Constructivist Approach in Foreign Policy and in International Relations

Isa Erbas

¹ PhD, Beder University, Tirana, Albania.
Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr. Arburim Iseni, Department of English
Language and Literature, State University of Tetova, North Macedonia, Email: arburim.iseni@unite.edu.mk

Abstract

This study covers the theoretical background and tools of the constructivist approach in the foreign policy and in the international Relations. In this study, the constructivism approach is defined and it is explained how the constructivism is used in the foreign policy and international relations analysis. Scholars claim, constructivism in the foreign policy, and in the international relations, emphasizes the significance of norms and ideas, which is in the nation's collective consciousness, associated with conceptions of national identity, and in the foreign policy context, norms and ideas are best thought of national identity. Constructivism scholars recognize the material world as existing independently, they also claim that through foreign policy state interact with each other, and then they socialize with each other. Because of this interaction, they gain their identity. The intermediate category of ideas, general attitudes and frames connects the core values of national identity to the causal ideas that shape policy choices. The process of national identity construction cannot be detached from the socio-political setting in which it takes place. In this study, special attention is given to the identity, collective identity, political identity, state identity, national identity and national interests. For the foreign policy and international relations as social constructivism claims, the identity and interests of actors are very vital for the states. Apart from interests, constructivists consider the mutual constitution of agents and structures, or structuration, to be part of constructivism's ontology. Activities, relations and interactions are very important between agents and structures; as a result, through these activities, states can understand each other and they can build and shape their identities.

Keywords: foreign policy, international relations, interests, identity, constructivism.

Introduction

This study mainly gives the theoretical background of the constructivist approach; it defines the constructivism and explains how the constructivism approach is used in the foreign policy analysis. Constructivism scholars recognize the material world as existing independently, they also claim that through foreign policy state interact with each other, and then they socialize with each other. Because of this interaction, they gain their identity. In this study, special attention will be given to the state identity, national identity and national interests, which is very important regarding the foreign policy. Scholars claim, constructivism in the foreign policy, emphasizes the significance of norms and ideas, which is in the nation's collective consciousness, associated with conceptions of national identity, and in the foreign policy context, norms and ideas are best thought of national identity. As a result, national identity can be conceptualized as a basic worldview, combined with ideas about the type of national image a nation aspires to, as well as a sense of the values represented by the nation. The intermediate category of ideas, general attitudes and frames connects the core values of national identity to the causal ideas that shape policy choices.

The process of national identity construction cannot be detached from the socio-

political setting in which it takes place. For the foreign policy as social constructivism claims the identity and interests of actors are very vital. Apart from interests, constructivists consider the mutual constitution of agents and structures, or structuration, to be part of constructivism's ontology. Activities, relations and interactions are very important between agents and structures; as a result, through these activities, states can understand each other and they can build and shape their identities. As we acknowledge that structure is not only made of material capabilities, but it is also social relationships. These social relations are shared knowledge, shared understandings, shared opinions, expectations, relations, activities and interactions.

States will have interests for each other when they know each other and when they share their knowledge.

In order to analyze the foreign policy and international relations towards countries, the constructivist approach is important for the foreign policy and international relations, because this approach deals with identity, state identity, national identity, national interests, national security, and this constructivist approach is a peaceful tool to study the foreign policy and international relations. Therefore, constructivism in the foreign policy is united in this study. Constructivism teaches that, ideational factors do not operate in a vacuum but in the real world. In order to give meaning to the foreign policy constructivism approach should be engaged (Uzer, 2011, p.16). Constructivist approach also will be used to study internal and external identities and norms. The constructivists approach will help us find out how the foreign policy preferences and interests of a state are formulated. In the foreign policy analysis constructivist approach is a very important tool. Scott Burchill claims that, the rise of constructivism has sparked a renewed interest in international history (Scott Burchill, 2005,p.206). For this reason, according to Ruggie:

Constructivism concerns the issue of human consciousness: the role it plays in international relations, and the implications for the logic and methods of social inquiry of taking it seriously. Constructivists hold the view that the building blocks of international reality are ideational as well as material; that ideational

factors have normative as well as instrumental dimensions; that they express not only individual but also collective intentionality; and that the meaning and significance of ideational factors are not independent of time and place (Ruggie, 1998, p.33).

