

RE-ASSESSING LEADERS AND FOREIGN POLICY CHARACTERISTIC IN THE USA: A CASE OF GEORGE W. BUSH AND BARACK OBAMA

F. Necmiye TUTAR

Yeditepe University, Istanbul, Turkey

© The Author(s) 2022

ABSTRACT

This study aims to re-assess and clarify the importance of analyses the role of leaders in foreign policy. In this context, a comparative analysis is used to examine the two American Presidents, Republic Bush, and the Democratic President Barack Obama. Major differences between democrats and republicans in American politics have been in foreign policy are evaluated. The findings suggest that American leaders followed different tactics to achieve their goals. Republicans applied hard power by mainly using military force in foreign policy, and democrats implemented soft power policies with discourses such as cooperation, diplomacy, and alliance on foreign policy issues. The role of the leaders' personalities in the implementation of different policies revealed by the leader Trait analysis Method. This study concludes that foreign policy in an important aspect in relation to decision making and leaders' personalities and beliefs have an influence on government's foreign policy choices.

©2022.All rights reserved

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: 09/11/2021
Accepted: 05/03/2022
Published online: 10/04/2022

KEYWORDS

Foreign Policy, Diplomacy, Soft
Power, Hard Power, Leadership,
Traits



1. Introduction

The end of the Cold War initiated a new process and led to significant changes in the understanding of foreign policy. The most important changes were the foreign policy priorities and decisions of the state. It could no longer be understood only by analyzing how the power was distributed in the international system. Foreign Policy, which has multi-factor and multi-level features, also requires analysis at different levels. For this reason, it has become necessary to investigate different elements, primarily the leaders. The individual-level analysis deals with the perceptions, choices, behaviours and actions of individuals. Because the decisions taken by the leaders constitute the foreign policy and the choices of the leaders change the course of history. Since the aims of the new period foreign policy analysis approach, argues that the actors are many and act at different levels, and their methods are also different. In this approach, it was necessary to use the most appropriate method to understand complex situations.

To make inferences about foreign policy, it has emerged that soft and hard power strategies are generally analyzed according to the characteristics trait of the leader. A plenty of literature has shown that the leader trait is an important variable that shapes foreign policy. At the macro level, the American Foreign Policy has been maintained with consistent and continuous strategies since its establishment, the micro-level, it has had a policy that does not hesitate to follow different tactics to achieve the goal from time to time, depending on the party, character and influential figures in the cabinet of the elected President. One of the main differences between Democrats and Republicans pertains to American foreign policy goals. Democrats focus on humanitarian and economic goals, while Republicans focus more on those directly related to the country's physical security. When there are differences between foreign policy objectives, the tools that thought to use to achieve them also differ. While Democrats prefer diplomacy in this regard, Republicans draw attention to the importance of military power. This study applies Hermann's (1990) Leadership Trait Analysis (LTA) to assess the leadership styles of American presidents. LTA assumes that leaders' choice of certain words in public speeches

reflects their personality traits, through which they can be compared with other leaders, and even themselves in different roles and times. In this study, the foreign policy approaches of Barack Obama and George W. Bush were identified and supported by using LTA.

2. Method and Data

A method was developed by Margaret G. Hermann and others to analyze the role of leaders in foreign policy. It aimed both to better understand the causes and consequences of the processes followed by the leaders while making foreign policy decisions and to evaluate the attitudes and behaviours of the leaders in this process. This analysis method provides the opportunity to reveal what kind of leadership characteristics the leader has.

It can be said that this is the most appropriate method for the analysis of leaders in crises. Because the normal functioning of the bureaucracy in crises is insufficient, the personal characteristics of the leaders come to the fore and have a very decisive effect on the decision to be taken. Both leaders had to face the Middle East problem in almost all periods of their presidency. For this reason, the texts used in the analysis of this study were selected from the speeches of Bush and Obama in the Middle East. As it is known, there have been developments in the Middle East during the periods of both leaders. The policy of Bush's intervention in Iraq and the Arab Spring under Obama has become essential to analyze the leadership type in different foreign policies carried out by the US in both leadership periods. The policies implemented by the two US leaders who came to power, revealed the differences between Republicans and Democrats. From a general perspective, Republican President George W. Bush declared that the US would not ratify the Kyoto Protocol and withdraw from the process not long after he took office in 2001. Contrary to George W. Bush, Democrat President Barack Obama, on the other hand, emphasized the need for the US to take responsibility in this regard, starting with the first election campaign in 2008, and supporting the Paris Climate Agreement

(Williams, p.93). The US under the presidency of Obama, as emphasized before, tries to avoid options that will require the use of force in foreign policy.

