

## Role Theory

Sebastian Harnisch

Professor of Political Science and International Relations

Heidelberg University

### Contents

1.	Introduction	2	
2.	International Roles	5	
2.1	The first phase (Ego-dominance)		6
2.2	The second phase (Ego-Alter balance and role interaction)	7	
2.3	Role enactment	9	
2.4	Role conflict	13	
2.5	Role Contestation	15	
2.6	Role change and learning	16	
2.7	Role and Identity	17	
2.8	Roles and Historical-Self-Identification	18	
2.9	Roles and Socialization	20	
2.10	Role composites		21
2.11	Leadership roles		22
3.	Roles and Methodology	23	
3.1	Roles, Content analysis and interpretive approaches <b>definiert.</b>		<b>Fehler! Textmarke nicht</b>
3.2	Binary role theory and game theory models <b>definiert.2</b>		<b>Fehler! Textmarke nicht</b>

## 1. Introduction

In the past two decades, role theory has gained importance as a cross-disciplinary approach for understanding agent, particularly state, behavior in global politics. With roots in psychology, social psychology and sociology, scholars have identified common patterns of agents performing “roles” in social groupings. As analytical concepts, roles tie agential behavioral patterns to social structures, thereby bridging the theoretical divide between Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA) and International Relations Theory (IRT). Despite considerable interest in the sociological roots of the concept, political scientists have not systematically imported insights from there, but rather used different terms, theoretical templates and phrases in their role studies). This article provides a general overview of past and current developments in the theoretical and methodological conceptualization of the term as well as its application in FPA and IRT (for excellent overviews: Thies 2010, Breuning 2017; Jönsson/Westerlund 1982, Walker 1987).

### **Breuning, M. 2017. Role Theory in Foreign Policy, in Oxford Research Encyclopedia**

This article presents a cutting-edge overview of recent theoretical and methodological developments in the field, focusing on Northern America.

### **Jönsson, C. and Westerlund, U. 1982. Role Theory and Foreign Policy, In Cognitive Dynamics and International Politics. Edited by Christer Jönsson. 122-157. London: Frances Pinter**

A first good overview of the role theoretical literature applied to foreign policy analysis in the early 1980s.

### **Thies, C. G. 2010. Role theory and foreign policy. In The international studies encyclopedia. Edited by R. Denmark. 6335–6356. Chichester, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell.**

An authoritative literature review, which takes stock of advances in theory, methodology and application in the last thirty years.

### **Walker, S.G. 1987. Role Theory and the Origins of Foreign Policy, In New Directions in the Study of Foreign Policy. Edited by Charles F. Hermann, Charles W. Kegley, and James N. Rosenau. 269-284. London: HarperCollins.**

This edited volume traces and evaluates systematically the first two decades of role theory studies as based on Kalevi Holsti's framework.

### **Walker, S. G. 2017. Role Theory as an Empirical Theory of International Relations: From Metaphor to Formal Model, Oxford Research Bibliographies on Politics.**

A careful and recent review of role theoretical works with a special emphasis on formal and game theoretical models.

Given its origins in sociology and social psychology, the role theoretical literature has benefitted greatly from a number of scholarly works in these and neighboring disciplines (see in particular Walker 1992).

**Biddle, B.J. 1986. Recent Developments in Role Theory. *American Review of Sociology* 12: 67-92.**

Excellent overview of the early role theoretical literature in sociology and social psychology, reaching back to the early 20th century.

**Sarbin, T. and Allen, V. 1968. Role theory. In *Handbook of social psychology*. Edited by Gardner Lindzey and Elliot Aronson. 488–567. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.**

A good and systematic introduction into role theoretical concepts from a sociological perspective.

**Serpe, R.T. and Stryker, S. 2011. The Symbolic Interactionist Perspective and Identity Theory, In *Handbook of Identity Theory and Research*. Edited by Schwarz Seth J. et al. 225-248. Heidelberg: Springer Science.**

A recent systematic account of the different lineages in role and identity studies from a symbolic interactionist perspective.

**Stryker, S. and Statham, A. 1985. Symbolic interaction and role theory. In *Handbook of social psychology*. Edited by Gardner Lindzey and Elliot Aronson. 311–378. New York: Random House.**

A foundational text, connecting role theoretical terms and their origin in the works of G.H. Mead, H. Blumer, E. Goffman.

**Turner, J. 2011. Extending the Symbolic Interactionist Theory of Interaction Processes: A Conceptual Outline. *Symbolic Interaction* 34 (3): 330–339.**

Based on George Herbert Mead's conceptualization of interaction processes, this brief article outlines a robust symbolic interactionist theory for micro-level social processes as well as key elements of meso- and macro-level dynamics.

**Walker, S.G. 1992. Symbolic Interactionism and International Politics: Role Theory's Contribution to International Organization, In *Contending Dramas: A Cognitive Approach to International Organizations*. Edited by Martha Cottam. and Chih-Yu Shih. 19-38. New York: Praeger.**

A brief but helpful introduction into the Chicago and Iowa schools of symbolic interactionism and their bearing on early FPA role studies.

## 2. International Roles

Given its liminal position between agents and structure, roles are typically either defined as “repertoires of behavior”, stressing agency, or “social positions”, foregrounding structures, thereby also indicating the differences between the structural and the interaction strands of symbolic interactionist role theory (see Stryker 2006). Following this conceptual division, the development of the FPA role theoretical literature may be structured into in two distinct phases, a first phase stressing ego expectations and a second phase focusing on ego-alter shifts and role interactions. While the FPA role theoretical literature has thus far not taken up the sociological differentiation between basic roles – associated with gender, age and social class – position and status roles – related to positions in formally organized groups – functional group roles - such as leader, follower etc – and value roles – hero, saint, villain etc – (see Turner 2006: 234), Thies 2013 challenges Alexander Wendt’s concept “role identities” in his structural social constructivism (1999): Examining US role taking during the Cold War through Presidential doctrines, Thies finds that Wendt’s three role identities (enemy, rival and friend), representing a Hobbesian, Lockean and Kantian international social culture (Wendt 1999) are far too static and do not match the much more diverse empirical role taking of the US vis-à-vis the Soviet Union.