Constructivism seeks to find out how the past shapes the way actors understand their present situation and by its very nature it focuses on historical process and constructivism has trouble analyzing how rational, prudent leaders deal with the pernicious problem of future uncertainty (Leander, 2006, p.19).   Ruggie claims: Constructivists seek to push the empirical and explanatory domains of international relations theory beyond the analytical confines of neo realism and neoliberal institutionalism in all directions: by problematizing states' identities and interests; by broadening the array of ideational factors that affect international outcomes; by introducing the logically prior constitutive rules alongside regulative rules; and by including transformation as a normal feature of international politics that systemic theory should encompass even if its empirical occurrence is episodic and moves on a different time line from everyday life (Ruggie, 1998, p.27).

It is stated that the rise of constructivism has had several significant impacts on the development of international relations theory and analysis. Due to the work of constructivists, the social, historical and normative have returned to the centre stage of debate, especially within the American core of the discipline (Scott Burchill, 2005, p.205).

Methodology

The study maintains a qualitative research. The author supports the study using various authors and scholars`point of views and claims about the constructivist approch regarding the impact on foreign policy and international relations. In this study the constructivism is defined by different perspectives. In addition, the author underlines the values and importance of interactions among states regarding their identities.

Constructivism

Authors give variuos definitions to constructivism. Kukla defines constructivism as an idea which arises in the course of conducting and thinking about sociological investigations of science (Kukla, 2000, p.18). Kratochwil states: "The issue is not whether somebody says or

believes she or he is a constructivist, but whether or not such a (self)-identification makes sense in view of some of the tenets defining constructivism" (Kratochwil, 2011, p.166).

First, constructivism is centrally concerned with the role of ideas in constructing social life. Constructivism is not subjectivism or pure idealism. Instead, the emphasis on ideas is meant to oppose arguments about social life, which emphasize the role of brute material conditions like biology, geography and technology. Second, constructivism is concerned with showing the socially constructed nature of agents or subjects. Third, constructivism is based on a research strategy of methodological holism rather than methodological individualism (Handbook of International Relations, 2002, pp.75-76).

Constructivism in International Relations

The study of culture and international relations is closely identified with constructivism (Scott Burchill, 2005, p.210). What is the use of constructivism? "Constructivism may help us analyze the place of law in international politics, suggesting that it is more than simply a result of political contestation, but also has a feedback effect, shaping politics" (Thomas J. Biersteker, 2007, p.10).

Postmodernists think that, "constructivism is an epistemology as well as an ontology because theories quite literally construct the world" (Wendt, 1999, p.49). "Our belief is that constructivism enables scholars to overcome the realist-idealist divide and to contemplate the relationship between structures, defined in material and normative terms" (Barnett, 1998, p.437). "The international system is a hard case for constructivism on both the social and construction counts" (Wendt, 1999, p.2).

According to Katzenstein P. J.:

Constructivism's contribution is that it evokes the "context" effects of norms. It rejects the dichotomy of norms versus interests/material factors. Material factors by themselves are not all there is; their meaning depends on how they are interpreted (Katzenstein P. J., 1996, p.118).

Activities, relations and interactions are very important between agents and structures; because through these activities, states can understand each other and they can also build and shape their identities. It is also known that there is another element, which is media. States can interact, develop their relations through media. As we acknowledge that structure is not only made of material capabilities, but it is also social relationships. These social relations are shared knowledge, shared understandings, shared opinions, expectations, relations, activities and interactions. These are all united with each other. States will have interests for each other when they know each other and when they have shared knowledge. Through these activities, interactions and shared knowledge states can solve any problems or conflicts without a war. These things will all happen by following the constructivist approach.

According to Leander, Even Human beings, as constructivists emphasize, are mutable they can be changed through interaction (Leander, 2006, p.19).

Zehfuss argues that the significance of constructivism is established more easily than its identity. Constructivism as a phenomenon has become inescapable. Thus, constructivism is significant not only because it is considered central but also because of the possibility of deploying it strategically to exclude more radical perspectives from consideration. Through constructivism, there have not been any problems between domestic and international politics. "Constructivism breaks down the wall between domestic and international politics. Unlike other IR theories, constructivism accounts for the fact of globalization" (Thomas J. Biersteker, 2007, p.252).