This approach most felt in the Arab Spring. Obama allowed American soldiers to use weapons, especially during the Libyan intervention, after the UN Security Council decided on the issue (Nünlist, 2016, p.2). While Bush was organizing military operations against the Middle East during his rule, it seems that Obama started an operation to attract the region with his country's soft power.

In this context, I propose hypotheses that formalize the influence of the personalities of the two American presidents on the American foreign policy.

Hypothesis 1: In the US political history, it has been observed that Republicans have more realistic, In this regard, Republican President Bush has identified and implemented strategies for a realistic, aggressive, and hard power foreign policy for the Middle East. The conservative American presidents are using hard power in foreign policy.

Hypothesis 2: In the US political history, it has been observed that Democrats have a more idealistic approach to foreign policy. In this regard, Democrat President Obama has implemented strategy within the framework of an idealistic and soft foreign policy strategy. The Democrat American President has used soft power in foreign policy.

In order to prove these hypotheses, the LTA method was preferred to reveal the differences between the personalities of George W. Bush and Barack Obama. In this study, the public texts of the leaders used as data. The texts of the speeches of both leaders in the Middle East collected. These texts are taken ready-made from the Whitehouse archive, George bush library, miller center and national archive web pages. It covers speeches given by George Bush from 2001-2009 and Obama from 2009-2017. A long period was used to perform a comprehensive analysis of a leader's cognitive characteristics. Because it is important to avoid focusing on a very

narrow time frame, because the uniqueness of a particular event may unnecessarily affect the scores thus obtained (Vaughn, P.,2007).

After the data collection completed, Herman's LTA analysis method was applied with the help of Profiler Plus software. The codebooks for each variable prepared, and the frequency of each speech of these words calculated using the software.

3. Leader Trait Analysis

It is often not possible to pass political leaders through psychological tests or perform in-depth interviews with them. For this reason, Hermann states that without the cooperation and assistance of leaders, the best and feasible way to assess their leadership qualities is to analyze the speeches of their leaders (Hermann, 1997, p.178). According to this approach, it referred to as “remote evaluation”, the psychological and personality traits of leaders can be identified and assessed using their verbal behaviours when they are speaking. It means that the speeches of the leaders are important for understanding their minds (Schafer, and Walker, 2006, p.26).

According to Hermann (1999), leaders generally speak two types of speeches. The first of these are the speeches prepared by the counselors or other people who work together. The second group of conversations is spontaneous conversations that do not rely on pre-made preparation. The second group of speeches is important in terms of reflecting the instincts and tendencies of the leaders. Leaders in spontaneous talk have less control over what they say and express themselves as they are.

As a result of the 122-different leader analyses conducted so far, Hermann (1999) notes that 50 different spontaneous transcripts of at least 100 words in length are sufficient for the leaders to analyzed healthily. Hermann (1999) points out that as the number increases, the reliability of the analysis will increase, and if less than 50 texts are analyzed, the reliability of the analysis will gradually decrease.

Leadership Profiling Analysis conducted using seven different personality variables. Words or markers represent each personality variable created for each personality. After discussing the leaders' talks using these codebooks, the results of the personality variables examined and the leader's "Leadership Profile" can be put forward. These personality variables and the criteria used to identify the indicators that represent each personality variable can be summarized as follows:

1. The belief that the leader may have influence or control over events and developments: The indicators prepared for this variable focus on words that describe actions. When these indicators are determined, actions taken by the leader or leader of the group (political party, government, country, etc.) need to consider.
2. The desire or expectation of the leader to have power and influence: Indicators are again words that indicate actions. However, it is substantial that the leader here wants to empower himself, maintain his control, or reinforce it. In addition, although the leader has not asked for help, the leader may also take part in matters such as offering assistance, making suggestions to shape the attitudes and attitudes of the interlocutors, influencing people, and raising their reputation.
3. Leadership Cognitive Capacity (skill level in perceiving and evaluating people and events around the leader): When this variable is analyzed, the leader is looking for an indicator of the ability to see different aspects of events. These indicators are analyzed separately, expressing a high cognitive perception capacity, and by evaluating these two indicators together, the leader determines the status of that leadership variable.
4. Self-confidence: The most basic indications for this variable are the pronouns "I" and "we". Other indicators may also use to express how important the leader sees himself.
5. The leader focuses on solving the problems and considering the thoughts and sensitivities of the people around him (relationship orientation) by preserving the integrity (success orientation) or the integrity of the group (political party, country, etc.), the words used

about a target, such as “struggle, the goal” are considered. Relationship-orientation indicators selected from words and phrases for group integrity and sensitivity, such as “solidarity, all together, dialogue”.

6. The inner-group prejudice that the leader possesses: The indicators used for this variable are the words and phrases (the indivisible group of the state and the nation), the glorious adjectives (big, prosperous, saints, etc.), red lines, country, etc. are considered.
7. How insecure and sceptical the leader is against others (political opponents, other countries, etc.): doubt, provocation, conspiracy, treacherous, etc. words can be used as indicators for this variable.

4. Foreign Politics Analysis in Individual Level

Foreign policy analysis is the study of the implementation of relations among different actors in the international system. According to Hudson (2005) diplomacy, intelligence, trade negotiations, and cultural exchanges are analyzed within foreign policy. It is noted that foreign policy is all the decisions, behaviours, and goals that governments make about foreign affairs. The Foreign policy defines strategy or planned method of action developed by a government to decision-makers towards other states or international bodies. While creating these strategies and movements, decision-makers consider the support, demands, and similar inputs from the national and international contexts and their worldviews, understanding their national interests, goals, and perceptions. The resulting policies are not only products of decision-makers, but also the state, the system and the international environment. Therefore, foreign policy decisions are taken in line with a broad framework covering personal, national, and international factors (Erişen, C., 2012, p.3).

There are different classifications of the factors that influence the formation of foreign policy. For example, while Rosenau (1990) classifies individuals, roles, government, society, and the system, Neack (1995) uses individual, state, and system levels in foreign policy analysis. Clarke (2017) and White (1999) have created a new model of the “Foreign Policy Systems Approach” in their work that

brings together all these factors. The most important message of these studies is that the decision-making process and the characteristics of the people involved in this process have vital importance in understanding foreign policy decisions.

Leadership and Foreign Policy studies evaluated within the scope of the studies are grouped as “the psychological and social environment of the decision-maker”. Although individual studies carried out in the past, the leaders’ personalities systematically dealt with using the “Operational Code” method first developed by Leites (1951) developed by George (1969), Holsti (1977) and Walker (1983). According to this method, a decision maker’s cognitive schema or belief system is embodied using two different components. These are the political approach to the decision-maker and to identify by examining the answers to five questions:

1. *Is the essential characteristic of civic life harmonious or incompatible?*
 2. *Is it possible to reach its values and targets?*
 3. *Can the future be predicted?*
 4. *How much is the control itself and the control power over the historical development of the “other”?*
 5. *What is the role of luck in human relations and historical development?*
- (George, 1969, p.190-222).

Hermann (1980) compared the beliefs and motivations of leaders, decision-making styles, and interpersonal communication styles, using the operational code framework in combination with content analysis. Hermann (1980) further outlined a general picture of the personality traits of the leaders, using it to distinguish two different groups of leaders and eight distinct groups for his foreign policy orientations. As a result of these studies, many new leadership typologies and leadership definitions developed.

In view of the above, it is observed that the importance of foreign policy analysis of the role of the leader is increasing. Hence, the foreign policy approaches of the leaders are further examined.

5. American Foreign Policy Understanding

When the relevant literature examined, it can be mentioned that non-material factors, namely beliefs and ideas, have decisive effects in the US foreign policy, apart from the structural necessities as a requirement of power distribution (Drezner, 2005, p.430). Undoubtedly, it is not possible to consider the main issues of American foreign policy independently of the distinction between actor-centred and system-centred theories, which are hotly debated from foreign policy analysis.