**Stryker, S. 2006. Traditional Symbolic Interactionism, Role Theory, and Structural Symbolic Interactionism, In Handbook of Sociological Theory. Edited by Jonathan H. Turner. 211-231, New York: Springer Science.**

The chapter dissects the differences between structural and more interactional symbolic Interactionism, tracing its roots to the 18<sup>th</sup> century and American Pragmatism in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century.

**Thies, C. G. 2013. The Roles of Bipolarity: A Role Theoretic Understanding of the effects of Ideas and Material factors on the Cold War, International Studies Perspectives 14, 269-288.**

The article argues that the beginning, evolution and end of the Cold War can be traced back to changes in US and SU role taking which cannot be accounted for when using Wendt’s static concept of “role identities”.

**Turner, R. H. 2006. Role Theory, In Handbook of Sociological Theory. Edited by Jonathan H. Turner. 233-254. New York: Springer Science.**

A substantial but concise overview of sociological role theory as based on the tradition of symbolical interactionism.

**Wendt, A. 1999. Social Theory of International Politics, Cambridge: Cambridge UP.**

Foundational text of structural social constructivism, using Meadian role theory to root three types of international social culture (Hobbesian, Lockean, and Kantian) in the role taking of major states vis-à-vis each other as enemies, rivals or friends.

## **2.1 The first phase (Ego-dominance)**

In the first phase (up to the 1990s), and starting with Kalevi Holsti's seminal article (1970), a group of FPA scholars focused on the ego-part of the international role, i.e. expectations of decision-makers or the foreign policy elite of their country's position in the world. These studies, with the exception of Jönsson 1982 and Gaupp 1983, tried to first identify (national) role conceptions in foreign policy speeches and then to connect these expectations with behavioral patterns (e.g. Breuning 1995). Empirically, these studies addressed the United States, the Soviet Union and their respective allies, trying to establish a causal nexus between "word and deeds", while accounting for intervening variables which may explain implementation gaps.

**Breuning, M. 1995. Words and Deeds: Foreign Assistance Rhetoric and Policy Behavior in the Netherlands, Belgium, and the United Kingdom. *International Studies Quarterly* 39 (2): 235-254.**

Examining the congruence between national role conceptions and respective role enactment, the article finds consistency between the rhetoric and policy behavior of the foreign assistance decision makers of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, while Belgian role enactment lacks such congruence.

**Gaupp, P. 1983. States as Role-bearers. *The Role Theory as Instrument for the Analysis of Foreign Policy and International Relations*, Bern (in German).**

An early application of role theory in Europe, analyzing Swiss foreign policy in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE).

**Hollis, M. and Smith, S. 1988. Roles and Reasons in Foreign Policy Decision Making. *British Journal of Political Science* 16: 269-286.**

A comparative conceptual study, evaluating a role theoretical approach with a bureaucratic and rational actor model to account for US foreign policy behavior during the Iranian hostage crisis.

**Holsti, K. 1970. National role conceptions in the study of foreign policy. *International Studies Quarterly* 14: 233-309.**

The most important, foundational, text of FPA role studies, analyzing hundreds of foreign policy statements to inductively identify seventeen different roles that were prevalent in state behavior between 1965-1967.

**Jönsson, C. 1982. Superpower. Comparing United States and Soviet Foreign Policy, New York: Frances Pinter.**

Very early conceptual studies that trace instances of role transfer between the United States and the Soviet Union in three policy areas, finding substantial evidence that the SU imitated US role behavior.

**Shih, C. 1988. National Role Conception as Foreign Policy Motivation: The Psychocultural Bases of Chinese Diplomacy. Political Psychology 9(4): 599-631.**

In one of the first studies of PRC roles, Shih explores the choices made between different roles and the interaction patterns, which derive from there.

**Wish, N. B. 1980. Foreign Policy Makers and Their National Role Conceptions. International Studies Quarterly 24 (4): 532-554.**

Based on data from 29 decision makers from 17 states, Wish establishes three dimensions of national role conceptions affecting a state's behavioral pattern (participation, hostility, independence, resource commitment).

**Walker, S.G. (ed.). 1987. Role theory and foreign policy analysis. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.**

This book is the first comprehensive and systematic account of role theoretical studies on the individual, bureaucratic and state level, presenting conceptual, methodological, theoretical and empirical advances until the 1980s.

**Walker, S.G. 1979. National Role Conceptions and Systemic Outcomes, In Psychological Models in International Politics. Edited by: Falkowski, L. 169-210. Boulder, CO: Westview Pr.**

In this substantial article, Walker ties individual role conceptions by decision makers from various states with the respective role enactment vis-à-vis the Superpowers.

## **2.2 The second phase (Ego-Alter balance and role interaction)**

During the second (ongoing) development phase, role scholars started to stress both the importance of alter expectations for role behavior as well as the impact of the interaction between different roles and role holders. Theoretically, this dynamic involved both a turn towards

constructivist (Aggestam 2004; Harnisch et al. 2011) and post-structuralist applications (Nabers, 2011; McCourt 2014) as well as structuralist (Thies 2013) and formal models (Walker 2013). Empirically, this phase saw a substantial expansion of role theoretical studies both on a regional, state as well as individual level of analysis (Breuning 1995, see below; Chafetz et al. 1996, see below; Elgström and Smith 2006, LePrestre 1997; Harnisch and Maull 2001; Maull 1990/91), moving the primary focus of the conceptual debate towards questions of role conflict (Cronin 2001; Tewes 1998) and domestic role contestation (Brummer, Thies 2015; Cantir/Kaarbo 2012, 2016), the impact of significant others (Kirste and Maull 1996), and historical experience (Benes and Harnisch 2014).

**Aggestam, L. 2004. A European Foreign Policy? Role Conceptions and the Politics of Identity in Britain, France and Germany. Stockholm: Stockholm University, Department of Political Science.**  
A comparative role theoretical approach, tracing differences in three national role conceptions and respective behavior back to diverging self-conceptualizations, thereby accounting for shifts in EU foreign policy.

**Elgström, O. and Smith, M. (Eds.) 2006. The European Union's Roles in International Politics: Concepts and Analysis. London: Routledge.**  
One of the first full-blown applications of role theory on a major power, focusing on national and EU role conceptions, the origins of roles, their institutionalization as well as on role performance and role impact.