Adler claims that "constructivism is the view that the manner in which the material world shapes and is shaped by human action and interaction depends on dynamic normative and epistemic interpretations of the material world" (Adler, 2005, p.90). Contrary to Adler, "constructivism is correctly seen as defined in part by opposition to materialism" (Handbook of International Relations, 2002, p.77). Constructivism is a social theory on which constructs theories of international politics. Constructivism can illuminate significant characters of international politics that were previously enigmatic and have crucial practical implications for international theory and empirical research (Adler, 2005, p.90).

"Social constructivism does not take the interests of actors for granted, but problematizes and relates the socialization of human rights norms them to the identities of actors" (Thomas Risse, 1999, p.8). Constructivists see the world as a project under construction, as becoming rather than being. Constructivism, which reached the

shores of IR in the 1980s, describes the dynamic, contingent and culturally based condition of the social world. It provides important implications for an understanding of knowledge, including scientific knowledge, and how to achieve it. (Handbook of International Relations, 2002, p.128).

In addition to idealism, a key feature of constructivism is holism or structuralism, the view that social structures have effects that cannot be reduced to agents and their interactions. Among these effects is the shaping of identities and interests, which are conditioned by discursive formations by the distribution of ideas in the system as well as by material forces, and as such are not formed in a vacuum (Wendt, 1999, p.139).

We have seen above that how the constructivism approach is understood and defined. It is also essential to know the purpose of constructivists approach. According to Adler, the main purpose of constructivism as to provide both theoretical and empirical explanations of social institutions and social change, with the help of the combined effect of agents and social structures (Adler, 2005, p.93). Lynch also claims that, constructivism seeks to understand mutual constitution of agents and structures (Lynch, 2007, p.26). For the foreign policy as social constructivism claims the identity and interests of actors are very essential (Ruggie, 1998 p.4). Apart from interests, constructivists consider the mutual constitution of agents and structures, or structuration, to be part of constructivism's ontology (Adler, 2005, p.10). Adler goes further that "constructivism takes community interests and individual interests as ontologically complementary" (Adler, 2005, p.12). Constructivism is generally associated with social changes, and unexpected implications for the possibility of change in international politics (Wendt, 1999, p.248). Bozdaglioglu argues that unlike domestic political systems, international systems are decentralized and hierarchic. For this reason, anarchy is the ordering principle of the system. In order to survive in world politics, foreign policy is very important for the states. "It is striking how anachronistic these characterizations seem today for foreign policy making in the industrialized parts of the world" (Ruggie, 1998, p.158).

According to Wendt academic students of international politics today as positivists think they can get closer to the truth about international politics, only if the methods are followed which have proven so successful in the natural sciences (Wendt, Dec.1998). That is why, in order to get the truth we have to follow the constructivists approach.

Kukla also supports Wendt stating that "constructivism about science involves the claim that social processes produce scientific facts" (Kukla, 2000, p.9).

There are various constructivistisms, such as: social constructivism, conventional constructivism, political constructivism etc. When we analyze the foreign policy towards the other states, we need to use all these constructivist approaches. Social constructivism seeks to account for what neo-utilitarianism assumes: the identity and interests of actors (Ruggie, 1998, p.4). Social constructivism more generally, is like that of game theory; it is analytically neutral with respect to conflict and cooperation. (Katzenstein P. J., 1996, p.11). A social constructivist approach is explicitly interested in the relationships among norms, interests, and outcomes but conceives of norms very differently from the way a rationalist account does (Katzenstein P. J., 1996, p.105). Ruggie claims that "the distinguishing feature of social constructivism is that it concerns itself with the nature, origins, and functioning of social facts, and what if any specific methodological requirements their study may entail" (Ruggie, 1998, p.13). The tradition of social constructivism, a perspective that promised a radical conceptualization of structure and causality in the social sciences was introduced to international relations theory at the end of the 1980s under the label 'constructivism' (McSweeney, 2004, p.127).

Conventional constructivism, which is the school dominant in the US, examines the role of norms and, in fewer cases, identity in shaping international political outcomes (Checkel, April 2004). Political constructivism is a theory that has developed comparatively which is cantered on a set of ideas primarily about the justification of principles of political justice, and so also about justifying political actions and institutions (Roberts, 2007, pp.1-4). Roberts goes further that, political constructivism is the argument that a political conception can be constructed which does not rely on, or assume the truth or falsity of, any particular comprehensive doctrine. He further claims that, political constructivism's subject has always been political, the basic structure of society, and constructivism was always conceived of as a response to the pluralism of foundational

claims (Roberts, 2007, p.82).