American Foreign Policy maintained at a macro level, with consistent and sustainable strategies since its inception. When viewed at the micro-level, different tactics were followed according to the character of the chosen president. While the use of force was at the forefront of Republican presidents such as Eisenhower, Nixon, Ford, Reagan, and Bush, in Democratic presidents such as Kennedy, Johnson, Carter, Clinton, Obama, power threw in the relative background. Since the end of the Cold War, micro-level changes have become clear. While Reagan, Father Bush, and Son Bush were pursuing an expansionist policy of using military force to protect American hegemony, during the Clinton and Obama eras, diplomacy was brought to the forefront (Brzezinski, 2005).

The ability to use soft power elements in US foreign policy is stated clearly in the 1996 National Security Strategy document adopted during the Clinton period. The US had to support emerging democracies in the foreign policy based on the free market economy because it would make democracy more peaceful and stable with the prosperity provided by the market economy. As a result, it emphasized that these states would encourage collaboration with America. Again, in the National Security Strategy document in 1997, it emphasized that the US would work to protect human rights at a global level and work with multilateral international institutions (A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement, 1996).

Having become the only superpower with the end of the Cold War, America has important soft power sources besides its demographic, economic, and military power. It has the World's number one economic power with its gross domestic

product of \$ 14 trillion in 2008 data. In addition to the dollar's reserve currency status and international trade in dollar terms, the World's best-known and most endorsed companies are the US like Microsoft, Mc Donald's ... 62 of the top 100 world brands are American Naturally, such a perfect economic fortune reflects public diplomacy. America strengthens its image in the World by taking advantage of corporate diplomacy through world-famous big brands (Business Week, 2003, p.72-78).

Some elements see themselves as a "private and model country" that stands out in US foreign policy. These elements base on some factors such as "values are idealism" and "religion is very effective in life". The influence of religion in the daily life of America goes to the origins of puritanism. In this case, the American political structure and policies of leaders are also influential elements. Religious references dominate the political discourses of the Republicans. Reagan refers to Saint Matthieu and resembles the US as "a city shining on the hill" (Lord, 1998, p.49). According to George H.W. Bush (1992), the US Cold War won "with the help of God". Son Bush uses Christian references to justify the "Crusade" against terrorism and fuels a "divine law nationalism".

The basis of the US' foreign policy protects the state against the "evils" that come from outside and isolated states from the World. This approach manifests itself as the "Monroe Doctrine" (Roosevelt,1904). In American Foreign Policy, it seems that an "isolated" side has always been alive. The US finds the rest of the World complicated and dangerous. With the Bush Administration, this complexity went a step further world recognized as an "enemy". The "conflict of civilizations" thesis proposed by Huntington (1996), the mentor of the American Administration, points to this "hostility". Because America considers other countries to be "enemies" in the process of living within the framework of peace and dialogue, do not fight with enemies, have a psychosis to overthrow them. The US occupation of Afghanistan and Iraq are the hottest examples of this "enemy psychosis".

The French researcher Lefebvre (2005) speaks of the “Messiah” in American Foreign Policy. The approach of the Messiah divides the World into “good” and “evil”. Indeed, the foreign policy pursued by the Bush administration traced to the Messiah approach. The phrase “sharps axis countries” is often used by Bush and his team dividing the World into “good and evil”. The word “war of the Crusaders” that Bush himself uses is symbolic of “the war against the evil ones”. According to the US, it represents “goodness”. Along with the Bush administration, the US has begun to set its foreign policy to a perspective that “believes it is right because it is strong” and has made it its duty to clear the World from evil.

5.1. Foreign Politics of Bush Administration

In his speech on June 1, 2002, President Bush declared a “preventive military interventionist doctrine” that sees the enemy as ineffective before moving to the US as a universal right. According to him, “The war against terrorism can not win with defense. The battlefield must take to the enemy's territory, the enemy's plans must destroy, the threats stemming from it must bring ineffective without an opportunity to appear. In today's World, the only way to safety is through action.” This statement was referred to as a “Bush doctrine” in the literature (President Bush Delivers Graduation Speech at West Point, 2002). Thus, American military power has become the principal element of the foreign policy pursued by Washington. The doctrine announced on September 20, 2002, as the new “National Security Strategy” of the US. In this document, preventive military operations may undertake against hostile states or terrorists deemed to threaten American foreign policy. The global military superiority of the US always preserved the emergence of a new competitor prevented. It emphasized that the US can take unilateral action when necessary.

