlarsky, ed., *Handbook of War Studies III: The Intrastate Dimension*, Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P 2009, 30-59; Roger Giner-Sorolla, "Affect in Attitude: Immediate and Deliberative Perspectives," in Shelly Chaiken and Yaacov Trope, eds., *Dual-Process Theories in Social Psychology*, New York: Guilford P 1999, ch. 22; Oded Löwenheim and Gadi Heimann, "Revenge in International Politics," *SS* 17,4 (2008): 685-724; Ted Brader and George E. Marcus, "Emotion and Political Psychology," in Huddy, Sears, and Levy, *OH*; Regina Heller, "More Rigor to Emotions! A Comparative, Qualitative Content Analysis of Anger in Russian Foreign Policy," in Maéva Cément and Eric Sangar, eds., *Researching Emotions in International Relations: Methodological Perspectives on the Emotional Turn*, Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan 2018: 75-99; and Douglas Becker, "The Rationality and Emotion of Russian Historical Memory: The Case of Crimea," in Erica Resende, Dovilė Budrytė, and Didem Buhari-Gulmez, eds., *Crisis and Change in Post-Cold War Global Politics: Ukraine in a Comparative Perspective*, Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan 2018: 43-68.

Rose McDermott, "The Biological Bases for Aggressiveness and Nonaggressiveness in Presidents," *FPA* 10,4 (2014): 313-27. **OPTIONAL**: David Owen, "The Effect of Prime Minister Anthony Eden's Illness on his Decision-Making During the Suez Crisis," *Quarterly Journal of Medicine* 98,6 (2005): 387-402; Rose McDermott, *Presidential Leadership, Illness, and Decision Making*, New York: Cambridge UP 2007, ch. 1; Thomas Omestad, "Psychology and the CIA: Leaders on the Couch," *Foreign Policy [FP]* 95 (1994): 104-22; David Owen and Jonathan Davidson, "Hubris Syndrome: An Acquired Personality Disorder? A Study of US Presidents and UK Prime Ministers Over the Last 100 Years," *Brain* 132,5 (2009): 1396-1406. More generally: Charles S. Taber and Everett Young, John T. Jost et al., "Political Neuroscience: The Beginning of a Beautiful Friendship," *APP* 35,S1 (2014): 3-42; "Political Information Processing," in Huddy, Sears, and Levy, *OH*; and also Rose McDermott and Peter K. Hatemi, "The Relationship Between Physical Aggression, Foreign Policy, and Moral Choices: Phenotypic and Genetic Findings," *Aggressive Behavior* 43,1 (2017): 37-46. See also the recently published book: Norman Ohler, *Blitzed: Drugs in Nazi Germany*, trans. S. Whiteside, London: Allen Lane 2016; and Richard a. Lertzman and William J. Birnes, *Dr. Feelgood: The Story of the Doctor Who Influenced History by Treating and Drugging Prominent Figures Including President Kennedy, Marilyn Monroe, and Elvis Presley*, New York: Skyhorse Publishing 2013.

5. October 15

Backgrounds 1: Personality and upbringing; beliefs and operational code; motivated reasoning

Esra Cuhadar et al., "Personality or Role? Comparisons of Turkish Leaders Across Different Institutional Positions," *PP* 38,1 (2017): 39-54 (note that this piece argues against role theories, so you can use it as a critical crib on the latter). **OPTIONAL**: Harald Schoen, "Personality Traits and Foreign Policy Attitudes in German Public Opinion," *JCR* 51,3 (2007): 408-30. Modern work on personality and foreign policy starts with Lloyd S. Etheredge, "Personality Effects on American Foreign Policy, 1896-1968: A Test of Interpersonal Generalization Theory," *APSR*. 72,2 (1978): 434-51; and a follow-up by Graham H. Shepard, "Personality Effects on American Foreign Policy, 1969-84: A Second Test of Interpersonal Generalization Theory," *ISQ* 32,1 (1988): 91-123; see also Margaret G. Hermann, "Explaining Foreign Policy Behavior Using the Personal Characteristics of Political Leaders," *ISQ* 24,1 (1980): 7-46; Shira Tibon, "Personality Traits and Peace Negotiations: Integrative Complexity and Attitudes Toward the Middle East Peace Process," *Group Decision and Negotiation* 9,1 (2000): 1-15; Yael S. Aronoff, *The Political Psychology of Israeli Prime Ministers: When Hard-Liners Opt for Peace*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP 2014, ch. 1; A. Burcu Bayram, "Due Deference: Cosmopolitan Social Identity and the Psychology of Legal Obligation in International

Politics," *IO* 71,S1 (2017): S137-S163 (a piece which arrives at a similar conclusion, albeit in a different way, is Paul Goren et al., "A Unified Theory of Value-Based Reasoning and U.S. Public Opinion," *Political Behavior* 38,4 [2016]: 977-997); and Herbert H. Blumberg et al., "Personality Dimensions and Attitudes Towards Peace and War," *J. of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research* 9,1 (2017): 13-23. A piece roughly analogous to Schoen's is Stephen Benedict Dyson, "Personality and Foreign Policy: Tony Blair's Iraq Decisions," *FPA* 2,3 (2006): 289-306; and a (much earlier) application to legislators is Philip E. Tetlock, "Personality and Isolationism: Content Analysis of Senatorial Speeches," *J. of Personality and Social Psychology* 41,4 (1981): 737-43. Much more recent but not as pointed as Etheredge: David G. Winter, "Personality and Political Behavior," in David O. Sears, Leonie Huddy, and Robert Jervis, eds., *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*, New York: Oxford UP 2003 [note: this is the first edn.], ch. 4; and his reworking: idem, "Personality Profiles of Political Elites," in *OH*; see also Gian Vittorio Caprara and Michele Vecchione, "Personality Approaches to Political Behavior," in *OH*; Peter Suedfeld, Karen Gutteri, and Philip E. Tetlock, "Assessing Integrative Complexity at a Distance: Archival Analyses of Thinking and Decision Making," in Jerrold M. Post, ed., *The Psychological Assessment of Political Leaders: With Profiles of Saddam Hussein and Bill Clinton*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press 2003, ch. 10; and Alexander L. George and Juliette L. George, *Presidential Personality and Performance*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press 1998, ch. 5. A good roundup is Jerrold M. Post, "Psychobiography: 'the Child is Father of the man,'" in *OH*. An interesting (optional) spinoff is the idea of (modal) personality traits attributed to persons from other countries: Véronique Eicher, Felicia Pratto, and Peter Wilhelm, "Value Differentiation Between Enemies and Allies: Value Projection in National Images," *PP* 34,1 (2013): 127-44; and Icek Ajzen, "Attitudes and Persuasion," in Kay Deaux and Mark Snyder, eds., *Oxford Handbook of Personality and Social Psychology*, OUP 2012. For a bit of background on current thinking about personality types and their relationship to politics the "Big-Five" approach (Lewis Goldberg, "An Alternative 'Description of Personality': The Big-Five Factor Structure," *J. of Personality and Social Psychology* [JPS] 59,6 [1990]: 1216-1229), see Alan S. Gerber et al., "The Big Five Personality Traits in the Political Arena," *Annual Review of Pol Sci* [ARPS] 14 (2011): 265-87; and Philip G. Chen and Carl L. Palmer, "The Prejudiced Personality? Using the Big Five to Predict Susceptibility to Stereotyping Behavior," *American Politics Research* (2017) first online publication <https://doi.org/10.1177/1532673X17719720>.