Constructivism also underlines collective identity and the variability of the constraints of anarchy as a consequence (McSweeney, 2004, p.122). It is known that constructivists deal extensively with metaphysics and social theories less for their own sake than because constructivism provides a firm basis for building better IR theories (Handbook of International Relations, 2002, p.127).

Constructivism is trendy and it brings fresh theoretical and disciplinary air to IR (Checkel, April 2004). Weber claims that the first point about constructivism is, it is a theory. It explains the ideas how they are constructed. In this concept, constructivism is a sort of historicism, a way of thinking that takes the origins and contexts of ideas as essential (Weber, 2010, p.88). Weber goes further that, constructivism is a position about the real that can be understood either metaphysically or epistemologically, since it is believed that the objects we come to know are themselves formed through a process of inquiry or deliberation (Weber, 2010, p.37). Bozdaglioglu argues that, despite the presence of various approaches within the constructivist research program, constructivists, in general, share the idea that international politics is not fully driven by material factors. Without denying the importance of material factors in the formulation of states' foreign policies, constructivists argue that, in the process, states' interests, and consequently their behaviours, are influenced by social and inter subjective factors such as norms, culture, ideas, and identity (Bozdaglioglu, 2003, p.22).

McKinnon compares constructivism with perfectionism and pragmatism. He states that the preferable alternative to perfectionism is constructivism. Because of its justificatory values constructivism is different from perfectionism, because it is indicated without reference to a true moral theory or faith, but rather through consideration of what has to be assumed about persons if they are to act at all: the values of constructivist political justification are ideas of practical reason. Constructivism is also different from pragmatism because the claim is not that justificatory values are vindicated in virtue of being shared by actual persons (McKinnon, 2002, p.26).

Wendt insists that for the success in international politics constructivist thinking is very important in IR, in order to shed interesting light on concrete problems of world politics must ultimately be the test of a method's worth (Wendt, 1999, p.4).

Identity in International Relations

In the foreign policy analysis constructivist approach focuses on identity such as: collective identity, political identity, national identity and state identity. Constructivism focuses especially on the relationship between interests and identities encompasses several competing approaches (Scott Burchill, 2005, p.26).

Bozdaglioglu states that, mutual construction is very important for identities and in order to hold and maintain for states a social identity requires acceptance and approval from others because identities are mutual constructions (Bozdaglioglu, 2003, pp.86-87). As it is stated by Leander that "Wendt's constructivism needs identity as a central concept but that this very concept threatens to undermine the possibility of his constructivism" (Leander, 2006, p.92). It is also claimed that identity theory, especially, is deeply contested, because it deals for scholars of national security directly and unavoidably pressing moral issues (Katzenstein P. J., 1996, p.4). According to Asano: "the concept of identity, whether it is of an ethnic or a religious community, on the other hand, loaded with emotion and spoken of in terms of material objects and manners of life" (Asano, 2005, p.34). In every country decision-makers' special sense of their own national history, identity and interests set the tone for the various patterns that are to characterize the aid discourses of countries during the ensuing decades (Veen, 2011, p.78). "The advent of the constructivist school has helped remedy this shortcoming by putting ideas and identity at the center of scholarly inquiry. The most fruitful line of inquiry entails examining how power, institutions, and ideas and identity together shape outcomes" (Kupchan, 2001, p.8). Barnett claims:

Most definitions of identity, as they say, begin with the understanding of oneself in relation to others. A political identity is an actor's experience of a shared social relation in which at least one of the parties including third parties is an individual or organization (Barnett, 1998, p.400).

Wendt argues that, the structures of human association are determined primarily by shared ideas rather than material forces. The identities and interests of purposive actors are constructed by these shared ideas rather than given by nature (Wendt, 1999, p.1). IR

constructivism deals with the role of identities, norms and causal understandings in the constitution of national interests (Handbook of International Relations, 2002, p.129).

According to Wendt, constructivists are interested in macro-level structures on identity and interests. In IR, constructivists analyze the causal effects of structure on identity and interests, which is neglected by individualists (Wendt, Social Theory of International Politics, 1999, p.212).