President Bush gave a speech at the United States Military Academy (West Point) on June 1, 2002. He said, “The war on terror will not win by the defense. We must take the battlefield to the enemy's territory, distort its plans and neutralize the threats that arise from it without leaving the opportunity to appear. In today's World, the only way to safety is through action” (President Bush Delivers

Graduation Speech at West Point, 2002). This to some extent led to questions about the American diplomacy and the values of the foreign policy.

If we look at the 8-year Bush period, the use of military force led by neo-conservatives has been brought to the fore as never before. To review the attitude of the Bush-era on issues related to international law; It would not be wrong to say that American Foreign Policy was walking on a not so bright-line during this period. Because, in this period, the US withdrew from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and the Rome Statute that established the International Criminal Court, invaded Iraq in violation of the United Nations Convention and approved the war tactics against terrorism that contradicted the Geneva Convention and various human rights treaties, floundered in the climate agreement, imposed tariffs on steel in violation of international trade law, and refused to sign many old and new agreements restricting violence in the event of war (Posner, 2009).

5.2. Foreign Politics of Obama Administration

Democrat Party president Barack Obama has served as the first black president in US political history for two terms between 2009 and 2017. The period of US President Barack Hussein Obama is a difficult interval to locate in US foreign policy. Because the coming to power of Obama as a democratic president in the post-Bush era corresponds to a period in which the hopes for renewal in US foreign policy peaked. On the other hand, an intense intellectual effort spent on making sense of the foreign policy that Obama has followed since the first day of his office. In this context, despite the democratic emphasis that dominates foreign policy rhetoric, the Obama era, especially in the Arab Spring process and after, formed the US foreign policy both in Libya, Egypt and Syria. When Obama's foreign policy evaluated as a whole, it argues that unlike, G.W. Bush, it was built on a more conciliatory basis (Carothers, p.5). During the first term of Obama's presidency, policies aimed at repairing the bilateral relations of the US. The foreign policy pursued towards the Middle East can be considered as a reflection of the US's aforementioned repair and restructuring strategy (Dueck, 2011, 58). Obama's

“reset” discourse, which envisages leaving behind all the burden of the past in relations with Russia, revealed the difference (Mankoff J., 2016). Again, a similar policy left its mark on relations with Cuba. The long-lasting tension regarding Cuba ended during the Obama era a rapid “normalization” was experienced (LeoGrande, 2015, 476). Another critical step in American foreign policy during the Obama era was the rapprochement with Iran. The nuclear agreement reached by many in 2015 between Iran and the US is an important breaking point in bilateral relations (Friedman, 2015). Obama gave great importance to the use of soft power elements in his foreign policy approach. He demonstrated policies and diplomatic activities and aimed at improving the image of the US, which deteriorated under the Bush administration, and the negative international views that emerged against the United States. The economic crisis began in the US at the beginning of the Obama period and soon reached a global position spreading the World.

Since its establishment, America has had an “isolationist” political tendency. But American isolationism is more than a refusal to deal with the World, but rather a policy to prevent the World from interfering with American interests. The “Monroe Doctrine”, proclaimed in 1823, was not very effective because the US was not strong enough. But the understanding expressed in that doctrine has become valid in practice as the country strengthens.

At this point, it would be appropriate to talk about a group called “Jacksonian”. They, usually composed of representatives and senators from the southern states, chosen by Congress. They can be said to be “Republicans”. They take their names from Andrew Jackson, who has been most successful in implementing American populism during his presidency. It is the most determined advocate of American isolation in the sense and content mentioned above. Since this isolation does not mean that America is ignoring world problems, the proposal of the “Jacksonian” lobby is the adoption of the “armed intervention” method, as the US will take the form of American determination in the World (Russo, 1972). Hence, military interventions such as the Middle East Project and the 2003 Iraq War were supported by this group. The US is passionately refusing ideas such as the reduction of military intervention and diplomatic orientation.

In his first speech after winning Obama's elections, he again put forth a firm pragmatism and a soft idealism, without repeating Father Bush's internationalist and realistic principles, using words that evoke negative emotions in the World like "sharpshoot", "war with terrorism".