Huiyun Feng and Kai He, "Decoding China's Political Future and Foreign Policy: An Operational Code Analysis of Hu's and Wen's Belief Systems," in Nikolaos Tzifakis, ed., *International Politics in Times of Change*, Athens: Konstantinos Karamanlis Institute for Democracy; Berlin: Springer, 2012, pp. 135-52. **OPTIONAL:** Jonathan Renshon, "Stability and Change in Belief Systems: The Operational Code of George W. Bush," *JCR* 52,6 (2008): 820-49; Stephanie Dornschneider and Nick Henderson, "A Computational Model of Cognitive Maps: Analyzing Violent and Nonviolent Activity in Egypt and Germany," *JCR* 60,2 (2016): 368-99 (for a less compressed analysis, see Dornschneider's monograph: *Whether to Kill: The Cognitive Maps of Violent and Nonviolent Individuals*, Philadelphia: U Pennsylvania P 2016); Su-Mi Lee, "Understanding the Yalta Axioms and Riga Axioms through the Belief Systems of the Advocacy Coalition Framework," *FPA* 11,3 (2015): 295-315; and, more abstractly, Mark Schafer and Stephen G. Walker, "Operational Code Analysis at a Distance: The Verbs in Context System of Content Analysis," in idem, eds., *Beliefs and Leadership in World Politics: Methods and Applications of Operational Code Analysis*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan 2006, ch. 2; and Stephen G. Walker and Mark Schafer, "The Political Universe of Lyndon B. Johnson and His Advisors: Diagnostic and Strategic Propensities in their Operational Codes," *PP* 21,3 (2000): 529-43. The canonical piece is Robert Axelrod, "The Analysis of Cognitive Maps," in Robert Axelrod, ed., *Structure of Decision: The Cognitive Maps of Political Elites*, Princeton: Princeton UP 1976, ch. 3; for a fascinating application, Charles S. Taber, "POLI: An Expert System Model of U.S. Foreign Policy Belief Systems," *APSR* 86,4 (1992): 888-904; and also see K.P. O'Reilly, "Leaders' Perceptions and Nuclear Proliferation: A Political Psychology Approach to Proliferation," *PP* 33,6 (2012): 767-89; Kai Oppermann and Alexander Spencer, "Thinking Alike? Salience and Metaphor Analysis as Cognitive Approaches to Foreign Policy Analysis," *FPA* 9,1 (2013): 39-56; and Nicolas Van der Linden et al.,

"Are Attitudes Toward Peace and War the Two Sides of the Same Coin? Evidence to the Contrary From a French Validation of the Attitudes Toward Peace and War Scale, *PLoS ONE* 12,9 (2017): e0184001. A related literature has to do with a range of phenomena grouped under the headings of "ideas" and "ideology": Mark Laffey and Jutta Weldes, "Beyond Belief: Ideas and Symbolic Technologies in the Study of International Relations," *European J. of International Relations [EJIR]* 3,2 (1997): 193-237; Peter Katzenstein, "Coping with Terrorism: Norms and Internal Security in Germany and Japan," in Judith Goldstein and Robert O. Keohane, eds., *Ideas and Foreign Policy: Beliefs, Institutions, and Political Change*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP 1993, ch. 10; Mark L. Haas, *The Ideological Origins of Great Power Politics, 1789-1989*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP 2005, ch. 1; Bruce Cumings, *The Origins of the Korean War, vol. 2: The Roaring of the Cataract 1947-1950*, Princeton: Princeton UP 1990, ch. 1; Michael H. Hunt, *Ideology and U.S. Foreign Policy*, New Haven: Yale UP 1988, ch. 5; and (somewhat more distant) R. Charli Carpenter, "Studying Issue (Non)-Adoption in Transnational Advocacy Networks," *IO* 61,3 (2007): 643-67. How important individual beliefs are, as compared with general values, is explored in Brian C. Rathbun et al., "Taking Foreign Policy Personally: Personal Values and Foreign Policy Attitudes," *ISQ* 60,1 (2016): 124-137.

Hulda Thórisdóttir and John T. Jost, "Motivated Closed-Mindedness Mediates the Effect of Threat on Political Conservatism," *PP* 32,5 (2011): 785-811. **OPTIONAL:** Jost has written extensively on these matters and his papers over the last 6 years or so are worth browsing (note in particular the piece with David M. Amodio, "Political Ideology as Motivated Social Cognition: Behavioral and Neuroscientific Evidence," *Motivation and Emotion* 36,1 [2012]: 55-64); see also the review chapter by Charles S. Taber and Everett Young, "Political Information Processing," in *OH*, as well as the chapter by Stanley Feldman ("Political Ideology"), also in *OH*; and see, more recently, his presidential address to the International Society of Political Psychology: "Ideological Asymmetries and the Essence of Political Psychology," *PP* 38,2 (2017): 167-208. Given the elections and referenda of the last few years, the political applicability of the research program is of obvious interest (though the identification of emotion is a bit more complicated than one might assume). For a bit more of theoretical perspective, see the short round-up piece is Patrick W. Kraft, Milton Lodge, and Charles S. Taber, "Why People 'Don't Trust the Evidence': Motivated Reasoning and Scientific Beliefs," *Annals* 658 (March 2015): 121-33; and a look back at the original piece by Milton Lodge and Charles S. Taber, "The Automaticity of Affect for Political Leaders, Groups, and Issues: An Experimental Test of the Hot Cognition Hypothesis," *PP* 26,3 (2005): 455-82 is definitely worthwhile. Direct applications to FPA are scarcer, though now see Richard K. Herrmann, "How Attachments to the Nation Shape Beliefs About the World: A Theory of Motivated Reasoning," *IO* 71,S2017: S61-S84. Note that what is lurking in the background is one of the most famous hypotheses in the history of political psychology, the "authoritarian personality": e.g., Stanley Feldman and Karen Stenner, "Perceived Threat and Authoritarianism," *PP* 18,4 (1997): 741-70; John Levi Martin, "The Authoritarian Personality, 50 Years later: What Lessons are There for Political Psychology?" *PP* 22,1 (2001): 1-26; though also Michael A. Milburn, Miho Niwa, and Marcus Patterson, "Authoritarianism, Anger, and Hostile Attribution Bias: A Test of Affect Displacement," *PP* 35,2 (2014): 225-43.

6. October 22

Backgrounds 2: Culture and identity; gender, race, and ethnicity; violence

Jordan Becker and Edmund Malesky, "The Continent or the 'Grand Large'? Strategic Culture and Operational Burden-Sharing in NATO," *ISQ* 61,1 (2017): 163-80. **OPTIONAL:** Alastair Iain Johnston, "Thinking About Strategic Culture," *IS* 19,4 (1995): 32-64; and Fredrik Doerer, "Strategic Culture, Domestic Politics, and Foreign Policy: Finland's Decision to Refrain from Operation Unified Protector," *FPA* 13,3 (2017): 741-59. More generally: Valerie M. Hudson, ed., *Culture and Foreign Policy*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner 1997, ch. 1 (Valerie M. Hudson, "Culture and Foreign Policy: Developing a Research Agenda") and ch. 5 (Marijke Breuning, "Culture, History, Role: Belgian and Dutch Axioms and Foreign Assistance Policy"); Shibley Telhami and Michael Barnett, eds., *Identity and Foreign*

Policy in the Middle East, Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP 2002, ch. 3 (Michael Barnett, "The Israeli Identity and the Peace Process: Re/creating the Un/thinkable") and ch. 8 (Stephen Saideman, "Thinking Theoretically about Identity and Foreign Policy"); Jonathan Rynhold, "Cultural Shift and Foreign Policy Change: Israel and the Making of the Oslo Accords," *Cooperation and Conflict* [CC] 42,4 (2007): 419-40; Dirk Nabers, "Filling the Void of Meaning: Identity Construction in U.S. Foreign Policy After September 11, 2001," *FPA* 5,2 (2009): 191-214; and Serdar S. Güner, "Religion and Preferences: A Decision-Theoretic Explanation of Turkey's New Foreign Policy," *FPA* 8,3 (2012): 217-3. The role theory literature criticized by Cuhadar et al. (Backgrounds 1) is used by Cameron G. Thies, "Role Theory and Foreign Policy Analysis in Latin America," *FPA* 13,4 (2017): 662-81.

