

# PL2022/2222 Foreign Policy Analysis

View Online



- 
1.  
Hill, C.: Foreign policy in the twenty-first century. Palgrave, London (2016).
  
  2.  
Hill, C.: The changing politics of foreign policy. Palgrave MacMillan, Basingstoke (2003).
  
  3.  
Smith, S., Hadfield, A., Dunne, T.: Foreign policy: theories, actors, cases. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2012).
  
  4.  
Alden, C.: Foreign policy analysis: new approaches. Routledge, London (2012).
  
  5.  
Neack, L.: The new foreign policy: power seeking in a globalized era. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Lanham, Md (2008).
  
  6.  
Rosenau, J.N.: The scientific study of foreign policy. Pinter, London (1980).
  
  - 7.

Hill, C.: *The changing politics of foreign policy*. Palgrave MacMillan, Basingstoke (2003).

8.

Smith, S., Hadfield, A., Dunne, T.: *Foreign policy: theories, actors, cases*. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2012).

9.

Neack, L.: *The new foreign policy: power seeking in a globalized era*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Lanham, Md (2008).

10.

Hudson, V.M.: *Foreign policy analysis: classic and contemporary theory*. Rowman & Littlefield Pub, Lanham (2014).

11.

Giacomello, G., Ferrari, F., Amadori, A.: With friends like these: foreign policy as personal relationship. *Contemporary Politics*. 15, 247–264 (2009).  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13569770902858202>.

12.

Hudson, V.M.: Foreign Policy Analysis: Actor-Specific Theory and the Ground of International Relations. *Foreign Policy Analysis*. 1, 1–30 (2005).  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1743-8594.2005.00001.x>.

13.

David, C.: Who was the real George Bush? Foreign policy decision-making under the bush administration. *Diplomacy & Statecraft*. 7, 197–220 (1996).  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09592299608406000>.

14.

Zhang, Q.: Towards an Integrated Theory of Chinese Foreign Policy: bringing leadership personality back in. *Journal of Contemporary China*. 23, 902–922 (2014).

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10670564.2014.882566>.

15.

Görener, A.Ş., Ucal, M.Ş.: The Personality and Leadership Style of Recep Tayyip Erdoğan: Implications for Turkish Foreign Policy. *Turkish Studies*. 12, 357–381 (2011).  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14683849.2011.604216>.

16.

Rottinghaus, B.: Presidential Leadership on Foreign Policy, Opinion Polling, and the Possible Limits of "Crafted Talk". *Political Communication*. 25, 138–157 (2008).  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10584600801985334>.

17.

Pravda, A.: Is there a Gorbachev foreign policy? *Journal of Communist Studies*. 4, 100–120 (1988). <https://doi.org/10.1080/13523278808414940>.

18.

Gallagher, M.E., Allen, S.H.: Presidential Personality: Not Just a Nuisance. *Foreign Policy Analysis*. 10, 1–21 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1111/fpa.12006>.

19.

DYSON, S.B.: Personality and Foreign Policy: Tony Blair's Iraq Decisions. *Foreign Policy Analysis*. 2, 289–306 (2006). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1743-8594.2006.00031.x>.

20.

Hill, C.: *The changing politics of foreign policy*. Palgrave MacMillan, Basingstoke (2003).

21.

Alden, C.: *Foreign policy analysis: new approaches*. Routledge, London (2012).

22.

Hudson, V.M.: *Foreign policy analysis: classic and contemporary theory*. Rowman & Littlefield Pub, Lanham (2014).

23.

Neack, L.: *The new foreign policy: power seeking in a globalized era*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Lanham, Md (2008).

24.

Garrison, J.A.: *Foreign Policymaking and Group Dynamics: Where We've Been and Where We're Going*. *International Studies Review*. 5, 155–202 (2003).  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1521-9488.5020015>.

25.

Clarke, M., White, B.: *Understanding foreign policy: the foreign policy systems approach*. Elgar, Aldershot (1989).

26.

Graham T. Allison and Morton H. Halperin: *Bureaucratic Politics: A Paradigm and Some Policy Implications*. *World Politics*. 24, 40–79 (1972).

27.

Hocking, B.: *Adaptation and the foreign policy bureaucracy: The experience of federal states*. *Diplomacy & Statecraft*. 5, 47–72 (1994).  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09592299408405908>.

28.

Lai, H., Kang, S.-J.: *Domestic Bureaucratic Politics and Chinese Foreign Policy*. *Journal of Contemporary China*. 23, 294–313 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10670564.2013.832531>.

29.

Badie, D.: Groupthink, Iraq, and the War on Terror: Explaining US Policy Shift toward Iraq. *Foreign Policy Analysis*. 6, 277–296 (2010).  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1743-8594.2010.00113.x>.