Obama's visit to Turkey in April 2009 carries important implications indeed. Obama's first overseas visits: The G-20 in London, the NATO summit on the Franco-German border, and the Czech Republic presided over the European Union after the summits. Obama's visit to Ankara in particular; Unlike visits to London, Strasbourg, Baden-Baden or Prague, is crucial because it is part of an international gathering, but because it is the first visit to another country capital city, not to the presidency of an international association. Obama emphasized that Turkey will be an ally in the solution of the Middle East issues, and made a speech that appeals to the subconscious of the listeners who use all the facts of the concept of soft power.

Obama (2016), speaking in Chicago, said the borders redrawn in the World. "We are Berliners", as well as the Kennedy-era slogans, while at the same time "free world leader" in the form of cold war-like discourse found. Unlike the Bush-era, Obama seems to continue many things during the Clinton period, with the influence of his staff, who took part in the Clinton Era. The most important of these is faith in negotiations. As Hillary Clinton puts it, "intelligent power" is the kind (cooperative engagement, smart power strategy). According to Bush, all tools in international relations are under the initiative and control of the US. These are diplomatic, economic, military, political, legal and cultural values. In a conversation, Obama said, "we must follow a new strategy that skillfully uses, balances, and unifies all the means of American power to achieve: the military and diplomacy; reason and law, economics and ethical responsibility" (Lobe , 2008, 19).

6. George W. Bush and Barack Obama Trait Analysis

As an example of the Leadership Profiling Analysis methodology, the leadership profiles of George W. Bush and Barack Obama analyzed in this study.

Bush served as President of the United States from 2001 to 2009, Obama 2009-2017. The foreign policy approaches of both leaders selected from the speeches they gave in the specified periods. Speeches were selected given at different times, cluster sampling was done according to years, and an equal number of speeches selected for each year. WordStar content analysis software used to analyze the conversations. The results obtained from the analysis shows in Table 1.

Table 1: George W. Bush and Barack Obama Trait Analysis

Trait	Code	Obama (%)	Bush (%)
Belief Can Control Events	Evangelist	0,48	0,80
Conceptual Complexity	Openness-understanding	0,75	0,30
Distrust Other	Irrespectful	0,63	0,16
In-group bias	Cooperation	0,58	0,81
Need for Power	Power	0,32	0,73
Self-Confidence	Proactive	0,57	0,72
Task Focus	Flexibility	0,65	0,34

Table 1 specifies the average values for the leaders. These values also indicate the limits of the high or low results for the corresponding variable. For example, a leader with less than 0.34% of result self-confidence is low; a leader with over 0.71% considers self-confidence high. It explained how these results use in terms of “Political Engagement”, “Openness to Knowledge”, and “Motivation”. Therefore, in determining the leadership profile. After analyzing these personality variables, the following three questions and the Leader's Profile put forward.

Leader’s Reactions to Constraints: How do leaders react to political obstacles? Are they accepting? are they challenging? Leaders face many internal and external obstacles and constraints when making decisions about foreign policy issues. This obstacle is the public reaction, sometimes caused by rival political parties’ criticism and opposition, sometimes the decision taken to harm the interests of some segments of society.

When confronted with these obstacles, the leader should overcome the barriers it faces in domestic politics and shape the international problems in a way that domestic politics can reasonably expect. It is the responsibility of the leader to act as a negotiator, bringing his national and international contacts to the point of reconciliation.

Analysis show that leaders who willing to cope with political barriers find faster solutions to the problems, are facing. Leaders with features such as flexibility, political timing ability, and seeking compromise are considered more sensitive to the reactions in their environment, more inclined to make decisions in the direction of the public opinion, and more open to bargaining and compromising (Hermann, 1997, 197). Leadership Profile Analysis uses “belief can control events” and “Need for power” as variables. It reveals the evidence that the leader has failed to cope with political obstacles. For both variables, the result is that the high leaders can deal with political obstacles and push the boundaries to achieve their goals. On the other hand, leaders in terms of both variables obey political challenges and pay attention to staying within these boundaries. If the results are close to the average of one or both variables, it can conclude that the investigating leader responded to the obstacles he encountered, as the situation requires. The analysis results can evaluate in the following Table 2.