**Fazendeiro, B., 2016. Rethinking Roles: Reflexive Role Ascription and Performativity in International Relations. International Studies Review 18(3): 487–507.**  
Based on Judith Butler's performativity concept and Paul Ricoeur's hermeneutics, the article advocates caution vis-à-vis non-reflexive ascription of roles and overgeneralizations that might lead to a "normalization of subject positions" in IR.

**Harnisch, Sebastian, Frank, Cornelia, and Maull, Hans W. 2011. Role Theory in International Relations: Approaches and analyses. New York: Routledge.**  
The first comprehensive theoretical treatment of role theory since Walker (1987), this edited volume brings together conceptual chapters, e.g. on communicative action and identity theory, as well as on foreign policy roles and international institutions and US hegemony.

**Harnisch, Sebastian and Maull, Hanns W. (eds.). 2001. Germany as a Civilian Power. The Foreign Policy of the Berlin Republic, Manchester: Manchester University Press.**



This volume examines whether the German role conception over time and several policy areas against the foil of the idealtypic “civilian power conception”, finding moderate change which can be traced back to shifts in domestic and foreign expectations.

**Kirste, Knut and Maull, Hanns W. 1996: Civilian Power and Role Theory. Zeitschrift für Internationale Beziehungen 3 (2): 283-212.**

Conceptual article, developing roles as sets of expectations of ego and alter and civilian power as an ideal type role conception.

**Le Preste, P. G. 1997. Role Quests in the Post-Cold War Era: Foreign Policies in Transition. Quebec: McGill-Queen's Press.**

Substantial edited volume examining the nature, evolution and origins of role conceptions of the United States, the Soviet Union/Russia, China, Japan, Germany, France, the United Kingdom, and Canada, tracing major changes in national role conceptions.

**McCourt, D. 2014. Britain and World Power since 1945. Constructing a nation's role in International Politics. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.**

Based on George H. Mead's symbolic interactionism, this monograph explains Great Britain's prominent international role through alter expectations by the United States and France in four historical episodes: the Suez Crisis of 1956, the Skybolt Crisis of 1962, Britain's second application to the European Economic Council in 1966–67, and Britain's reinvasion of the Falklands in 1982.

**Walker, S. G. 2013. Role Theory and the Cognitive Architecture of British Appeasement Decisions: Symbolic and Strategic Interaction in World Politics. New York: Routledge.**

Based on binary role theory and game theoretical models, this monograph presents a rigorous and compelling interpretation of the evolution of Great Britain's appeasement strategy vis-à-vis the German Reich and Japan in the 1930s.

### **2.3 Role enactment**

There is a large volume of literature that focuses on the application of role theory to an increasing number of actors, countries and institutions. Most of the first generation role scholarship focused on national role conceptions (e.g. in Walker 1987, see above) in Western countries (e.g. Breuning 1995; Le Prestre 1997, see above, Kirste 1998, see below). In contrast, the second wave of analyses spans individuals (Chelotti 2015) bureaucracies (Cusumano 2016; Keane/Wood 2016, see below; Vennesson et al. 2009), governments and international institutions (such as EU, e.g.

Lerch 2004; Michalski/Pan 2017) and an also a growing variety of non-Western countries in Eastern Europe (Chafetz et al. 1996), Asia (Hansel/Möller 2015; Harnisch et al. 2015; Harnisch/Friedrichs 2017) Africa (Adigbuo 2007; Hudson 1987), and Latin America (Below 2015; Wehner 2015). Given that this literature is informed by either ego-centered or more interactionist leanings, the exact meaning of the term enactment differs: earlier studies tend to equate role enactment with role taking while later analyses tend to put them into a sequence where role taking precedes role enactment which requires counter role taking to complete the role location process (cf. Thies 2013: 2).

**Adigbuo, R. 2007. Beyond IR Theories: The Case for National Role Conception. *Politikon* 34: 83–97.**

This study employs role theory to account for Namibia's foreign policy vis-à-vis the decolonization process in South Africa, challenging established structural IR theories.

**Below, A. 2015. Environmental Politics and Foreign Policy Decision Making in Latin America. Ratifying the Kyoto Protocol. New York: Routledge.**

The monograph traces explains the diverging environmental policies of Argentina, Mexico, and Venezuela vis-à-vis the Kyoto regime through process-tracing, finding that peculiar mixes of international, national and individual expectations account best for variant role enactments.

**Chafetz, G., Abramson, H. and Grillot, S. 1996. Role Theory and Foreign Policy: Belarussian and Ukrainian Compliance with the Nuclear Nonproliferation Regime. *Political Psychology* 17 (4): 727–757.**

Comparing Ukrainian and Belarussian nonproliferation behavior, the article finds a high constancy between national role conceptions and respective compliant and non-compliant behavior with the nuclear nonproliferation regime.

**Chelotti, N. 2015. A 'Diplomatic Republic of Europe'? Explaining role conceptions in EU foreign policy. *Cooperation and Conflict*, 50(2): 190–210.**

Based on over one hundred questionnaires with national officials serving in EU foreign policy committees, the article finds that these institutions have a stronger socializing effect towards more supranational role conceptions the longer the officials serve there.

**Cusumano, E. 2015. The scope of military privatization: Military role conceptions and contractor support in the United States and the United Kingdom. *International Relations* 29(2): 219–241.**

The article introduces different "military role conceptions" in the US and UK to explain diverging patterns of outsourcing military functions to Private Military and Security Companies.

**Gottwald, J.-C., & Duggan, N. 2011. Hesitant adaptation: China's new role in global policies. In Role theory in international relations: Approaches and analyses. Edited by Sebastian Harnisch, Cornelia Frank, and Hanns W. Maull. 234-251. London: Routledge.**

This chapter argues that PRC's Africa policy in the period of China's rise is characterized by an adaptation of its historical role conception as "leading developing country" to that of a "responsible care taker".

**Hansel, M. and Möller, M. 2015. Indian Foreign Policy and International Humanitarian Norms: A Role-Theoretical Analysis. Asian Politics & Policy 7 (1): 79–104.**

Applying role theory for the first time to Indian foreign policy, the article traces Inter- and Intra-role conflicts between salient role conceptions held by the Indian foreign policy elite and shows how decision makers have tried to mitigate and to evade conflicting role expectations.