Jennifer Milliken and David Sylvan, "Soft Bodies, Hard Targets, and Chic Theories: U.S. Bombing Policy in Indochina," *Millennium* 25,2 (1996): 321-59. **OPTIONAL:** Laura J. Shepherd, *Gender, Violence and Security*, London: Zed Books 2008, ch. 6; Elgin M. Brunner, "Consoling Display of Strength of Emotional Overstrain? The Gendered Framing of the Early 'War on Terrorism' in Transatlantic Comparison," *Global Society* 22,2 (2008): 217-51; Mary Caprioli and Mark A. Boyer, "Gender, Violence, and International Crisis," *JCR* 45,4 (2001): 503-18; Robert D. Dean, *Imperial Brotherhood: Gender and the Making of Cold War Foreign Policy*, Amherst: U of Massachusetts P 2001: ch. 7; Frank Costigliola, "'Unceasing Pressure for Penetration': Gender, Pathology, and Emotion in George Kennan's Formation of the Cold War," *J. of American History* 83,4 (1997): 1309-39; Pamela Johnston Conover and Virginia Shapiro, "Gender, Feminist Consciousness, and War," *AJPS* 37,4 (1993): 1079-99; Carol Cohn, "Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals," *Signs* 12,4 (1987): 687-718; Joshua Foust, "What It's Like to Be Gay in the Ultra-Masculine NatSec Community," <http://foreignpolicy.com/2015/09/30/what-its-like-to-be-gay-in-the-ultra-masculine-natsec-community/>; and, somewhat indirectly, Mary-Kate Lizotte, "Gender Differences in Support for Torture," *JCR* 61,4 (2017): 772-87; Elin Bjarnegård and Erik Melander, "Pacific Men: How the Feminist Gap Explains Hostility," *Pacific R* 30,4 (2017): 478-93; Annica Kronsell, "Sexed Bodies and Military Masculinities: Gender Path Dependence in EU's Common Security and Defense Policy," *Men and Masculinities* 19,3 (2016): 311-36; see also, again indirectly, Joshua S. Goldstein, *War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa*, Cambridge: CUP2001, chs. 3-6; and the literature rereading by Laura Sjoberg, *Gendering Global Conflict: Toward a Feminist Theory of War*, New York: Columbia UP 2013, ch. 3. On race: Roxanne Lynn Doty, "Foreign Policy as Social Construction: A Post-Positivist Analysis of U.S. Counterinsurgency Policy in the Philippines," *ISQ* 37,3 (1993): 297-320; Audie Klotz, "Norms Reconstituting Interests: Global Racial Equality and U.S. Sanctions Against South Africa," *IO* 49,3 (1995): 451-78; David R. Davis and Will H. Moore, "Ethnicity Matters: Transnational Ethnic Alliances and Foreign Policy Behavior," *ISQ* 41,1 (1997): 171-84; Michael L. Krenn, ed., *The Impact of Race on U.S. Foreign Policy: A Reader*, New York: Garland 1999, chs. by Thomas F. Gossett ("Imperialism and the Anglo-Saxon": pp. 90-122), Paul Gordon Lauren ("Human Rights in History: Diplomacy and Racial Equality at the Paris Peace Conference": pp. 163-84), John W. Dower ("Yellow, Red, and Black Men": pp. 185-226), Michael L. Krenn ("Unfinished Business": Segregation and U.S. Diplomacy at the 1958 World's Fair": pp. 265-86), and Steven Metz ("Congress, the Antiapartheid Movement, and Nixon": pp. 287-307); Gerald Horne, "Race from Power: U.S. Foreign Policy and the General Crisis of 'White Supremacy,'" *Diplomatic History* [DH] 23,3 (1999): 437-61; Cary Fraser, "Crossing the Color Line in Little Rock: The Eisenhower Administration and the Dilemma of Race for U.S. Foreign Policy," *DH* 24,2 (2000): 233-64; Mary L. Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy*, Princeton: Princeton UP 2000: ch. 5; Stephen M. Saideman, *The Ties That Divide: Ethnic Politics, Foreign Policy, and International Conflict*, New York: Columbia UP 2001: chs. 2, 3, 6; Thomas Borstelmann, *The Cold War and the Color Line: American Race Relations in the Global Arena*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP 2001: ch. 6; Katharyne Mitchell, "Education, Race and Empire: A Genealogy of Humanitarian Governance in the United States," *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 42,3 (2017): 349-62; and Juan Cole, "Islamophobia and American Foreign Policy Rhetoric: The Bush Years and After," in John L. Esposito and Ibrahim Kalin, eds., *Islamophobia: The Challenge of Pluralism in the 21st Century*, New York: Oxford UP 2011, ch. 8. One of the rare pieces to attempt to combine gender- and race-marking regarding foreign policy is Maria Stern, "Gender and Race in the

European Security Strategy: Europe as a 'Force for Good'?" *J of International Relations and Development* 14,1 (2011): 28-59.

Lloyd Etheredge, "Hardball Politics: A Model," *PP* 1,1 (1979): 3-26. **OPTIONAL:** Rachel M. Stein, "War and Revenge: Explaining Conflict Initiation by Democracies," *APSR* 109,3 (2015): 556-73; Dennis M. Foster and Jonathan W. Keller, "Leaders' Cognitive Complexity, Distrust, and the Diversionary Use of Force," *FPA* 10,3 (2014): 205-23; Eldon Kenworthy, *America/Américas: Myth in the Making of U.S. Policy Toward Latin America*, University Park: Pennsylvania State UP 1999, ch. 4; Todd S. Sechser, "Are Soldiers Less War-Prone than Statesmen?" *JCR* 48,5 (2004): 746-74. Most recently, see Rose McDermott and Peter K. Hatemi, "The Relationship Between Physical Aggression, Foreign Policy, and Moral Choices: Phenotypic and Genetic Findings," *Aggressive Behavior* 43,1 (2017): 37-46; and Richard J. Harnish, K. Robert Bridges, and Joshua T. Gump, "Predicting Economic, Social, and Foreign Policy Conservatism: The Role of Right-Wing Authoritarianism, Social Dominance Orientation, Moral Foundations Orientation, and Religious Fundamentalism," *Current Psychology* (2017), online publication before print. You might also want to browse through (the book consists of hundreds of snippets, running between a paragraph and a page) Nicholson Baker, *Human Smoke: The Beginnings of World War II, the End of Civilization*, New York: Simon and Schuster 2008; and then to revisit the "authoritarian personality" concept I introduced last week.

7. October 29

Backgrounds 3: Public opinion; regime type; mass and elite media

Michael Tomz, Jessica Weeks, and Keren Yarhi-Milo, "Public Opinion and Decisions About Military Force in Democracies," typescript 2018. **OPTIONAL:** Joshua D. Kertzer and Thomas Zeitzoff, "A Bottom-Up Theory of Public Opinion About Foreign Policy," *AJPS* 61,3 (2017): 543-58; Christopher Gelpi, "Democracies in Conflict: The Role of Public Opinion, Political Parties, and the Press in Shaping Security Policy," *JCR* 61,9 (2017): 1925-49; Robert Y. Shapiro and Lawrence R. Jacobs, "Who Leads and Who Follows? U.S. Presidents, Public Opinion, and Foreign Policy," in Brigitte L. Nacos, Robert Y. Shapiro, and Pierangelo Isernia, eds., *Decisionmaking in a Glass House: Mass Media, Public Opinion, and American and European Foreign Policy in the 21st Century*, Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield 2000, ch. 14; William Zimmerman, *The Russian People and Foreign Policy: Russian Elite and Mass Perspectives, 1993-2000*, Princeton: Princeton UP 2002, chs. 1, 6; David M. Paul and Rachel Anderson Paul, *Ethnic Lobbies and U.S. Foreign Policy*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner 2008, ch. 2; T. Knecht and M.S. Weatherford, "Public Opinion and Foreign Policy: The Stages of Presidential Decision Making," *ISQ* 50,3 (2006): 805-27; Leonie Huddy et al., "Threat, Anxiety, and Support of Antiterrorism Policies," *AJPS* 49,3 (2005): 593-608; Benjamin I. Page and Robert Y. Shapiro, *The Rational Public: Fifty Years of Trends in Americans' Policy Preferences*, Chicago: U of Chicago P 1992, chs. 1-2, 6, 10; Jeffrey W. Knopf, *Domestic Society and International Cooperation: The Impact of Protest on U.S. Arms Control Policy*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP 1998, chs. 3, 7; John E. Mueller, *War, Presidents and Public Opinion*, New York: John Wiley & Sons 1973, chs. 3-6; and Matthew A. Baum, "The Iraq Coalition of the Willing and (Politically) Able: Party Systems, the Press, and Public Influence on Foreign Policy," *AJPS* 57,2 (2013): 442-58. An extension on public opinion is Thomas C. O'Brien, Bernard Leidner, and Linda R. Tropp, "Are They For Us or Against Us? How Intergroup Metaperceptions Shape Foreign Policy Attitudes," *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations* (2017), online publication before print; and Carola Lustig and Tomás Olego, "Public Opinion and Framing Effects of Argentine Foreign Policy Toward Brazil: Evidence from a Survey Experiment in Urban Centers in Argentina," *Contexto Internacional* 38,1 (2016): 241-75. See also Timothy B. Gravelle et al., "The Structure of Foreign Policy Attitudes in Transatlantic Perspective: Comparing the United States, United Kingdom, France and Germany," *EJPR* 56,4 (2017): 757-76; and, on the coherence of attitudes and the problematic issue of survey design, Katja B. Kleinberg and Benjamin O. Fordham, "Don't Know Much About Foreign Policy: Assessing the Impact of 'Don't Know' and 'No Opinion' Responses on Inferences About Foreign Policy Attitudes," *FPA* forthcoming, pre-