Table 2: Leader’s Reactions to Constraints

	Need for Power	Belief Can Control Events
Bush	High	High
Obama	Low	Low

These results indicate that the two leaders are at the extreme in terms of the foreign policy approach. Does the analysis provide satisfactory results for the investigated parameters? Since President Bush was more challenging against the constraints and pushed/demolished legal boundaries when he needed to override the system, we may confidently say that the results are satisfactory. In contrast to Bush,

president Obama remains within the limits of laws and regulations and uses by-pass strategies to overcome political situations.

Leader Open or Closed Contextual Information: How much do the leaders disclose the information from outside sources? Do they use the information they receive from the outside as selective, or can they transform their ideas into new information? According to a survey of US presidents' foreign policy decision-making processes, the type of information a leader needs to make a foreign policy decision depends on whether the leader has a well-formed vision or goals (Hermann, 1997). Leaders with a vision or goals will expect to work with consultants. Such leaders aim to persuade people with different opinions to accept their views.

On the other hand, leaders who attach importance to different information, after careful examination of what they think and suggest from those who have different opinions from their views, define the problem and take an attitude in this direction. These leaders give more importance to gathering information and consulting with essential people, and trying to get clues as to which people and institutions are advocating which ideas (Hermann, 1995).

Leaders with a high cognitive capacity and low self-confidence are generally considered pragmatic leaders and are sensitive to interests, needs, thoughts, and demands. When such leaders decide on a matter, they act according to their acceptability under the circumstances. On the other hand, leaders with low cognitive capacity and high self-confidence regarded as leaders of knowledge. Such leaders are ideologists who act in the direction of the countries. It can say that these leaders have a "right" concept and try to persuade the people of their environment to justify their own decisions. In other cases, the following table used to comment on the leaders.

Table 3: Determining to Openness to Information

	Self-Confidence	Openess to Contextual Information
Bush	High	Close
Obama	Moderate- Low	Open

Using contextual information to form political decisions depends on the nature of the leader. Bush is a self-confident character when making decisions and may ignore external-contextual details, as evident from Table 3. His self-confidence is high and, he may / may not use external information depending on his character. On the contrary, Obama may pick up beneficial parts of the information partly or totally and even modify this information according to his policies as extracted from Table 3.

Leader Motivation: When choosing their attitudes against events, do they motivate their leaders, inner desires, and thoughts, or are the important actors influenced by internal and external politics and the groups' reactions they care about? Motivation expresses how leaders lead themselves permanently and continuously. In general, it is possible to say that political leaders are motivated by internal or external factors. Internal motivation may be due to a problem or cause, an ideology, or a group of interests. External motivation is the desire to get an inevitable return (acceptance, approval, power, support, appreciation, status, etc.) from people in the environment.

Leaders who know what to do in line with their goals determine the decisions and actions taken in line with their internal motivations. The motivating leaders in the direction of external factors are motivated by external factors for actions and decisions since they often try to get support from political circles, even the public, and attach importance to their views.

Leaders who feel closer to certain groups make more effort for their prerogatives and often perceive the political World as a threat to their group. Leaders who do not feel close to any group are open to closer cooperation with other people and groups. For this reason, when motivation is analyzed, both the leader's goal focus and the group protection instigation (in-group bias and insecurity towards others) are taken into account. The focus is on whether the leader is successful in his actions or whether the leader focuses on improving the environment by protecting the relationship (voters, essential others, etc.). The leader's target focus can be determined using Table 4.

Table 4: Motivation for seeking office

	Task Focus Value	Task Focus
Bush	Low	Low
Obama	High	High

Leader policies depend on human factors, and when making a decision, relationships with other people are important. Some decisions may hurt or even harm people, therefore maintaining a good relationship and carrying out politics without breaking people while making a progressive decision is hard. Obama uses a step-wise policy when persuading people and does not make an abrupt change in decisions. But President Bush distrusts others and is not protective against his surroundings. Therefore, the values of each president are at the opposite ends (Table 4).