**Harnisch, S. et al. 2015. China's International Roles. Challenging or supporting international order? New York, London: Routledge.**

This edited volume presents a systematic account of Changes in China's roles and the mechanisms of role change, covering role-identity interaction, as well as the PRC's role behavior in a set of global and regional contexts.

**Harnisch, S. and Friedrichs, G. 2017. Alliances Rebalanced? The Social Meaning of the U.S. Pivot and Allies' Responses in Northeast Asia. Korean Journal of International Studies, 15(1): 1-39.**

Focusing on foreign policy role taking and its structural effects, the article argues that the structural impact United States Pivot to Asia hinges as much on the role taking the US's allies, Japan and South Korea, as on US-China role interaction.

**Hermann, M. 1987. Assessing the Foreign Policy Orientation of Sub-Saharan African Leaders, In Role theory and foreign policy analysis. Edited by Stephen G. Walker. 161-198. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.**

This chapter investigates the nexus between individual leadership traits and national role conceptions for twelve Sub-Saharan leaders through content analysis of their foreign policy speeches.

**Kirste, K. 1998. Role Theory and Foreign Policy Analysis. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.**

This monograph first establishes the role ideal type Civilian power to analyze German Foreign policy after unification and then identifies ego and alter expectations in case studies on Germany's trade (1985-1992), security (1990-1992) and unification policy (1990-1991).

**Keane, C. and Wood, S., 2016. Bureaucratic Politics, Role Conflict, and the Internal Dynamics of US Provincial Reconstruction Teams in Afghanistan. *Armed Forces & Society*, 42(1): 99–118.**

Merging role theory and bureaucratic politics approaches, the article traces role conflicts in US Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) back to competing organizational cultures with divergent role conceptions.

**Lahneman, W. J. 2003. Changing Power Cycles and Foreign Policy Role-power Realignment: Asia, Europe and North America. *International Political Science Review* 24: 97–111.**

Based on power cycle theory, this article traces “power-role gaps” of Asian, European and Northern American states back to inertia in adjusting roles and responsibilities by states rising or declining from their respective social position.

**Lerch, M. 2004. Human rights and European Foreign Policy: a constructivist analysis. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.**

Critically examining the EU’s role behavior in the field of human rights through a role theoretical lens, this study finds different patterns of role conflict concerning the abolition of death sentence and employment rights.

**Michalski, A. and Pan, Z. 2017. Role Dynamics in a Structured Relationship: The EU–China Strategic Partnership. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 55(3): 611–627.**

The article conceptualizes strategic partnerships as arenas (structures) of role interaction processes, identifying role change through interaction in four historical episodes of EU-China relations.

**Venneson, P., F. Breuer, C. de Franco and U. C. Schroeder. 2009. Is There a European Way of War? Role Conceptions, Organizational Frames, and the Utility of Force. *Armed Forces and Society* 35(4): 628–645.**

Examining role conceptions and organizational frames of the armed forces in France, Germany, Italy, and the United Kingdom since the early 1990s, the article holds that these shape both national conceptions of force employment and limit common European ones.

**Wehner, L. E. 2015. Role expectations as foreign policy: South American secondary powers' expectations of Brazil as a regional power. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 11 (4): 435-455.**

The article assesses the importance of role ascriptions by secondary Latin American states, Argentina, Chile, and Venezuela, for the role taking of Brazil as a regional power striving for global recognition.

## 2.4 Role conflict

Role conflict has meant different things to different generations of role researchers: whereas sociological studies in the 1960s and 1970s focused upon the capacity of actors to fulfil external (structural) expectations one or several roles with limited resources to do so, resulting in “role strain” (Goode 1960). Follow-up studies, thus, centered on a variety of “coping strategies” how to reduce the gap between role expectations and role performance (see also Rosenau 1987; Cronin 2001). In the 1980s and 1990s, then, FPA role analyses foregrounded that most states featured more than one role, as only novice states possessed few roles, while established or great powers achieved a much larger number of international roles. It followed that these latter states regularly faced several divergent role expectations, requiring parallel and/or contradictory role enactments (Barnett 1993; Tewes 1998). The resulting Inter-role conflict between expectations of two or more roles from one national role set (e.g. Karim 2017; Nilsson 2015; Pfeil 2001), however, should be distinguished from an Intra-Role conflict in which divergent expectations towards one single role clash with each other (Kaarbo/Cantir 2013; Wehner 2016), resulting in conflicting signals as to how that role should be enacted (Thies 2010: 6339, see above).

**Barnett, M. 1993. *Institutions, Roles, and Disorder: The Case of the Arab State System*, *International Studies Quarterly* 37: 3, 271-296.**

This early role theoretical article traces Inter-role conflicts in Arab States’ foreign policies, emanating from diverging sovereign state and Pan-Arabic role expectations.

**Bengtsson, R. and Elgström, O. 2012: *Conflicting Role Conceptions? The European Union in Global Politics*. *Foreign Policy Analysis* 8: 93–108.**

Analyzing the EU’s relations with Eastern Europe (including Russia), and the African-Caribbean-Pacific State (ACP) community, the article holds that tensions between the EU’s self-perception and those of its counter-parts account for the variant patterns of interaction.

**Cronin, B. 2001: *The Paradox of Hegemony: America’s Ambiguous relationship with the United Nations*, *European Journal of International Relations* 7: 1, 103-130.**

The article traces an Inter-role conflict in US foreign policy between diverging (parochial) hegemonic power and (socially shared) great power expectations vis-à-vis the United States, resulting in a “paradox of hegemony”.

**Goode, W. J. 1960: *A Theory of Role Strain*, *American Sociological Review* 25, 483-496.**

An early conceptual article, defining Inter-role conflicts and outlining different coping strategies.

**Kaarbo, J. and Cantir, C. 2013. Role conflict in recent wars: Danish and Dutch debates over Iraq and Afghanistan. *Cooperation and Conflict* 48 (4): 465–483.**

Comparative analysis of Danish and Dutch involvement in Afghanistan, foregrounding the impact of domestic politics on role conflicts that shape respective role taking behavior.