30.

GARRISON, J.: Constructing the 'National Interest' in U.S.?China Policy Making: How Foreign Policy Decision Groups Define and Signal Policy Choices. *Foreign Policy Analysis*. 3, 105–126 (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1743-8594.2007.00043.x>.

31.

Kaarbo, J., Beasley, R.K.: Taking It to the Extreme: The Effect of Coalition Cabinets on Foreign Policy. *Foreign Policy Analysis*. 4, 67–81 (2008).  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1743-8594.2007.00058.x>.

32.

Marsh, K.: Obama's Surge: A Bureaucratic Politics Analysis of the Decision to Order a Troop Surge in the Afghanistan War. *Foreign Policy Analysis*. 10, 265–288 (2014).  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/fpa.12000>.

33.

Hill, C.: *The changing politics of foreign policy*. Palgrave MacMillan, Basingstoke (2003).

34.

Hudson, V.M.: *Foreign policy analysis: classic and contemporary theory*. Rowman & Littlefield Pub, Lanham (2014).

35.

Alden, C.: *Foreign policy analysis: new approaches*. Routledge, London (2012).

36.

Hadfield, A.: British foreign policy, national identity, and neoclassical realism. Rowman & Littlefield, Lanham, MD (2010).

37.

Mattes, M., Rodríguez, M.: Autocracies and International Cooperation. *International Studies Quarterly*. 58, 527–538 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1111/isqu.12107>.

38.

Rosenau, J.N.: *Domestic sources of foreign policy*. Free Press, New York (1967).

39.

Neack, L.: *The new foreign policy: power seeking in a globalized era*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Lanham, Md (2008).

40.

Reiter, D.: Political structure and foreign policy learning: Are democracies more likely to act on the lessons of history? *International Interactions*. 21, 39–62 (1995).

41.

Ungerer, J.L.: Assessing the Progress of the Democratic Peace Research Program. *International Studies Review*. 14, 1–31 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2486.2012.01103.x>.

42.

CHAN, S., SAFRAN, W.: Public Opinion as a Constraint against War: Democracies' Responses to Operation Iraqi Freedom. *Foreign Policy Analysis*. 2, 137–156 (2006). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1743-8594.2006.00024.x>.

43.

Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, Randolph M. Siverson and Gary Woller: War and the Fate of Regimes: A Comparative Analysis. *The American Political Science Review*. 86, 638–646

(1992).

44.

Waltz, K.N.: Foreign policy and democratic politics: the American and British experience. Longmans, Harlow (1968).

45.

Lee, S.: Canadian values in Canadian foreign policy. *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal*. 10, 1-9 (2002). <https://doi.org/10.1080/11926422.2002.9673303>.

46.

Hill, C.: *The changing politics of foreign policy*. Palgrave MacMillan, Basingstoke (2003).

47.

Smith, S., Hadfield, A., Dunne, T.: *Foreign policy: theories, actors, cases*. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2012).

48.

Neack, L.: *The new foreign policy: power seeking in a globalized era*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Lanham, Md (2008).

49.

Alden, C.: *Foreign policy analysis: new approaches*. Routledge, London (2012).

50.

Nincic, M., Ramos, J.M.: Ideological structure and foreign policy preferences. *Journal of Political Ideologies*. 15, 119-141 (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1080/13569317.2010.482368>.

51.

Thorngate, W.: The social psychology of policy analysis. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*. 3, 85–112 (2001).  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13876980108412655>.

52.

Lebow, R.N.: Psychological dimensions of post-Cold War foreign policy. *Israel Affairs*. 2, 46–56 (1996). <https://doi.org/10.1080/13537129608719392>.

53.

Schafer, M.: Science, Empiricism, and Tolerance in the Study of Foreign Policymaking. *International Studies Review*. 5, 155–202 (2003).  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1521-9488.5020014>.

54.

Jack S. Levy: Learning and Foreign Policy: Sweeping a Conceptual Minefield. *International Organization*. 48, 279–312 (1994).

55.

Goldsmith, B.: Imitation in International Relations: Analogies, Vicarious Learning, and Foreign Policy. *International Interactions*. 29, 237–267 (2003).  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03050620304593>.

56.

Oppermann, K., Spencer, A.: Thinking Alike? Salience and Metaphor Analysis as Cognitive Approaches to Foreign Policy Analysis. *Foreign Policy Analysis*. 9, 39–56 (2013).  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1743-8594.2011.00167.x>.

57.

Dolan, T.M.: Emotion and Strategic Learning in War. *Foreign Policy Analysis*. n/a-n/a (2014).  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/fpa.12052>.