publication online 2017. The unfortunately (because the key concept mostly scants the relational and embedded nature of the phenomenon) named literature on "roles" in foreign policy does contain two very nice papers on what in this course we're calling the issue of permeability: see Christian Cantir and Juliet Kaarbo, "Unpacking Ego in Role Theory: Vertical and Horizontal Role Contestation and Foreign Policy," Kaarbo and Cantir, "Agents in Structures: Insights From Cases of Internal Role Contestation," chs. 1 and 11 in Cantir and Kaarbo, eds., *Domestic Role Contestation, Foreign Policy, and International Relations*, New York and London: Routledge 2016, and, most recently, Kaarbo, "Prime Minister Leadership Style and the Role of Parliament in Security Policy," *British J of Politics and International Relations* 20,1 (2018): 35-51. Note that the above literatures are focused on the potential effects of public opinion on foreign policy making (including the substance of foreign policies adopted or implemented); they are not concerned with the apparently related question of the influence of events, or policies, on public opinion itself. As you might imagine, the advent of Trump has given a major impetus to this and you only have to do a cursory search on Google Scholar to find a large and growing literature on that question. I would single out the "mood" sub-literature as among the more interesting strand in that regard.

Benjamin O. Fordham, "Domestic Politics, International Pressure, and the Allocation of American Cold War Military Spending," *JOP* 64,1 (2002): 63-88. **OPTIONAL:** Felicia Pratto et al., "When Domestic Politics and International Relations Intermesh: Subordinated Publics' Factional Support Within Layered Power Structures," *FPA* 10,2 (2014): 127-48; Valerie M. Hudson, Susan M. Sims, and John C. Thomas, "The Domestic Political Context of Foreign Policy-Making: Explicating a Theoretical Construct," in David Skidmore and Valerie M. Hudson, eds., *The Limits of State Autonomy: Societal Groups and Foreign Policy Formulation*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press 1993, ch. 3; Peter Trubowitz, *Defining the National Interest: Conflict and Change in American Foreign Policy*, Chicago: U of Chicago P 1998, ch. 1; Fritz Fischer, *War of Illusions: German Policies from 1911 to 1914*, trans. Marian Jackson, New York: W.W. Norton 1975; Henry A. Kissinger, "Domestic Structure and Foreign Policy," *Daedalus* 95,2 (1966): 503-29; E.E. Schattschneider, *Politics, Pressures and the Tariff: A Study of Free Private Enterprise in Pressure Politics, as Shown in the 1929-1930 Revision of the Tariff*, New York: Prentice-Hall 1935, ch. 3; Douglas Brommesson and Ann-Marie Ekengren, "What Happens When a New Government Enters Office? A Comparison of Ideological Change in British and Swedish Foreign Policy 1991-2011," *CC* 48,1 (2012): 3-27; Elena V. McLean and Taehee Whang, "Designing Foreign Policy: Voters, Special Interest Groups, and Economic Sanctions," *JPR* 51,5 (2014): 589-602; Alan Tidwell, "The Role of 'Diplomatic Lobbying' in Shaping US Foreign Policy and Its Effects on the Australian-US Relationship," *Australian J of International Affairs* 71,2 (2017): 184-200; Donald E. Abelson and Stephen Brooks, "Struggling to be Heard: The Crowded and Complex World of Foreign-Policy-Oriented Think Tanks," in idem and Xin Hua, eds., *Think Tanks, Foreign Policy and Geo-Politics: Pathways to Influence*, London: Routledge, 2017, ch. 1. The Schurmann book mentioned in class is Franz Schurmann, *The Logic of World Power: An Inquiry into the Origins, Currents, and Contradictions of World Politics*, New York: Pantheon 1974; see also Bruce Cumings, *The Origins of the Korean War, vol. 2: The Roaring of the Cataract 1947-1950*, Princeton UP 1990, ch. 1 and pts. 1, 4; and, more recently, Michaela Mattes, Brett Ashley Leeds, and Royce Carroll, "Leadership Turnover and Foreign Policy Change: Societal Interests, Domestic Institutions, and Voting in the United Nations," *ISQ* 59,2 (2015): 280-90. Note also that the "democratic peace" literature can be assimilated to this topic; see the entry by Joe D. Hagan, "Regime Type, Foreign Policy, and International Relations," in Robert A. Denemark, ed., *The International Studies Encyclopedia*, Blackwell 2010.

Rianne Dekker and Peter Scholten, "Framing the Immigration Policy Agenda: A Qualitative Comparative Analysis of Media Effects on Dutch Immigration Policies," *International J of Press/Politics* 22,2 (2017): 202-22. **OPTIONAL:** Robert M. Entman, "Framing U.S. Coverage of International News: Contrasts in Narratives of the KAL and Iran Air Incidents," *J. of Communication* 41,4 (1991): 6-27 (this is the canonical piece in the field; Chong and Druckman [below] simply abstract from Entman's arguments. See also Kyla Jo McEntire, Michele Leiby, and Matthew Krain, "Human Rights Organizations as Agents of Change: An Experimental Examination of Framing and Micromobilization,"

APSR 109,3 (2015): 407-26; Isaac Speer, "Reframing the Iraq War: Official Sources, Dramatic Events, and Changes in Media Framing," *J of Communication* 67,2 (2017): 282-302; Dennis Chong and James N. Druckman, "Framing Theory," *ARPS* 10 (2007): 103-26; Tim Groeling and Matthew A. Baum, "Journalists' Incentives and Media Coverage of Elite Foreign Policy Evaluations," *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 26,5 (2009): 437-70; Tim Groeling and Matthew A. Baum, "Crossing the Water's Edge: Elite Rhetoric, Media Coverage, and the Rally-Round-the-Flag Phenomenon," *J. of Politics* 70,4 (2008): 1065-85; Matthew A. Baum and Philip B.K. Potter, "The Relationships Between Mass Media, Public Opinion, and Foreign Policy: Toward a Theoretical Synthesis," *ARPS* 11 (2008): 39-65; Matthew A. Baum, *Soft News Goes to War: Public Opinion and American Foreign Policy in the New Media Age*, Princeton: Princeton UP 2003, chs. 1-2, 6; Jon Western, *Selling Intervention and War: The Presidency, the Media, and the American Public*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP 2005, chs. 1, 6; Yehudith Auerbach and Yaeli Bloch-Elkon, "Media Framing and Foreign Policy: The Elite Press vis-à-vis US Policy in Bosnia, 1992-95," *J. of Peace Research* 42,1 (2005): 83-99; Amber E. Boydston and Rebecca A. Glazier, "A Two-Tiered Method for Identifying Trends in Media Framing of Policy Issues: The Case of the War on Terror," *Policy Studies J* 41,4 (2013): 706-35. Two interesting recent pieces on the complexity of making one-directional and undifferentiated claims about framing: Maria Hellman and Charlotte Wagnsson, "New Media and the War in Afghanistan: The Significance of Blogging for the Swedish Strategic Narrative," *new media & society* 17,1 (2015): 6-23; and Thomas Zeitzoff, John Kelly, and Gilad Lotan, "Using Social Media to Measure Foreign Policy Dynamics: An Empirical Analysis of the Iranian-Israeli Confrontation (2012-13)," *JPR* 52,3 (2015): 368-83.