**Karim, M. F. 2017. Role conflict and the limits of state identity: the case of Indonesia in democracy promotion. *The Pacific Review*, 30(3): 385–404.**

This article argues that Indonesia's role as a democracy promoter has been hindered by inter-role conflicts, arising from its enactment of multiple roles, such as regional leader and bridge-builder.

**Nilsson, N. 2015. *Beacon of Liberty. Role Conceptions, Crises and Stability in Georgia's Foreign Policy, 2004-2012*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.**

In this monograph, the author develops an explanatory model for role crisis management and applies it to Georgian foreign policy and particularly the crisis episode in 2007/2008, arguing that stability in Georgia's national role conceptions stemmed from its close relationship with the United States and its capacity to adjust conflicting role expectations.

**Pfeil, F. 2001. *Civilian Power and Human Rights: the case of Germany*. In: *Germany as a Civilian Power. The Foreign Policy of the Berlin Republic*. Edited by Sebastian Harnisch and Hanns W. Maull. 88-105. Manchester: Manchester University Press.**

This chapter employs the ideal type role concept civilian power to Germany's human rights policy, finding substantial respective role commitment in self-obligation, standard-setting, and institution-building but conflicting commercial and security role elements in several cases.

**Rosenau, J. N. 1987. *Roles and Role Scenarios in Foreign Policy*, in: *Role Theory and Foreign Policy Analyses*. Edited by Stephen G. Walker. 44-65. Durham, Duke University Pr.**

Foregrounding role conflicts for decision makers emanating from expectations out of their private, governmental and larger societal environment, the author argues that these individuals develop role scenarios to help them choose between several roles.

**Tewes, H. 1998. *Between Deepening and Widening: Role Conflict in Germany's Enlargement Policy*, *West European Politics* 21: 2, 117-133.**

The end of the Cold War transformed external expectations towards Germany's international role, resulting in Eastern European cues to advocate the EU's eastern enlargement and existing Western European expectations for further deepening.

**Wehner, L. E. 2016. Inter-role conflict, role strain and role play in Chile's relationship with Brazil. *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, 35 (1): 64-77.**

The article explores role conflicts in Chile's interaction with Brazil, focusing on disparities and overlaps between Chile's different roles and Brazil's role ascriptions towards Chile.

## **2.5 Role Contestation**

Recent work on domestic role contestation has begun to consider domestic institutional constraints as factors in the role formulation process. The goal of this literature is to carefully theorize and empirically document the causal pathways by which ego role expectations by, and within, government occur and are challenged by formal or informal veto players. Following Cantir and Kaarbo (2012), this literature has been distinguishing horizontal contestation – the contestation of roles and their prioritization among governmental actors including small leadership groups, government-opposition relations, intra-governing coalition and between governmental bureaucracies – and vertical contestation – challenges to governmental role concepts by societal actors. Mechanisms identified in the contestation literature include referenda and elections, (in vertical contestation processes) and intra-party dissent, role entrepreneurship and intra-coalition cleavages (in horizontal contestations) (Kaarbo and Cantir 2016).

**Brummer, K. and Thies, C. G. 2015. The Contested Selection of National Role Conceptions. *Foreign Policy Analysis* 11 (3): 273–293.**

The article develops a model for role contestation and role selection and applies to early Post-WWII German foreign policy episodes, finding substantial government/opposition dynamics and less evidence of bureaucratic politics.

**Cantir, C. and Kaarbo, J. 2012. Contested Roles and Domestic Politics: Reflections on Role Theory in Foreign Policy Analysis and IR Theory. *Foreign Policy Analysis* 8: 5–24.**

A systematic conceptualization of domestic role contestation in democratic states, foregrounding horizontal contestations (between governmental actors) and vertical contestation (in state-society relations).

**Cantir, C. and Kaarbo, J. 2016. Domestic Role Contestation, Foreign Policy, and International Relations. New York: Routledge.**

This edited volume presents the first comprehensive application of domestic role contestation analysis over a wide variety of FPA approaches and different state actors, finding that vertical and horizontal role contestations regularly occur over a wide variety of cases, with role entrepreneurs appearing more often in systems with executive dominance.

**Keane, C. and Wood, S. 2016. Bureaucratic Politics, Role Conflict, and the Internal Dynamics of US Provincial Reconstruction Teams in Afghanistan. *Armed Forces & Society*, 42(1): 99–118.**

Merging role theory and bureaucratic politics approaches, the article traces role conflicts in US Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) back to competing organizational cultures with divergent role conceptions.

**Jones, E. 2017. “Sellout” Ministries and Jingoists: China’s Bureaucratic Institutions and the Evolution of Contested National Role Conceptions in the South China Sea. *Foreign Policy Analysis* 13 (2): 361-379.**

This article applies the role-bureaucratic politics nexus to an autocratic state, arguing that inter-bureaucratic contestation accounts for China’s diverse role behavior in the South China Sea territorial disputes between 1979 and 1992.

**Kaarbo, J. and Cantir, C. 2016. Agents in Structures. Insights from Cases of Internal Role contestation. In: *Domestic Role Contestation, Foreign Policy, and International Relations*. Edited by Christian Cantir and Juliet Kaarbo. 174-192. New York: Routledge.**

This chapter summarizes the findings of the first major edited volume on vertical and horizontal role contestation processes for a selected number of democratic countries.

## **2.6 Role change and learning**

Whereas role change is typically thought of as also involving role adaptation – i.e. changes in the strategies and instruments in performing a role – role learning regularly includes a change of beliefs or the development of new beliefs (Harnisch 2011: 10). The former – role adaptation - can take the form of imitation or emulation (see also Jönsson 1982, see above) but the latter, at least in its complex form, involves a transformation of the constitutive parts of the Self, and thus the role.

**Grossman, M. 2005. Role Theory and Foreign Policy Change: The Transformation of Russian Foreign Policy in the 1990s. *International Politics* 42: 334–351.**

The article examines shifts in Russian elite national role conceptions and establishes congruence between these expectations and changes in respective role behavior.

**Harnisch, S. 2012. Conceptualizing in the Minefield: Role Theory and Foreign Policy Learning. *Foreign Policy Analysis* 8: 47- 71.**



Based on Meadian symbolic interactionism, the article explores different modes of role taking to complement them with “role making”, the result of individual and organizational learning processes.