58.

O'Reilly, K.P.: Perceiving Rogue States: The Use of the 'Rogue State' Concept by U.S. Foreign Policy Elites. *Foreign Policy Analysis*. 3, 295–315 (2007).  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1743-8594.2007.00052.x>.

59.

Hill, C.: *The changing politics of foreign policy*. Palgrave MacMillan, Basingstoke (2003).

60.

Hudson, V.M.: *Foreign policy analysis: classic and contemporary theory*. Rowman & Littlefield Pub, Lanham (2014).

61.

Langhorne, R.: The Diplomacy of Non-State Actors. *Diplomacy & Statecraft*. 16, 331–339 (2005). <https://doi.org/10.1080/09592290590948388>.

62.

Michael A. Cohen and Maria Figueroa Küpçü: Privatizing Foreign Policy. *World Policy Journal*. 22, 34–52 (2005).

63.

Kim, Y.: How NGOs Influence US Foreign Aid Allocations. *Foreign Policy Analysis*. n/a-n/a (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1111/fpa.12064>.

64.

McMillan, S.L.: Subnational Foreign Policy Actors: How and Why Governors Participate in U.S. Foreign Policy. *Foreign Policy Analysis*. 4, 227–253 (2008).  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1743-8594.2008.00068.x>.

65.

True, J., Mintrom, M.: Transnational Networks and Policy Diffusion: The Case of Gender Mainstreaming. *International Studies Quarterly*. 45, 27–57 (2001).  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/0020-8833.00181>.

66.

Price, R.: Reversing the Gun Sights: Transnational Civil Society Targets Land Mines. *International Organization*. 52, 613–644 (1998).  
<https://doi.org/10.1162/002081898550671>.

67.

Hoffman, M.E.S.: Discretion, Lobbying, and Political Influence in Models of Trade Policy. *The Journal of Policy Reform*. 8, 175–188 (2005). <https://doi.org/10.1080/13841280500181650>.

68.

Warner, C.M., Walker, S.G.: Thinking about the Role of Religion in Foreign Policy: A Framework for Analysis. *Foreign Policy Analysis*. 7, 113–135 (2011).  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1743-8594.2010.00125.x>.

69.

Joachim, J.: Framing Issues and Seizing Opportunities: The UN, NGOs, and Women's Rights. *International Studies Quarterly*. 47, 247–274 (2003).  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2478.4702005>.

70.

Frank R. Baumgartner and Bryan D. Jones: Agenda Dynamics and Policy Subsystems. *The Journal of Politics*. 53, 1044–1074 (1991).

71.

Nelson, P., Dorsey, E.: New Rights Advocacy in a Global Public Domain. *European Journal of International Relations*. 13, 187–216 (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066107076953>.

72.

Hill, C.: *The changing politics of foreign policy*. Palgrave MacMillan, Basingstoke (2003).

73.

Smith, S., Hadfield, A., Dunne, T.: Foreign policy: theories, actors, cases. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2012).

74.

GILBOA, E.: The CNN Effect: The Search for a Communication Theory of International Relations. *Political Communication*. 22, 27–44 (2005).  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10584600590908429>.

75.

Robinson, P.: The CNN Effect Revisited. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*. 22, 344–349 (2005). <https://doi.org/10.1080/07393180500288519>.

76.

Gilboa, E.: Diplomacy in the media age: Three models of uses and effects. *Diplomacy & Statecraft*. 12, 1–28 (2001). <https://doi.org/10.1080/09592290108406201>.

77.

Rosenau, J.N.: Domestic sources of foreign policy. Free Press, New York (1967).

78.

Neack, L.: The new foreign policy: power seeking in a globalized era. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Lanham, Md (2008).

79.

Robinson, P.: Theorizing the Influence of Media on World Politics: Models of Media Influence on Foreign Policy. *European Journal of Communication*. 16, 523–544 (2001).  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323101016004005>.

80.

Hjarvard, S., Kristensen, N.N.: When media of a small nation argue for war. *Media, War & Conflict*. 7, 51–69 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750635213516560>.

81.

Wang, J., Wang, X.: Media and Chinese Foreign Policy. *Journal of Contemporary China*. 23, 216–235 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10670564.2013.832523>.

82.

Murray, S.: Broadening the Debate about War: The Inclusion of Foreign Critics in Media Coverage and Its Potential Impact on US Public Opinion. *Foreign Policy Analysis*. n/a-n/a (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1111/fpa.12010>.

83.

The Relationships Between Mass Media, Public Opinion, and Foreign Policy: Toward a Theoretical Synthesis - *Annual Review of Political Science*, 11(1):39.

84.