NOTE: It is worthwhile browsing around the most recent (2018) Chicago Council on Global Affairs survey of public opinion, *America Engaged: American Public Opinion and US Foreign Policy* (summary and link to full report on https://digital.thechicagocouncil.org/america-engaged?_ga=2.200682222.1346017405.1540126721-230084557.1540126721). Similarly, there is regular reporting of European attitudes on public opinion regarding foreign policy, for example Catarina Thomson, Jason Reifler, and Thomas Scotto, "Perceptions on NATO and Defence Policy," University of Exeter: <https://ore.exeter.ac.uk/repository/bitstream/handle/10871/32003/Perceptions%20on%20NATO%20and%20Defence%20Policy.docx?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

8. November 5

Organizations 1: Cybernetics; routines

Graham Allison and Philip Zelikow, *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*, 2d edn., New York: Longman 1999, chs. 3-4. **OPTIONAL:** Charles E. Lindblom, "The Science of 'Muddling Through,'" *Public Administration R.* 19,2 (1959): 79-88; Richard M. Cyert and James G. March, *A Behavioral Theory of the Firm*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall 1963, ch. 6; John D. Steinbruner, *The Cybernetic Theory of Decision: New Dimensions of Political Analysis*, Princeton: Princeton UP 1974, ch. 3; Herbert A. Simon, *Administrative Behavior*, 4th edn., Free Press 1997, ch. 6 and commentary; Markus C. Becker, "Organizational Routines: A Review of the Literature," *Industrial and Corporate Change* 13,4 (2004): 643-78; Martha S. Feldman et al., "Beyond Routines as Things: Introduction to the Special Issue on Routine Dynamics," *Organization Science* 27,3 (2016): 505-13; Geoffrey Edwards, "Europe and the Falkland Islands Conflict," in Stelios Stavridis and Christopher Hill, eds., *Domestic Sources of Foreign Policy: Western European Reactions to the Falklands Conflict*, Oxford: Berg 1996: ch. 2; David S. McDonough, "Getting It Just Right: Strategic Culture, Cybernetics, and Canada's Goldilocks Grand Strategy," *Comparative Strategy* 32,3 (2013): 224-44; Timothy J. McKeown, "Plans and Routines, Bureaucratic Bargaining, and the Cuban Missile Crisis," *JOP* 63,4 (2001): 1163-90; and, most recently, Jon Strandquist, "Governmental Re-organization in Counterinsurgency Context: Foreign Policy Program Transfer and Operation Switchback in South Vietnam," *Small Wars & Insurgencies* 28,2 (2017): 337-60 (a beautiful article).

David Sylvan and Stephen Majeski, *U.S. Foreign Policy in Perspective: Clients, Enemies and Empire*, London: Routledge 2009, chs. 1, 6. **OPTIONAL:** William I. Bacchus, *Foreign Policy and the Bureaucratic Process: The State Department's Country Director System*, Princeton UP 1974; Walter M. Hudson, *Army Diplomacy: American Military Occupation and Foreign Policy After World War II*, Lexington, KY: UP of Kentucky 2015; James G. March, "How Decisions Happen in Organizations," *Human-Computer Interactions* 6,1 (1991): 95-117; Valerie M. Hudson, Philip A. Schrod, and Ray D. Whitmer, "Discrete Sequence Rule Models as a Social Science Methodology: An Exploratory Analysis of Foreign Policy Rule Enactment within Palestinian-Israeli Event Data," *FPA* 4,2 (2008): 105-26; James G. March and Johan P. Olsen, "The Logic of Appropriateness," in Michael Moran, Martin Rein, and Robert E. Goodin, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy [OHPP]*, Oxford: Oxford UP 2006: 689-708; Giliberto Capano and Andrea Lippi, "How Policy Instruments are Chosen: Patterns of Decision Makers' Choices," *Policy Sciences* 50,2 (2017): 269-93. An interesting, but problematic, set of attempts to explain policy analyses deemed dysfunctional is Amy B. Zegart, *Spying Blind: The CIA, the FBI, and the Origins of 9/11*, Princeton: Princeton UP 2009, ch. 3; Kimberly Marten Zisk, *Engaging the Enemy: Organization Theory and Soviet Military Innovation, 1955-1991*, Princeton: Princeton UP 1993, chs. 1-2; C.F. Larry Heimann, *Acceptable Risks: Politics, Policy, and Risky Technologies*, Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P 1997: chs. 1, 2. It should be noted that Zegart's book on 9/11 is part of a larger series of publications by her on how organizational practices help explain intelligence "failures": for example, *Flawed by Design: The Evolution of the CIA, JCS, and NSC*, Stanford UP 2000; "The Cuban Missile Crisis as Intelligence Failure," *Policy R.* 175 (2012): 23-39; and "Inside Threats and Organizational Root Causes: The 2009 Fort Hood Terrorist Attack," *Parameters* 45,2 (2015).

9. November 12

Organizations 2: Garbage can models; networks

William W. Newmann, "Foreign Policy Decision Making, Garbage Cans, and Policy Shifts: The Eisenhower Administration and the 'Chances for Peace' Speech," *American R. of Public Administration* 28,2 (1998): 187-212. **OPTIONAL:** Nikolaos Zahariadis, "Political Leadership, Multiple Streams and the Emotional Endowment Effect: A Comparison of American and Greek Foreign Policies," in Reimut Zohlnhöfer and Friedbert W. Rüb, eds., *Decision-Making Under Ambiguity and Time Constraints: Assessing the Multiple-Streams Framework*, Colchester, UK: ECPR Press 2016, ch. 9; Jutta Joachim, "Framing Decisions in the United Nations: The Exploitation of the Political Opportunity Structure," in Bob Reinalda and Bertjan Verbeek, eds., *Decision Making Within International Organizations*, London: Routledge 2004, ch. 11; Michael Lipson, "A 'Garbage Can Model' of UN Peacekeeping," *Global Governance* 13,1 (2007): 79-97; James G. March and Roger Weissinger-Baylon, *Ambiguity and Command: Organizational Perspectives on Military Decision Making*, Marshfield, MA: Pitman 1986, ch. 2 (James G. March and Johan P. Olsen, "Garbage Can Models of Decision Making in Organizations") and ch. 3 (Roger Weissinger-Baylon, "Garbage Can Processes in Naval Warfare"); Alessandro Lomi and J. Richard Harrison, eds., *The Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice: Looking Forward at Forty, Research in the Sociology of Organizations* 36 (2012), pp. 33-64 (David R. Gibson, "Turn-Taking and Politics in the Making of Decisions") and pp. 431-58 (Mie Augier and Jerry Guo, "Geopolitics and Garbage Cans: Understanding the Essence of Decision Making in an Interdisciplinary and Psycho-Cultural Perspective"); also see the very perceptive review of the book by John F. Padgett, "Book Review Essay: Recycling Garbage Can Theory," *Administrative Science Q. [ASQ]* 58,3 (2013): 472-82; John W. Kingdon, *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies*, updated 2d edn., Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson 2010, ch. 4; Jonathan Bendor, Terry M. Moe, and Kenneth W. Shotts, "Recycling the Garbage Can: An Assessment of the Research Program," *APSR* 95,1 (2001): 169-190; Johan P. Olsen, "Garbage Cans, New Institutionalism, and the Study of Politics," *APSR* 95,1 (2001): 191-8; John F. Padgett, "Managing Garbage Can Hierarchies," *ASQ* 25,4 (1980): 583-604; Fritz Sager and Yvan Rielle, "Sorting Through the Garbage Can: Under What Conditions Do Governments Adopt

Policy Programs?" *Policy Sciences* 46,1 (2013): 1-21; and B. Guy Peters, "Governance: A Garbage Can Perspective," Institute for Advanced Studies, Vienna, *Political Science Series* 84, December 2002. An interesting and related literature on agenda setting has to do with "multiple streams" approaches: see Nikolaos Zahariadis, "Bounded Rationality and Garbage Can Models of Policy-Making," in B. Guy Peters and Philippe Zittoun, eds., *Contemporary Approaches to Public Policy: Theories, Controversies and Perspectives*, London: Springer Nature for Palgrave Macmillan 2016, ch. 9; Michael Howlett, Allan McConnell, and Anthony Perl, "Moving Policy Theory Forward: Connecting Multiple Stream and Advocacy Coalition Frameworks to Policy Cycle Models of Analysis," *Australian J of Public Administration* 76,1 (2017) [an earlier version is in *EJPR* 54,3 (2015): 419-34]: 65-79; Pragati Rawat and John Charles Morris, "Kingdom's 'Streams' Model at Thirty: Still Relevant in the 21st Century?" *Politics and Policy* 44,4 (2016): 608-38; Robert Ackrill, Adrian Kay, and Nikolaos Zahariadis, "Ambiguity, Multiple Streams, and EU Policy," *J of European Public Policy* 20,6 (2013): 871-87; Charles-Philippe David, "Policy Entrepreneurs and the Reorientation of National Security Policy Under the G.W. Bush Administration (2001-04)," *Politics and Policy* 43,1 (2015): 163-95.