**Harnisch, S. 2011. Operationalization of key concepts. In: Role Theory in International Relations: Approaches and analyses. Edited by Sebastian Harnisch, Cornelia Frank and Hans W. Maull. 7–15. New York: Routledge.**

This text deals with the definition and operationalization of key concepts for role theory, such as: roles, role expectations, role conceptions, role enactment and role change among others.

**Naarajärvi, T. 2017. Constructing the Role of a Great Power. China's peripheral relations, Territorial Disputes and Role Change, 2002–2012. Ph.D. dissertation, Helsinki University**

This monograph examines China's role behavior as a Great Power in its relations with Central Asia, Southeast Asia and Japan, finding that China learned to be a Great Power in the former, adapted its Great power role in the latter and tried to altercast Japan unsuccessfully into a commensurate role.

**Turner, R. H. 1990. Role Change. American Review of Sociology 16: 87–110.**

The article outlines major avenues for role change on the micro- and meso-level (individual and family), presents conditions leading to the abortion of potential role change and generates a tentative general model of role change.

## **2.7 Role and Identity**

Being still in many respects in its infancy, the literature has only slowly differentiated between some core concepts, among these are roles and identities. Most common is the simple equation of the two concepts. But more recently, McCourt 2011, 2012 and Harnisch 2014, 2015, see below have tried to delimit the two terms while keeping a conceptual nexus to discern their dynamic relationship. Harnisch 2014 distinguishes their temporal, functional and relational dimension, arguing that identities are stable self-conceptualizations over time vis-à-vis other actor that are meant to stabilize an actor's agency in a community. In contrast, international roles are temporary social positions to facilitate coordinated action within a group of actors. It follows that roles are meant to stabilize social relationships (structures) rather than agency.

**Flockhart, T. 2011. NATO and the (re-)constitution of roles: "self", "we" and "other"? In: Role Theory in International Relations. Edited by Sebastian Harnisch, Cornelia Frank and Hans W. Maull. 95-112. New York: Routledge.**

The chapter argues that NATO, as a mature and complex organization, features several roles, which have been renegotiated among its members and with other outside actors, resulting in a “constructive ambiguity” about NATO’s self-identification.

**Harnisch, S. 2014. Full-spectrum role-taking: A two-level role theoretical model. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the International Studies Association 2014, Toronto, Canada. 26-30 March 2014.**

The paper develops an interactionist role theory model, integrating domestic and international role-taking. The model locates the role resources for external role-taking in the domestic realm where the role-taking/making by the executive must coincide with commensurate counter-role taking by the legislature, citizenry and additional “significant others”.

**McCourt, D. 2011. Role-playing and identity affirmation in international politics: Britain’s reinvasion of the Falklands, 1982. Review of International Studies 37: 1599–1621.**

In this article, McCourt purports that because roles give meaning to a state’s social identity, a role theoretical explanation of Britain’s intervention in the Falklands can better account for the respective behavior and legitimizing narrative.

**McCourt, D. 2012. The Roles States Play: a Meadian Interactionist Approach. Journal of International Relations and Development 13 (3): 370–392.**

A conceptual article based on Meadian symbolic interactionism, delimiting first international roles from state identities, and then establishing roles as sets of appropriate behavior within social groups that are both meaning-creating and identity-reaffirming.

**Nabers, D. 2011. Identity and role change in international politics. In: Role Theory in International Relations: Approaches and analyses. Edited by: Sebastian Harnisch, Cornelia Frank und Hans W. Maull. 74-92. New York: Routledge.**

Drawing on the Essex School of Discourse theory, this chapter presents a post-structuralist model of political leadership, linking identity and role change.

## **2.8 Roles and Historical-Self-Identification**

Based on symbolic interactionism, today’s foreign policy roles are not conceived as determined by past experiences but rather that past roles are re-evoked through current self-identification processes with current and historical others (Flaherty and Fine 2001) . As G. H. Mead concluded: “The past must be found in the present world” (Mead 1934: 116).

**Benes, V. and Harnisch, S. 2015. Role theory in symbolic interactionism: Czech Republic, Germany and the EU. *Cooperation and Conflict* 50 (1): 146–165.**

The article challenges the literature on norm diffusion and Europeanization, arguing that historical self-identifications explain the major differences between German and Czech institutionalization policies for the EU.

**Flaherty, M. and Fine, G. A. 2001. Present, Past, and Future. Conjugating George Herbert Mead's perspective on time, in: *Time & Society* 10:2/3, 147–161.**

Conceptual article, outlining George H. Mead's philosophy of temporality and tracing its impact on different social theories of time.

**Frank, C. 2011. Comparing Germany's and Poland's ESDPs. Roles, path dependencies, learning, and socialization. In: *Role Theory in International Relations: Approaches and analyses*. Edited by: Sebastian Harnisch, Cornelia Frank und Hans W. Maull. 131-146. New York: Routledge.**

The article traces Poland's and Germany's approach towards the EU's Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) back to a reflexive historical commitment to sovereignty of the former and a reflexive commitment to institution building of the latter.

**Han, D. G. X. 2017. Malaysian Foreign Policy Toward Singapore From Mahathir to Badawi and Najib: A Role Theory Assessment. *Asian Politics & Policy* 9(2): 289–309.**

The article traces bilateral conflict between Malaysia and Singapore back to diverging historical self-identifications in Malaysia's national role conceptions from Mahathir to Abdullah Badawi and Najib Razak.

**Harnisch, S. 2015. China's International Role and its 'historical self'. In: *China's International Roles*. Edited by Sebastian Harnisch and Sebastian Bersick and Jörn-Carsten Gottwald, 38-58. London: Routledge.**

This chapter situates current Chinese role taking and making as instances of both positive and negative self-identification with its historical self as a victim of foreign humiliation and more recently as a successful emerging country.

**Mead, G. H. 1934. *Mind, Self, and Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.**

The foundational text of symbolic interactionist role theory, focusing on the process of self-identification through inaction between the individual and various significant others.