There are several ways that are important for identities. One of them is culture. Cultures are also important for identity because cultures shape individual identity (Smits, 2005, p.12). Smits goes further saying that identity was shaped by "national character" as well as class and social position (Smits, 2005, p.5). Notions of identity is related to belonging to asocial group (Alistair Scott, May, 2004, p.8).

Identity politics have given a sharper and often destructive twist to struggles for cultural recognition (Loescher, 2011, p.99). The significance of identity will provide principles fit to preserve cultural contexts, which are necessary for the preservation of identity (McKinnon, 2002, p.11). According to Katzenstein identity is that people often come to identify with a group of others because people share common interests. An identity acts as a cultural frame that tells us who we are and how we ought to act (Katzenstein, 2009, p.138). For example, "social group requires being able to distinguish itself from others in ways that give it a relatively positive social identity" (Alistair Scott, May, 2004, p.26). Yurdusev argues that, identity, comes from its being with others, not just from others (Yurdusev, 2003, p.50). Another author describes identity as a central need of individuals but a need that can be met without conflict.

That identity often seems a source of conflict is misleading. He underlines that it is a use of state power to buttress an identity that creates conflict (Hilkermeier, 2004, p.65). Barnett argues:

Identities, in short, are not only personal or psychological, but are social, defined by the actor's interaction with and relationship to others; therefore, all political identities are contingent, dependent on the actor's interaction with others and place within an institutional context. It is mainly a social identity that generates a positive identification between peoples of members'

states (Barnett, 1998, p.47).

Internal and external factors play very significant roles in shaping identity. Thus, identity-based explanations require a better understanding of a state's preferences and interests, and consequently its foreign policy priorities. That is why implementing a certain foreign policy would require consent and consensus among various groups which are involved in identity and interest construction and which have different role identities (Bozdaglioglu, 2003, pp.23-24).

"What constructivism has to say on identity and national and transnational interests, and what it signifies for the rearrangement and mitigation of the sense of ''we'' and ''they'' in the context of security communities and human rights discourse.In the process, changing interests and values,as part of an evolving identity, transform the notion of national interest" (Wheeler, 2008, p.11).

As it is mentioned above, "the relation between identity and interests is probably best conceptualized as recursive, following the logic of structure and agency. Identity theory can be defined as the grounding of analysis in the causal potential of collective identity to the exclusion of material factors" (McSweeney, 2004, pp.127-128).

Identity is created through interaction between groups. That is why social identity theory is concerned both with the psychological and sociological aspects of group behavior (Alistair Scott, May, 2004, pp.22-23). States' identity and interests is relevant to their security and security policy (McSweeney, 2004, p.168). "Where the process is successful, the new identity and interests are not perceived as the sacrifice of self in favour of others, but as the realization of a different and superior conception of the national self and the national interest" (McSweeney, 2004, p.170).

Therefore, identity shapes a state' foreign policy preferences, interests and behavior. So, identity is very important for a person and for a state. For the foreign policy, firstly a state needs identity. Without identity a state cannot have sovereignty. State identity provides sovereignty for itself.

Collective Identity

Collective Identity is also one of the most important identities in the foreign policy analysis. Constructivists put much more stress on the significance of collective identity. Bozdaglioglu

describes collective identity as a systemic process which is another factor that plays a significant role in the emergence. Bozdaglioglu goes further saying strategic practice is the last factor that affects the emergence of collective identity (Bozdaglioglu, 2003, p.21). In the process of reproducing collective identity lies the key to the production and reproduction of security and security policy (McSweeney, 2004, p.12). Collective identity involves shared features, it is argued that not all type of identities are collective because not all involve identication (Wendt, Social Theory of International Politics, 1999, p.229).

According to McSweeney the collective identity is a process of state interaction with other states in the international arena that provides the school of learning by which collective identity, relevant to foreign policy (McSweeney, 2004, p.128). As Leander argues that ccollective identity begins to succeed in the interactions of states within a system, a tipping point will again be reached, and friendship will come to be seen as the attribute of the system itself (Leander, 2006, p.59). For these reasons, collective identity is very important for state relations. Wendt claims that "the constructivist model is saying that the boundaries of the Self are at stake in and therefore may change in interaction, so that in cooperating states can form a collective identity" (Wendt, Social Theory of International Politics, 1999, p.317).