Brian T. Pentland, Jan Recker, and George Wyner, "Conceptualizing and Measuring Interdependence Between Organizational Routines," 37th International Conference on Information Systems (ICIS 2016). **OPTIONAL:** Diederik Vancoppenolle and Filip Derynck, "Social Network Analysis in the Field of Politico-Administrative Role Theory: Exploring New Approaches in Studying Policy-Making Networks at the Egocentric Level," ECPR paper 2010; R.A.W. Rhodes, "Policy Network Analysis," in *OHPP*, pp. 425-47; Daniel Nohrstedt, "Shifting Resources and Venues Producing Policy Change in Contested Subsystems: A Case Study of Swedish Signals Intelligence Policy," *Policy Studies J.* 39,3 (2011): 461-84 [note that this issue of the journal is entirely devoted to "advocacy coalition framework" analysis]; Isabella Alcañiz, "Bureaucratic Networks and Government Spending: A Network Analysis of Nuclear Cooperation in Latin America," *Latin American Research R.* 45,1 (2010): 148-72 [this technically only details with FPA in passing, but the argument is clearly transferable to FPA]; Morten T. Hansen, "The Search-Transfer Problem: The Role of Weak Ties in Sharing Knowledge Across Organization Subunits," *ASQ* 44,1 (1999): 82-111; Brian Uzzi, "The Sources and Consequences of Embeddedness for the Economic Performance of Organizations: The Network Effect," *American Sociological R.* [ASR] 61,4 (1996): 674-98; Omar Lizardo and Melissa Fletcher Pirkey, "How Organizational Theory can Help Network Theorizing: Linking Structure and Dynamics via Cross-level Analogies," *Research in the Sociology of Organizations* 40 (2014): 33-56; John F. Padgett, "Country as Global Market: Netherlands, Calvinism, and the Joint-Stock Company," in idem and Walter W. Powell, *The Emergence of Organizations and Markets*, Princeton: Princeton UP 2012, ch. 7; Diane Stone, "Understanding the Transfer of Policy Failure: Bricolage, Experimentalism and Translation," *Policy and Politics* 45,1 (2017): 55-70.

Daniel Ellsberg, "The Quagmire Myth and the Stalemate Machine," in Daniel Ellsberg, *Papers on the War*, New York: Simon & Schuster 1972, pp. 41-141 (Pocket Books edn). **OPTIONAL:** Joseph T. Mahoney, *Economic Foundations of Strategy*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage 2005, ch. 1; Claire Piana, "The Institutions of the EU's Common Foreign and Security Policy: How Bureaucratic Politics Meets Network Analysis," MS 2001: http://aei.pitt.edu/2157/1/002249_1.PDF.

10. November 19

Organizations 3: Professionalization; state-building

Deborah Bauer, "Planting the Espionage Tree: The French Military and the Professionalization of Intelligence at the End of the Nineteenth Century," *Intelligence and National Security* 31,5 (2016): 659-73. **OPTIONAL:** Stephan Hensell, "Staff and Status in International Bureaucracies: A Weberian Perspective on the EU Civil Service," *Cambridge R of International Affairs [CRIA]* 29,4 (2016): 1486-1501; Jing Sun, "Growing Diplomacy, Retreating Diplomats – How the Chinese Foreign Ministry has Been Marginalized in Foreign Policymaking," *J of Contemporary China [JCC]* 26,105 (2017): 419-33;

Jens Steffek, "Max Weber, Modernity and the Project of International Organization," *CRIA* 29,4 (2016): 1502-19; Malcolm Waters, "Collegiality, Bureaucratization, and Professionalization: A Weberian Analysis," *American J. of Sociology* 94,5 (1989): 945-72; Johan P. Olsen, "Maybe it is Time to Rediscover Bureaucracy," *J. of Public Administration Research and Theory* 16,1 (2006): 1-24; idem, "The Ups and Downs of Bureaucratic Organization," *ARPS* 11 (2008): 13-37; George Ritzer, "Professionalization, Bureaucratization and Rationalization: The Views of Max Weber," *Social Forces* 53,4 (1975): 627-34; Erin Metz McDonnell, "Patchwork Leviathan: How Pockets of Bureaucratic Governance Flourish Within Institutionally Diverse Developing States," *ASR* 82,3 (2017): 476-510.

Fred Kaplan, *The Insurgents: David Petraeus and the Plot to Change the American Way of War*, New York: Simon & Schuster 2013, chs. 1-5; **OPTIONAL:** idem, *The Wizards of Armageddon*, Stanford, CA: Stanford UP 1991, chs. 1-5; Thomas E. Ricks, *The Gamble: General Petraeus and the American Military Adventure in Iraq*, New York: Penguin Press 2009, chs. 1-4; Michael Banks, "Professionalism in the Conduct of Foreign Policy," *International Affairs* 44,4 (1968): 720-34; Kori Schake, "State of Disrepair," *FP*, 11 April 2012: http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/04/11/state_of_disrepair?print=yes&hidecomments=yes&page=full.

Ira Katznelson, *Fear Itself: The New Deal and the Origins of Our Time*, New York: Liveright 2013, chs. 11-12. **OPTIONAL:** Peter A. Gourevitch, "Reinventing the American State: Political Dynamics in the Post-Cold War Era," in Ira Katznelson and Martin Shefter, eds., *Shaped by War and Trade: International Influences on American Political Development*, Princeton: Princeton UP 2002, ch. 11. Alfred W. McCoy, Francisco A. Scarano, and Courtney Johnson, "On the Tropic of Cancer: Transitions and Transformations in the U.S. Imperial State," in Alfred W. McCoy and Francisco A. Scarano, eds., *Colonial Crucible: Empire in the Making of the Modern American State*, Madison, WI: U of Wisconsin P 2009, pp. 3-33; Andrew A. Workman, "Creating the National War Labor Board: Franklin Roosevelt and the Politics of State Building in the Early 1940s," *J. of Policy History* 12,2 (2000): 233-64; David Halloran Lumsdaine, *Moral Vision in International Politics: The Foreign Aid Regime 1949-1989*, Princeton: Princeton UP 1993, chs. 6-8; Stephen Skowronek, *Building a New American State: The Expansion of National Administrative Capacities 1877-1920*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP 1982, ch. 7; Desmond King and Robert C. Lieberman, "Ironies of State Building: A Comparative Perspective on the American State," *WP* 61,3 (2009): 547-88; James F. Brickman, "The Development of the American General Staff: 1800 to 1920," US Army War College 1985; James Fulcher, "The Bureaucratization of the State and the Rise of Japan," *British J of Sociology* 39,2 (1988): 228-54; Pascal Abb, "China's Foreign Policy Think Tanks: Institutional Evolution and Changing Roles," *JCC* 24,93 (2015): 531-53. See also an interesting literature as it developed some decades ago: Donald P. Warwick, "Bureaucratization in the U.S. Department of State," *Sociological Inquiry* 44,2 (1974): 75-91; William G. Roy, "The Process of Bureaucratization in the U.S. State Department and the Vesting of Economic Interests, 1886-1905," *ASQ* 26,3 (1981): 419-33; Fred V. Carstensen and Richard Hume Werking, "The Process of Bureaucratization in the U.S. State Department and the Vesting of Economic Interests: Toward Clearer Thinking and Better History," *ASQ* 28,1 (1983): 56-60.