## **2.9 Roles and Socialization**

Socialization has re-entered the study of international relations and foreign policy due to former communist countries joining Western institutions after the end of the Cold War. Conceptually, socialization studies tackle three main questions. Who socializes whom? What kind of content is being socialized? And how can we observe a socialization process? While Thies (2016) provides a helpful survey of the literature, there is no consolidated conceptual and empirical assessment of the socialization literature. The following books and articles represent the diversity of choices made by scholars about who socializes whom for what purposes.

**Baumann, M.-O. 2014. *Humanitarian Intervention: Structural Shift in International Politics through State Intervention*. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlag.**

This monograph develops a symbolic interactionist two-way socialization role theoretical model to explain North-South cooperation in five cases of humanitarian intervention.

**Folz, R. 2012. *Germany, Sweden, and the Shift in European Security Policy from 1945 until 2010*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.**

This monograph develops a framework to integrate elements of socialization studies into role theory through systematically probing alter expectations for Swedish and German security policy since the end of World War II.

**Thies, C. G. 2012. *International Socialization Processes v. Israeli National Role Conceptions: Can Role Theory Integrate IR Theory and Foreign Policy Analysis?* *Foreign Policy Analysis* 8: 25-46.**

The article presents a socialization “game” as based on cognitive dissonance theory and the role location process to better understand how states are socialized into and out of roles vis-à-vis their dominant socializers over time. The model is then applied to early Israeli history (1948-1956) to explain its adoption or failure to adopt key national role conceptions.

**Thies, C. G. 2010. *State Socialization and Structural Realism*. *Security Studies* 19: 689–717.**

Using role theory, the article revises Waltz’s socialization approach and applies it to the case of the early United States.

**Thies, C. G. 2016. *Political Learning and Socialization*. In *Oxford Bibliographies in International Relations*. Edited by: Patrick James. New York: Oxford University Press. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/obo/9780199743292-0142>**

This bibliographical essay delimits socialization from learning processes, systematizes different socialization approaches and tackles several dimensions of the pertinent literature.

## 2.10 Role composites

Originally, Kalevi Holsti (1970, see above) inductively identified a set of 17 different roles by analyzing Foreign Policy leader statements from 71 states. The distinct mix of some or many of these 17 roles were called “national role conceptions” or NRCs by role researchers (e.g. Krotz 2002). Starting with Jönsson (1982), role theoreticians then began to tag a composition of roles as recurrent social positions in international societies, i.e. Superpowers, Great Powers, Small States etc (see e.g. Gigueux 2016). In a related theoretical move, Thies (2013) has argued that states pursuing such role compositions may occupy one of four master statuses in an international system in which they are socialized by primary states. A second strand of research started to work on “idealtypic role composites”. Already in the early 1970s, Francois Duchene developed the concept of European Community as a “Civilian Power”, suggesting that the EC, because of its limited competences delegated by its member states, was constrained in its foreign affairs (for a rebuttal Bull 1982). Based on Duchene (and Norbert Elias) Hanns Maull set Japan and Germany apart as “Civilian Powers”, arguing that a peculiar division of labor with the United States allowed them to resort to primarily peaceful and economic means in their foreign relations (Maull 1990/1991).

**Bull, Hedley 1982. Civilian Power Europe: A Contradiction in Terms? In: Journal of Common Market Studies 21(2): 149-64.**

In this rebuttal, Hedley Bull argues that the European Community not only lacks agency but will also need much more military capable nation states to be able to act responsibly on the world scene.

**Duchêne, François. 1973. The Role of Europe in the World System: From Regional to World Interdependence. In: Zivilmacht Europa – Supermacht oder Partner? Edited by: Max Kohnstamm and Wolfgang Hager. 11-35. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp,**

A close confidant of Jean Monnet, Duchêne purports that the internal setting of the European Community translates into a Civilian Power behavioral profile.

**Gigueux, V. 2016. Explaining the diversity of small states' foreign policies through role theory. Third World Thematics: A TWQ Journal 1(1): 27–45.**

In this article, the author challenges the realist notion that all small states behave similarly, because of their lack of resources, finding that divergent national role conception account for much of the differences.

**Holsti, K. 1970. National role conceptions in the study of foreign policy. *International Studies Quarterly*, 14, 233–309.**

The foundational text of FPA role studies analyzes hundreds of foreign policy statements to identify seventeen different roles inductively that were prevalent in state behavior between 1965-1967.

**Jönsson, C. 1982. Superpower. Comparing United States and Soviet Foreign Policy, New York: Frances Pinter.**

Very early conceptual studies that trace instances of role transfer between the United States and the Soviet Union in three policy areas, finding substantial evidence that the SU imitated US role behavior.

**Krotz, U. 2002. National Role Conceptions and Foreign Policies: France and Germany Compared. Cambridge, MA. Program for the Study of Germany and Europe Working Paper 02.1. Minda de Ginzburg Center for European Studies, Harvard University.**

One of the first comparative analysis of “national role conceptions” (NRC) as based on Holsti’s originally ego-centered role approach.

**Mauil, H. W. 1990/1991. Germany and Japan: The New Civilian Powers. *Foreign Affairs* 69(5): 91-106.**

The article suggests that benevolent leadership by the United States since World War II has enabled Germany and Japan to develop distinct patterns of foreign policy behavior (Civilian Power) based on economic and peaceful means.

**Thies, C. G. 2013. The United States, Israel and the Search for International Order: Socializing States. New York: Routledge.**

Based on Kenneth Waltz theory of international politics, this monographs devises a “socialization game” by which states are altercasted into four distinct structural positions, called master statuses (novice states, small member states, major member states, great power) by primary socializing states.

Leadership roles have been addressed by role theoreticians since the days of Kalevi Holsti (1970: 250-251, see above) and research has firmly established that leadership roles, and their effectiveness, hinge on the degree of followership they can attract (Cooper/Higgott/Nossal 1991: 395). Only recently, however, Harnisch 2014 has begun to systematize leadership as role composites, consisting of a mediator, representative and agenda setter role.

**Cooper, A. F., Higgott, R. A. and Nossal, K. R. 1991. Bound to Follow? Leadership and Followership in the Gulf Conflict, in: Political Science Quarterly 106(3): 391-410.**

The article dissects the leader-follower relationship between the United States and its allies during the 1990/1991 military campaign to liberate Kuwait from Iraqi occupation.