According to Asano collective identity is still one step further from understanding. The process of this type of identification is found both in the core of communal culture, particular collectivity and in the aggregated society in which the group is located (Asano, 2005, p.37).

According to constructivists perspective, "collective identity that gives actors an interest in the preservation of their culture. Collective interests mean that actors make the welfare of the group an end in itself, which will in turn help them overcome the collective action problems that beset egoists" (Wendt, Social Theory of International Politics, 1999, p.337). As we have seen that collective identity is very essential in states interactions and relations.

Political Identity

Political identity is another type of identity in the foreign policy analysis. Political identity is also very important in foreign policy. For example, construction of identity suggests an engineering view of politics one that focuses on purposeful actors and their political choices (Katzenstein, 2009, p.3). "Deliberative democracy builds upon the claims of identity politics that groups be heard in the political process; as a democratic paradigm, it owes its appeal to the fact that it attempts to reconcile the speech claims of identity politics with a communitarian-inspired commitment to democratic community" (Smits, 2005, p.8).

Katzenstein argues that, political identity is a social and at the same time, it is a historical construct. As a social construct, it reflects the institutional nature of the political community and as a historical construct, its emergence and consolidation is bound up with historical contingencies. He continues underlying that, there is a significant functional element to political identity, and it plays an important role in sustaining citizens' allegiance and loyalty to their political community (Katzenstein, 2009, pp. 29-30).

National Identity

National identity is another factor in the foreign policy analysis. Katzenstein describes national identity "as one form of collective identity. National identity could be a source of conflict for groups in a society who did not think of themselves as belonging to the nation and, if the patterns of interaction became conflict, could result in some groups deciding to form a new or alternative nation" (Katzenstein, 2009, pp.135-136).

The importance of national identity in the foreign policy cannot be denied. According to Veen, constructivism emphasizes the significance of norms and ideas which is in the nation's collective consciousness, associated with conceptions of national identity and he also states that in the foreign policy context, norms and ideas are best thought of in terms of national identity (Veen, 2011, p.26). Veen goes further: "national identity can be conceptualized as a basic worldview, combined with ideas about the type of national image a nation aspires to, as well as a sense of the values represented by the nation. The intermediate category of ideas, general attitudes and frames connects the core values of national identity to the causal ideas that shape policy choices" (Veen, 2011, p.28). Geppert also claims that, the process of national identity construction cannot be detached from the socio-political setting in which it takes place (Geppert, 2011, p.347). The importance of national identity is never decreasing in foreign policy (Barnett, 1998, p.91).

The process of national identity construction is closely linked to Power (Geppert, 2011, p.350). McSweeney states that, identity can also be an instrument or weapon in the security policies of others as, for instance, in the stimulation of ethnic unrest for the purpose of destabilizing a foreign government, or in the instrumentality of national identity in the interests of the state (McSweeney, 2004, p.88). For this reason, national identity is a significant and essential element of the organizational actors' sense making processes (Geppert, 2011, p.371). According to Yurdusev, national identity has become the major social identification (Yurdusev, 2003, p.140). It is very important to understand national identity in a right way. National identity and national interests affect foreign policy in a positive way. Dawisha claims that if national identity emerges because of purposeful narrative, then it is necessary to comprehend properly when the narrative began, for its later development and contemporary impact has to have something to do with the intellectual, ideological, and political influence under which it emerged (Dawisha, 2003, p.16). Veen argues that:

Foreign policy is about national identity itself. National identity can be conceptualized as a basic worldview, combined with ideas about the type of national image a nation aspires to, as well as a sense of the values represented by the nation (Veen, 2011, pp.27-28).

Wheeler underlines the importance of identity. According to him, identity leads to special conceptions of the national interest; what the country cares about and what aspects of its ''collective self'' as a result of national interests, the polity attempts to achieve through global politics (Wheeler, 2008, p.153). National identity is a context-bound resource and some contexts are more fertile in providing various discourses around national identity than others (Geppert, 2011, p.375). Finally, the argument revolved around national identity, the definition of national interest, and the kind of political, economic, and social systems that states should adopt. In the course of these arguments, basic decisions regarding a state's foreign policy (defence and national security) became inextricably intertwined with the national identity of a state (Bozdaglioglu, 2003, p.7). So as a result national interests emerge from the national identity. National identity is a main factor in the international relations and foreign policy.