11. November 26

Groups 1: Leaders; coalitions; advisors

Margaret G. Hermann, "How Decision Units Shape Foreign Policy: A Theoretical Framework," *International Studies R. [ISR]* 3,2 (2001): 47-81. **OPTIONAL:** Thomas Preston, "Following the Leader: The Impact of U.S. Presidential Style upon Advisory Group Dynamics, Structure, and Decision," in Paul 't Hart, Eric K. Stern, and Bengt Sundelius, eds., *Beyond Groupthink: Political Group Dynamics and Foreign Policy-making*, Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P 1997, ch. 7; Charles F. Hermann, "Avoiding Pathologies in Foreign Policy Decision Groups," in Dan Caldwell and Timothy

McKeown, eds., *Force, Diplomacy, and Leadership: Essays in Honor of Alexander George*, Boulder, CO: Westview 1993, ch. 8: <http://voxprof.net/cfh/hermann-pubs/Hermann-Avoiding%20Pathologies%20in%20Foreign%20Policy%20Decision%20Group.pdf>; Juliet Kaarbo, "A Foreign Policy Analysis Perspective on the Domestic Politics Turn in IR Theory," *ISR* 17,2 (2015): 189-216; Raymond T. Sparrowe et al., "Social Networks and the Performance of Individuals and Groups," *Academy of Management J. [AMJ]* 44,2 (2001): 316-25; Sameer B. Srivastava, "Threat, Opportunity, and Network Interaction in Organizations," *Social Psychology Q.* 78,3 (2015): 246-62; Michael A. Hogg, "A Social Identity Theory of Leadership," *Personality and Social Psychology R.* 5,3 (2001): 184-200; Donelson R. Forsyth, "How do Leaders Lead? Through Social Influence," in ch. George R. Goethals et al., *Conceptions of Leadership: Enduring Ideas and Emerging Insights*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan 2014, ch. 11; Elizabeth N. Saunders, "No Substitute for Experience: Presidents, Advisers, and Information in Group Decision Making," *IO* 71,S1 (2017): S219-S247.

Joe D. Hagan, "Coalition Politics and Foreign Policy Decision-Making in Anocratic Regimes," *European Political Science [EPS]* 16,4 (2017): 463-74. **OPTIONAL:** Ryan K. Beasley and Juliet Kaarbo, "Explaining Extremity in the Foreign Policies of Parliamentary Democracies," *ISQ* 58,4 (2014): 729-40; Kaarbo, *Coalition Politics and Cabinet Decision Making: A Comparative Analysis of Foreign Policy Choices*, Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P 2012, chs. 2, 7; Brian C. Rathbun, *Partisan Interventions: European Party Politics and Peace Enforcement in the Balkans*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell U P 2004, chs. 1-2; Hagan et al., "Foreign Policy by Coalition: Deadlock, Compromise, and Anarchy," *ISR* 3,2 (1991): 169-216; Hagan, *Political Opposition and Foreign Policy in Comparative Perspective*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner 1993, ch. 3; Shaul R. Shenhav et al., "Story Coalitions: Applying Narrative Theory to the Study of Coalition Formation," *PP* 35,5 (2014): 661-78; Sibel Oktay, "Coalition Politics and Foreign Policy," *Oxford Research Encyclopedia* 2017: DOI: 10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.013.396; Kaarbo, "Coalition politics, international norms, and foreign policy: multiparty decision-making dynamics in comparative perspective," *International Politics* 54,6 (November 2017): 669-82; Jeffrey S. Lantis and Patrick Homan, "Factionalism and US Foreign Policy: A Social Psychological Model of Minority Influence," *FPA* (2018, forthcoming): <https://doi.org/10.1093/fpa/orx014>. Note that the required piece by Hagan is part of a symposium in *EPS* on coalition politics and foreign policy; see also the Introduction to the issue by Oppermann, Kaarbo, and Brummer, as well as the individual articles by Oktay and Beasley, Oppermann, Brumer, and van Willigen, and Blarel and van Willigen.

David Mitchell, "Does Context Matter? Advisory Systems and the Management of the Foreign Policy Decision-Making Process," *Presidential Studies Q. [PSQ]* 40,4 (2010): 631-59. **OPTIONAL:** idem, "Centralizing Advisory Systems: Presidential Influence and the U.S. Foreign Policy Decision-Making Process," *FPA* 1,2 (2005): 181-206; idem, *Making Foreign Policy: Presidential Management of the Decision-Making Process*, Aldershot: Ashgate 2005, chs. 1, 8-9; Jean A. Garrison, *Games Advisors Play: Foreign Policy in the Nixon and Carter Administrations*, College Station, TX: Texas A&M UP 1999, chs. 1 and Conclusion; Stephen Majeski and David Sylvan, "How Foreign Policy Recommendations are Put Together: A Computational Model with Empirical Applications," *II* 25,4 (1999): 301-32; Robert Axelrod, "Argumentation in Foreign Policy Settings," *JCR* 21,4 (1977): 727-56; Marijke Breuning, "Roles and Realities: When and Why Gatekeepers Fail to Change Foreign Policy," *FPA* 9,3 (2013): 307-25; Paul A. Kowert, *Groupthink or Deadlock: When Do Leaders Learn from their Advisors?* Albany: State University of New York P 2002, chs. 1-2; special issue of *Presidential Studies Q.* (35,2 [2005]) on presidential decision making, articles by Burke; Dickinson; Haney; and Walcott and Hult; and R.A.W. Rhodes and Paul T Hart, eds., *Oxford Handbook of Political Leadership*, OUP 2014, chs. 34 (Eichbaum and Shaw, "Prime Ministers and their Advisers in Parliamentary Democracies") and 35 (Andeweg, "Cabinet Ministers: Leaders, Team Players, Followers?"). Note the special issue of *Policy Sciences* (50,1: 2017) on policy advisory systems: not very much on foreign policy per se, but a number of interesting hypotheses.

12. December 3

Groups 2: Social pressures; groupthink; polarization

Irving L. Janis, *Groupthink: Psychological Studies of Policy Decisions and Fiascoes*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin 1982, chs. 1-2. **OPTIONAL:** An up-to-date and reasonable (albeit underplaying mechanisms; hence see the next section of this week's readings, below) overview of FPA literature on groupthink can be found in Kasey Barr and Alex Mintz, "Public Policy Perspective on Group Decision-Making Dynamics in Foreign Policy," *Policy Studies J* 46,S1 (2018): S69-S90. See also Eric K. Stern, "Probing the Plausibility of Newgroup Syndrome: Kennedy and the Bay of Pigs," in *Beyond Groupthink*, ch. 6; Paul A. Kowert, *Groupthink or Deadlock: When Do Leaders Learn from their Advisors?* Albany: State U of New York P 2002, chs. 1-2, 7; Donelson R. Forsyth, "Social Influence and Group Behavior," in Howard Tenen and Jerry Suls, eds., *Handbook of Psychology*, 2d edn., vol. 5: *Personality and Social Psychology*, Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons 2012, ch. 14. Be careful of what is sometimes labeled as "groupthink," as the term has, for better or worse, passed into general academic discourse (other examples: "soft power"; "civil society"; "democratic peace"): Franz Eder, "Making Concurrence-Seeking Visible: Groupthink, Discourse Networks, and the 2003 Iraq War," *FPA* forthcoming (online publication 2017); also Allan McConnell, "A Public Policy Approach to Understanding the Nature and Causes of Foreign Policy Failure," *J of European Public Policy* 23,5 (2016: a whole issue on the subject!): 667-84.

Clark McCauley, "The Nature of Social Influence in Groupthink: Compliance and Internalization," *J of Personality and Social Psychology* 57,2 (1989): 250-60. **OPTIONAL:** For a recent use of McCauley's work, see David Dryden Henningsen, Mary Lynn Miller Henningsen, and Gregory Allen Russell, "Do Groupthink Symptoms Reflect a Single Social Influence Process?" *Groupwork* 27,1 (2017): 28-48. McCauley's claim is classically social-psychological; for a sociological take on the phenomenon, see David Melamed and Scott V. Savage, "Status, Faction Sizes, and Social Influence: Testing the Theoretical Mechanism," *AJS* 122,1 (2016): 201-32; a finding that points to another mechanism (far more indirect) of influence is Sarah E. Gaither et al., "Mere Membership in Racially Diverse Groups Reduces Conformity," *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, forthcoming (online publication 2017). A direct take on Janis is Roderick M. Kramer ("Revisiting the Bay of Pigs and Vietnam Decisions 25 Years Later: How Well Has the Groupthink Hypothesis Stood the Test of Time?" *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes [OBHDP]* 73, 2-3 (1998): 236-71). Kramer's piece is one article in a special issue of *OBHDP*, edited by Marlene E. Turner and Anthony R. Pratkanis and entitled "Groupthink: A Twenty-Fifth Anniversary Appraisal"; see in particular other articles in the same issue, notably by Esser; McCauley; Fuller and Aldag; Whyte; Turner and Pratkanis (article pp. 210-35); and Peterson et al.; see also Jeni L. Burnette, Jeffrey M. Pollack, and Donelson R. Forsyth, "Leadership in Extreme Contexts: A Groupthink Analysis of the May 1996 Mount Everest Disaster," *J. of Leadership Studies* 4,4 (2011): 29-40 [NB: this piece has a good synthetic argument and a reasonably up-to-date review of literature]. A useful alternative (even if exaggerated) is Alex Mintz and Carly Wayne, "The Polythink Syndrome and Elite Group Decision-Making," *PP* 37,S1 (2016): 3-21.