Baru, S.: The Influence of Business and Media on Indian Foreign Policy. *India Review*. 8, 266–285 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1080/14736480903116792>.

85.

Hill, C.: *The changing politics of foreign policy*. Palgrave MacMillan, Basingstoke (2003).

86.

Smith, S., Hadfield, A., Dunne, T.: *Foreign policy: theories, actors, cases*. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2012).

87.

Cable, J.: Foreign policy making: Planning or reflex? *Diplomacy & Statecraft*. 3, 357–381 (1992). <https://doi.org/10.1080/09592299208405861>.

88.

Kleiner, J.: The Inertia of Diplomacy. *Diplomacy & Statecraft*. 19, 321–349 (2008).  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09592290802096380>.

89.

John G. Tower: Congress versus the President: The Formulation and Implementation of American Foreign Policy. *Foreign Affairs*. 60, 229–246 (1981).

90.

Breuning, M.: Roles and Realities: When and Why Gatekeepers Fail to Change Foreign Policy. *Foreign Policy Analysis*. 9, 307–325 (2013).  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1743-8594.2012.00178.x>.

91.

Charles F. Hermann: Changing Course: When Governments Choose to Redirect Foreign Policy. *International Studies Quarterly*. 34, 3–21 (1990).

92.

Hagan, J.D., Everts, P.P., Fukui, H., Stempel, J.D.: Foreign Policy by Coalition: Deadlock, Compromise, and Anarchy. *International Studies Review*. 3, 169–216 (2001).  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1521-9488.00237>.

93.

Saideman, S.M., Ayres, R.W.: Pie Crust Promises and the Sources of Foreign Policy: The Limited Impact of Accession and the Priority of Domestic Constituencies. *Foreign Policy Analysis*. 3, 189–210 (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1743-8594.2007.00047.x>.

94.

Foreign Policy Engineering: From Theory to Practice and Back Again. *International Security*. 18, 143–171.

95.

Stern, E.K.: Crisis Studies and Foreign Policy Analysis: Insights, Synergies, and Challenges. *International Studies Review*. 5, 155–202 (2003).  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1521-9488.5020016>.

96.

T. Knecht and M. S. Weatherford: Public Opinion and Foreign Policy: The Stages of Presidential Decision Making. *International Studies Quarterly*. 50, 705–727 (2006).

97.

Hill, Christopher: The capability-expectations gap, or conceptualizing Europe's international role. *Journal of Common Market Studies*. 31,.

98.

Hill, C.: *The changing politics of foreign policy*. Palgrave MacMillan, Basingstoke (2003).

99.

Neack, L.: *The new foreign policy: power seeking in a globalized era*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Lanham, Md (2008).

100.

K. J. Holsti: National Role Conceptions in the Study of Foreign Policy. *International Studies Quarterly*. 14, 233–309 (1970).

101.

Hudson, V.M.: *Foreign policy analysis: classic and contemporary theory*. Rowman & Littlefield Pub, Lanham (2014).

102.

Wehner, L.E., Thies, C.G.: Role Theory, Narratives, and Interpretation: The Domestic Contestation of Roles. *International Studies Review*. n/a-n/a (2014).  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/misr.12149>.

103.

Carranza, M.E.: Rising Regional Powers and International Relations Theories: Comparing Brazil and India's Foreign Security Policies and Their Search for Great-Power Status. *Foreign Policy Analysis*. n/a-n/a (2014). <https://doi.org/10.1111/fpa.12065>.

104.

Jordaan, E.: The concept of a middle power in international relations: distinguishing between emerging and traditional middle powers. *Politikon*. 30, 165–181 (2003).  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0258934032000147282>.

105.

Sussex, M.: The impotence of being earnest? Avoiding the pitfalls of 'creative middle power diplomacy'. *Australian Journal of International Affairs*. 65, 545–562 (2011).  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10357718.2011.610436>.

106.

Gecelovsky, P.: Constructing a middle power: Ideas and Canadian foreign policy. *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal*. 15, 77–93 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1080/11926422.2009.9673483>.

107.

Beeson, M.: Can Australia save the world? The limits and possibilities of middle power diplomacy. *Australian Journal of International Affairs*. 65, 563–577 (2011).  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10357718.2011.607149>.

108.

Nye, J.S.: Power and foreign policy. *Journal of Political Power*. 4, 9–24 (2011).  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/2158379X.2011.555960>.

109.

Status Seekers: Chinese and Russian Responses to U.S. Primacy. *International Security*. 34, 63–95.

110.

Brown, C.: Do Great Powers Have Great Responsibilities? Great Powers and Moral Agency. *Global Society*. 18, 5–19 (2004). <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360082032000173545>.