State Identity

State identity is another identity in the Foreign policy analysis. Coskun argues that one of the essential ways for states is to get a new identity or protect the previous one through foreign policy. Interactions with other states help a way for states get them accepted as a part of a certain international community and gain respect. Particularly during the process of identity formulation or reformulation, foreign policy is a key instrument decision makers use in order to realize their goals (Coskun, 2008).

State identity affects domestic political developments and foreign policy identity.

According to Leander, states do not form a conception of themselves only through interaction with other states, socialization processes internal to a state can change and shape state's identity and interests independently of such interactions (Leander, 2006, p.13).

As Bozdaglioglu claims that "any changes in the corporate identity of the state as a result of domestic political developments will eventually affect the identity formation at the systemic level where states will try to reorient their foreign policy preferences in accordance with the new identity" (Bozdaglioglu, 2003, pp.30-31).

Wendt claims that "much of the construction is at the domestic level, as Liberals have emphasized, and a complete theory of state identity needs to have a large domestic component" (Wendt, Social Theory of International Politics, 1999, p.24).

Contrary to Wendt, McSweeney claims that when it is focused only on the domestic arena, and if malleability of state identity is ignored through international negotiation then state identity is fixed and unproblematic (McSweeney, 2004, p.161).

International organizations are also very important concerning state identity. They are related to power, they support identity and interest formation. Sometimes states and individuals and other social actors can draw on their material and symbolic resources (Adler, 2005, p.102). While building of the European Community, the purpose has always been to reconstruct the identity of the state (McSweeney, 2004, p.132).

The community also becomes an essential source of state identity (Barnett, 1998, p.428). "The state's interests, and the identity of its people, can be exchangeable with those of the community, and the foreign policy of the state takes on a whole new meaning and purpose"

(Barnett, 1998, p.48). State build their identities before interacting with each other.

Coskun claims, "Constructivism assumes that as states interact with each other and then they gain an identity for themselves and also attach an identity to the others. However, the international aspect of state identity is only one part of the whole picture: there are also domestic factors defining what kind of entity a state may become" (Coskun, 2008).

With the development of constructivism in IR, the idea that interests are given and unchanging has been challenged by the claim that state identities and interests are constituted by norms, and that as these change in international society, new possibilities open up for action that were previously excluded (Thomas J. Biersteker, 2007, p.114).

According to Thomas J. Biersteker, it is argued that, once created, institutions develop an identity and power of their own, constraining state behavior even where states may wish to deviate from agreed rules (Thomas J. Biersteker, 2007, p.5). State identity is also essential for national security interests or policies of states. According to Katzenstein P. J:

Variations in state identity, or changes in state identity, affect the national security interests or policies of states. Identities both generate and shape interests. Some interests, such as mere survival and minimal physical well-being, exist outside of specific social identities; they are relatively generic. But many national security interests depend on a particular construction of self-identity in relation to the conceived identity of others (Katzenstein P. J., 1996, p.21).

The discourse on the state's identity and its foreign policy can be dominated by entirely new actors with different role identities. Identity crisis can affect the course of states' foreign policies in several ways: First, states may try to change the identity and consequently their foreign policy preferences and Interests (Bozdaglioglu, 2003, p.32).

As we have stated above that states gain identity when they interact with each other. States are very important factors in building identities through state society relations. Katzenstein claims that "conceiving of the state in relational terms and investigating the domestic sources of foreign policy focuses attention on the degree to which the identities of actors are constructed by state-society relations" (Katzenstein P. J., 1996, p.16).

Through interaction and activities as it is claimed by Katzenstein states can develop interests in enacting, sustaining, or developing a particular identity (Katzenstein P.J., 1996, p.22).

Bozdaglioglu goes further that for constructivists, states do not have any identity or interest prior to systemic interaction. After they begin their interaction with others in the system, they define and redefine their identities and interests. Bozdaglioglu goes on that according to constructivism, by looking at the nature of their interaction states will or will not acquire egoistic or collective identities and interests (Bozdaglioglu, 2003, pp.160-161). Nuclear decisions serve significant symbolic functions; they shape and reflect a state's identity (Utgoff, 2000, p.37). State identity is very important for security,peace and stability. State identity and the mutual attribution are critical in understanding the formation of the stable zone of peace that today exists among the Atlantic democracies (Kupchan, 2001, p.29). State identity enables other people to know each other. When peaceful change is being tried to explain, identity factor allows people from different states to know each other (Adler, 2005, p.189).