Daniel J. Isenberg, "Group Polarization: A Critical Review and Meta-Analysis," *J. of Personality and Social Psychology* 50,6 (1986): 1141-51. **OPTIONAL:** Isenberg's work still influences research: see, for example, Michael Gabbay et al., "Frame-Induced Group Polarization in Small Discussion Networks," *Social Psychological Q* 81,3 (2018): 248-71; see also Lyn M. Van Swol, "Extreme Members and Group Polarization," *Social Influence* 4,3 (2009): 185-99; David G. Myers and Helmut Lamm, "The Group Polarization Phenomenon," *Psychological Bull. [PB]* 83,4 (1976): 602-27; Noah E. Friedkin, "Choice Shift and Group Polarization," *ASR* 64,6 (1999): 856-75; Pi-Yueh Cheng and Wen-Bin Chiou, "Framing Effects in Group Investment Decision Making: Role of Group Polarization," *Psychological Reports [PR]* 102,1 (2008): 283-92; David H. Zhu, "Group Polarization on Corporate Boards: Theory and Evidence on Board Decisions About Acquisition Premiums," *Strategic Management J.* 34,7 (2013): 800-22.

13. December 10

Groups 3: Loyalty/conformity/obedience; identification; bureaucratic politics

Philip Zimbardo, *The Lucifer Effect: Understanding How Good People Turn Evil*, New York: Random House 2007, ch. 12. **OPTIONAL:** Theodore A. Avtgis, "Locus of Control and Persuasion, Social Influence, and Conformity: A Meta-Analytic Review," *PR* 83,3 (1998): 899-903; Robert B. Cialdini and Noah J. Goldstein, "Social Influence: Compliance and Conformity," *Annual R. of Psychology* 55 (2004): 591-621; Aparna Joshi and Andrew P. Knight, "Who Defers to Whom and Why? Dual Pathways Linking Demographic Differences and Dyadic Deference to Team Effectiveness," *AMJ* 58,1 (2015): 59-84; Yunhyung Chung et al., "Cracking but not Breaking: Joint Effects of Faultline Strength and Diversity Climate on Loyal Behavior," *AMJ* 58,5 (2015): 1495-1515; a good and fairly up-to-date bibliography is Leandre R. Fabrigar and Meghan E. Norris, "Conformity, Compliance, and Obedience," *Oxford Bibliographies* 2012: <http://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199828340/obo-9780199828340-0075.xml>. Note that the Stanford Prison Experiment discussed by Zimbardo was the subject of an interesting back-and-forth, all in *Personality and Social Psychology Bull. [PSPB]*: Thomas Carnahan and Sam McFarland, "Revisiting the Stanford Prison Experiment: Could Participant Self-Selection Have Led to the Cruelty?" *PSPB* 33,5 (2007): 603-14; Craig Haney and Philip G. Zimbardo, "Persistent Dispositionalism in Interactionist Clothing: Fundamental Attribution Error in Explaining Prison Abuse," *PSPB* 35,6 (2009): 807-14; and Sam McFarland and Thomas Carnahan, "A Situation's First Powers are Attracting Volunteers and Selecting Participants: A Reply to Haney and Zimbardo (2009)," *PSPB* 35,6 (2009): 815-8. Note that not only the Zimbardo study, but several of the other social psychology experiments discussed both last week and this week are usefully summarized, as well as put into intellectual and disciplinary context (with a good discussion of the pros and cons of various critiques) in Joanne R. Smith and S. Alexander Haslam, eds., *Social Psychology: Revisiting the Classic Studies*, 2d edn., Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage 2017; see in particular the chapters on Festinger's end-of-the-world study, on Sherif's autokinetic illusion study, on Asch's line-judgment studies, on Milgram's shock experiments, on Sherif's boys' camp studies, and of course on Zimbardo's Stanford Prison Experiment. More generally still, but of importance in terms of complementary work and of its general intellectual-political significance, see Bob Altemeyer, *The Authoritarians* (widely available as an ebook), 2006, especially chs. 1, 3, and 6.

Richard D. Ashmore, Kay Deaux, and Tracy McLaughlin-Volpe, "An Organizing Framework for Collective Identity: Articulation and Significance of Multidimensionality," *PB* 130,1 (2004): 80-114. **OPTIONAL:** Michael A. Hogg and Scott A. Reid, "Social Identity, Self-Categorization, and the Communication of Group Norms," *Communication Theory* 16,1 (2006): 7-30; Deborah A. Prentice, Dale T. Miller, and Jenifer R. Lightdale, "Asymmetries in Attachments to Groups and to Their Members: Distinguishing Between Common-Identity and Common-Bond Groups," *PSPB* 20,5 (1994): 484-93; Massimo Bergami and Richard P. Bagozzi, "Self-Categorization, Affective Commitment and Group Self-Esteem as Distinct Aspects of Social Identity in the Organization," *British J. of Social Psychology* 39,4 (2000): 555-77; Sonja Utz and Kai Sassenberg, "Distributive Justice in Common-Bond and Common-Identity Groups," *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations* 5,2 (2002): 151-62; and S. Alexander Haslam and Stephen D. Reicher, "Contesting the 'Nature' of Conformity: What Milgram and Zimbardo's Studies Really Show," *PLoS Biology* 10,11 (2012).

Morton H. Halperin and Priscilla A. Clapp, with Arnold Kanter, *Bureaucratic Politics and Foreign Policy*, 2d edn., Washington: Brookings Institution Press 2006, chs. 3, 5. **OPTIONAL:** Conor Keane and Steve Wood, "Bureaucratic Politics, Role Conflict, and the Internal Dynamics of US Provincial Reconstruction Teams in Afghanistan," *Armed Forces and Society* 42,1 (2016): 99-118; Daniel W. Drezner, "Ideas, Bureaucratic Politics, and the Crafting of Foreign Policy," *AJPS* 44,4 (2000): 733-49; Stephen D. Krasner, "Are Bureaucracies Important? (Or Allison Wonderland)," *FP* 7 (1972): 159-79 [NB: the piece is reprinted in G. John Ikenberry, ed., *American Foreign Policy: Theoretical Essays*, 5th edn., Boston: Houghton Mifflin 2004, pp. 447-59]; Dan Caldwell, "Bureaucratic Foreign Policy-

Making," *American Behavioral Scientist* 21,1 (1977): 87-110; Thomas Preston and Paul 't Hart, "Understanding and Evaluating Bureaucratic Politics: The Nexus Between Political Leaders and Advisory Systems," *PP* 20,1 (1999): 49-98; Vincent Abel-Bundock, James Atkinson, and Rachel Augustine Potter, "The Limits of Foreign Aid Diplomacy: How Bureaucratic Design Shapes Aid Distribution," *ISQ* 59,3 (2015): 544-56; Juliet Kaarbo, "Power Politics in Foreign Policy: the Influence of Bureaucratic Minorities," *EJIR* 4,1 (1998): 67-97; Lauren Holland, "The U.S. Decision to Launch Operation Desert Storm: A Bureaucratic Politics Analysis," *Armed Forces and Society* 25,2 (1999): 219-42; and Kevin Marsh, "Obama's Surge: A Bureaucratic Politics Analysis of the Decision to Order a Troop Surge in the Afghanistan War," *FPA* 10,2 (2014): 265-88.

14. December 17

Final exam (put online at 10.00 on December 17, due at noon on December 19)