**Eckersley, R. 2016. National identities, international roles, and the legitimization of climate leadership: Germany and Norway compared. Environmental Politics, 25(1):180-201.**

The article examines functional leadership in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) by two countries, Germany and Norway, arguing that common but also differentiated international role conceptions underpin their respective leadership behavior.

**Harnisch, S. 2014. German Leadership in the International Community: a role-theoretical analysis. In: Deutsche Außenpolitik und internationale Führung: Edited by: Sebastian Harnisch and Joachim Schild. 17-55. Baden-Baden: Nomos.**

This conceptual and empirical chapter first delimits leadership as an international role from concepts such as hegemony, status and authority and then applies a revised leadership role concept to Germany's policy during the Eurozone crisis (2010-2014).

**Mauil, H. W. 2011. Hegemony reconstructed? America's role conception and its leadership within its core alliances. In: Role Theory in International Relations: Approaches and analyses. Edited by: Cornelia Frank, Hans W. Mauil and Sebastian Harnisch. 176-193. New York: Routledge.**

The chapter takes stock of external expectation in two of the US' core alliances in East Asia and Europe, US-Japan bilateral security treaty and NATO – towards the US leadership role, concluding commensurate counter-role taking leaves US leadership on shaky grounds.

### **3. Roles and Methodology**

As there is not one Foreign policy role theory, but many different approaches, which share common concepts and assumptions, role theoreticians have used a broad and changing variety of methods. Holsti's foundational study (1970, see above), which coded decision-maker

statements of their country's position in the world, identified seventeen different roles and showed that many leaders ascribed several roles at the same time. Holsti, however did not examine the nexus between role expectation and behavior. Subsequently, a host of studies used Holsti's inductively derived roles to identify role changes and gaps between role expectations and behavior through content analysis and case studies (e.g. the studies in Walker 1987, by Gaupp 1983, see above, or in Le Prestre 1997, see above).

Using a mixed method, in between deducting ideal-type categories from Norbert Elias' "theory of the civilizational process" and induction from German and Japanese foreign policy statements, Maull and Kirste (1996, see above) and Kirste (1998) developed a set of categories to identify ideal-type civilian powers through a combination of content analysis and case-studies based on process-tracing (see also Harnisch and Maull 2001, above). More recently, Wehner and Thies (2014) have used an interpretive method in combination with case study to compare role concepts and behavior for two Latin American countries and Brommesson and Ekengren (2017) use quantitative content analysis and case studies to gauge the effects of Mediatization for Humanitarian Intervention behavior in two cases (Côte d'Ivoire and Libya) for three countries (UK, Sweden and Finland).

In contrast, Walker (2013, see above, 2017) and Maliki and Walker (2017) as well as Thies (2013, see above) have used formal models and game theoretical models (e.g. in the form of decision trees, with binary choices at several successive choice points) to examine strategies or role evolution and role transition over time. Thies and Nieman (2017), then, use a mix of qualitative methods to identify national role conceptions and qualitative methods to explore changes in emerging power's conflict behavior during militarized interstate conflicts.

### 3.1 Roles, Content analysis and interpretive approaches

**Brommesson, Douglas and Ekengren, Ann-Marie 2017. *The Mediatization of Foreign Policy, Political Decision-Making, and Humanitarian Intervention*, Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan**

A comparative study (UK, Finland, Sweden) on the effects of mediatization for foreign policy role taking in the field of humanitarian intervention, employing a mix of quantitative content analysis and case studies. The authors find considerable differences in respective national media representation and subsequent intervention behavior in Côte d'Ivoire and Libya.

**Kirste, K. 1998. *Role Theory and Foreign Policy Analysis*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.**

This monograph first establishes the role ideal type Civilian power to analyze German Foreign policy after unification and then identifies ego and alter expectations in case studies on Germany's trade (1985-1992), security (1990-1992) and unification policy (1990-1991).



**Kirste, Knut and Maull, Hanns W. 1996: Civilian Power and Role Theory. *Zeitschrift für Internationale Beziehungen* 3 (2): 283-212.**

Conceptual article, developing roles as sets of expectations of ego and alter and civilian power as an ideal type role conception.

**Le Preste, P. G. (ed.). 1997. *Role Quests in the Post-Cold War Era: Foreign Policies in Transition*. Quebec: McGill-Queen's Press.**

Substantial edited volume examining the nature, evolution and origins of role conceptions of the United States, the Soviet Union/Russia, China, Japan, Germany, France, the United Kingdom, and Canada, tracing major changes in national role conceptions.

**Walker, S.G. (ed.). 1987. *Role theory and foreign policy analysis*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.**

This book is the first comprehensive and systematic account of role theoretical studies on the individual, bureaucratic and state level, presenting conceptual, methodological, theoretical and empirical advances until the 1980s.

**Wehner, Leslie E. and Thies, Cameron. 2014. *Role Theory, Narratives, and Interpretation: The Domestic Contestation of Roles*. *International Studies Review* 16(3): 1-26.**

This article employs an interpretive approach to role analysis, tracing Chile's and Mexico's attempts to join the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), their accession process to APEC, and their respective performance once accepted into APEC.

### 3.2 Binary role theory and game theory models

**Malici, A. and Walker, S. 2017. *Role Theory and Role Conflict in U.S.-Iran Relations Enemies of Our Own Making*, New York: Routledge.**

This monograph examines three critical episodes of US-Iran relations, the oil nationalization crisis and the ensuing clandestine coup aided by the CIA to overthrow the Iranian regime in 1950 to 1953; the Iranian revolution followed by the hostage crisis in 1979 to 1981; the reformist years pre- and post- 9/11 under Mohammad Khatami from 1997 to 2002, employing the Power-Identity-National Interest (PIN) formal model of role enactment.

**Thies, C., & Nieman, M. 2017. *Rising powers and foreign policy revisionism: Understanding BRICS identity and behavior through time*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.**

In this monograph, the authors use a sophisticated mix of qualitative and quantitative methods to capture systemic pressures of competition and socialization and how they impact upon emerging powers role transition.

**Walker, S. G. 2017. Role Theory as an Empirical Theory of International Relations: From Metaphor to Formal Model, Oxford Research Bibliographies on Politics.**

A careful and recent review of role theoretical works with a special emphasis on formal and game theoretical models.