As a result, the state identity is very important in foreign policy. If states do not intereact with each other they cannot gain state identity and state interests.

Conclusion

Constructivist approach in foreign policy and in international relations should maintain all identities and interests such as collective identity, political identity, national identity and state identity. It is claimed that this constructivist approach is significant in the foreign policy analysis.As the author has mentioned above that identities emerge from the state interactions and activities.For this reason, constructivist approach will help us analyse the foreign policy and international relationsamong countries. As we acknowledge that structure is not only made of material capabilities, but it is also social relationships. These social relations are shared knowledge, shared understandings, shared opinions, expectations, relations, activities and interactions. States will have interests for each other when they know each other and when they share knowledge.

References

Adler, E. (2005). Communitarian International Relations. London and New York:

Routledge.

Alistair S. May (2004). The Body for the Lord. London: T&T Clark International.

Asano, A. (2005). Community-Identity Construction in Galatians. London: T&T Clark International.

Barnett, E.A. (1998). *Security Communities.* Cambridge: Cambridge University. Press

Bozdaglioglu, Y. (2003). Turkish Foreign Policy and Turkish Identity. London: Routledge.

Checkel, P.J. (April 2004). Social Constructivisms in Global and European Politics. *Review of International Studies*, pp 229-244, http://journals.cambridge.org.

Coskun, B.D. (2008). Systemic Changes and State Identity: Turkish and German Responses. *Insight Turkey*, pp.31-54.

Dawisha, A. (2003). *Arab Nationalsim in the Twentieth Century.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Geppert, C.D. (2011). *Politics and Power in the Multinational Corporation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Handbook of International Relations. (2002). London: Sage.

Hilkermeier, M.A. (2004). *Observing International Relations.* London: Routledge.

Katzenstein, P.J. (1996). *The Culture of National Security:Norms and Identity in World Politics.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Kratochwil, F. (2011). *The Puzzles of Politics.* London: Routledge.

Kukla, A. (2000). *Social Constructivism and the Philosophy of Science.* London: Routledge.

Kupchan, C.A. (2001). *The peaceful change of international order.* Tokyo: United Nations University Press.

Leander, S.G. (2006). *Constructivism and International Relations.* London: Routledge.

Loescher, A.B. (2011). *Refugees in International Relations.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lynch, A.K. (2007). *Strategies for Research in Constructivist International Relations.* London: M.E. Sharpe.

McKinnon, C. (2002). *Liberalism and the Defence of Political Constructivism.* New York: Palgrave.

McSweeney, B. (2004). *Security, Identity and Interests, A Sociology of International Relations.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ruggie, J. G. (1998). *Constructing the World Polity.* London: Routledge.

Scott Burchill, A. L.-S. (2005). *Theories of International Relations.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Smits, K. (2005). *Reconstructing Post-Nationalist Liberal Pluralism From Interest to Identity.* New York: Palgrave Macmilan.

Thomas J. Biersteker, P.J. (2007). *International Law and International relations.* New York: Routledge.

Thomas Risse, S.C. (1999). *The Power of Human Rights.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Utgoff, V.A. (2000). *The Coming Crisis,Nuclear Proliferation, U.S. Interests, and World Order.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Uzer, U. (2011). *Identity and Turkish Foreign Policy.* London: I.B.Taurus.

Veen, M.v. (2011). *Ideas, Interests and Foreign Aid, Cambridge Studies in International Relations.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weber, E.T. (2010). *Rawls, Dewey, and Constructivism On the Epistemology of Justice.* London: Continuum.

Wendt, A. (1999). *Social Theory of International Politics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wendt, A. (Dec. 1998). On Constitution and Causation in International Relations. *Review of International Studies,Vol. 24, The Eighty Years' Crisis 1919-1999* , 101-117.

Wheeler, J.-M.C. (2008). *National interest and international solidarity.* Tokyo: United Nations University Press.

Yurdusev, A.N. (2003). *International Relations and the Philosophy of History.* New York: Palgrave.