Ingroup Bias and Distrust other: The leader is tied to his group with strong emotional ties and considers him the best in possible groups. Insecurity for others refers to the tendency not to doubt the aims and actions of other people and institutions. If the leader is insecure toward others, it can say that he has a generally sceptical, restless, and anxious attitude towards them. In this case, the leader feels uneasy about what others do and thinks these actions are harmful to him or his group. The results of the "inner-group prejudice" and "insecurity towards others" variables can evaluate using the following Table 5.

Table 5: Ingroup Bias

	Ingrroup Bias	Distrust Other s
Bush	High	High
Obama	Low	Low

As seen in Table 5, the reflection of the results elucidates each president's character. Obama has non-biased political views and evaluates different groups' views. In Bush's situation, the politics based on sceptical and cautious political approaches.

7. Discussion and Result

During the first decade after the collapse of the USSR in 1991, Bill Clinton's success led to the experience of the "benevolent hegemon era" of the World. However, this period was closed after the September 11 attacks. After September 11, the United States has taken a one-sided approach, abandoning the versatile policy it has followed since the early 20th century. The process of the wars of Afghanistan and Iraq confirmed the new dimension of US foreign policy. Parallel to these developments, all initiatives in the international arena in the twentieth century abandoned with international structures such as NATO, the UN, the World Trade Organization and the North American Free Trade Area. Contrary to the geopolitical approach of the Bush-era, Obama aimed to maximize America's moral and political reputation in the World by maximizing intergovernmental cooperation. In this period, America has abandoned its one-sided foreign political attitude and developed an understanding of alliance.

There are entirely two specific foreign American foreign policies as we see between the Bush and the Obama period. Obama and his cabinets have a much more positive influence on the strategies used to reach the masses of politics applied in foreign policy and the perception by people. With the election of Obama, the American image, which is said to be a slander in the minds of the global mind

because of the aggressive politics of the Bush government, gradually leaves its place to more favourable views. For example, the fact that Obama won the Nobel Peace Prize. He did not show any activity about but which he would like to concentrate on later, has brought about a new climate that he has brought “only to international relations” and that “the United Nations and other international institutions a multi-faceted approach to diplomacy”. In other words, Obama won the Nobel Peace Prize after Bush’s anger and hatred by the whole World and softer discourses. Indeed, Obama continues to direct Bush policies for American global hegemony. But, Bush perceived it so aggressive that even Obama’s talking about similar politics positively impacts the discourse's moderate attitude and successful communication campaigns. Republican political discourses dominated religious references. According to Father Bush, the US has won the cold war with the help of God. The son Bush is using a divine law to justify the Crusade against terrorism and nationalism.

Another issue is between democrats and republicans’ foreign policy approach. Republicans in military intervention, on the other hand, tend to change the regimes, which are against US interests, by direct military intervention. Unlike Bush, Obama took foreign policy decisions with strategies that emphasized a more compromising and collaborative. Finally, the personality structures and ideas of significant decision-makers are highly influential in the foreign policymaking process. The results of the analysis of the two leaders also show that the leader’s trait is an important influence on the formation of foreign policy.

8. Conclusion

The foreign policy decision-making process can deepen understanding of self-sacrifice, motivation and perception, especially when making decisions at an individual level. Moreover, the growth and development theories of cognitive psychology and decision theory have encouraged progress in foreign policy decision-making. It is shaped by the decisions of the leaders of world politics. Any ambiguity about decision making in foreign policy may belong to the motivations,

beliefs, intentions, or calculations of competitors. If we understand how decisions are made, perhaps we can understand the decisions importantly, we can predict some results on the international scene. Factors such as the personality and beliefs of the leaders, leadership styles, emotions, images, cognitive coherence, analogy use, intelligence, how they affect decision making processes and expected outcomes question the explanatory power of the rational model.

Given the complexity of the foreign policy decision-making process, it turns out that the focus on the decision-making process, the approach to foreign policy analysis, the understanding of our world's foreign policy behavior and the special behaviors of different nations. Foreign policy has models and theories that can help us to understand how decisions can determine decisions, bias, error, uncertainty and internal politics.

It is clear from this analysis of the leaders' decision-making style that the leaders' personalities have been observed to have a decisive influence on the government's foreign policy choices. It was seen during the analysis that the key element of Obama's leadership style is that he does not take snap decisions while persuading people and follows a policy step by step. The language that Obama uses and the facts he emphasizes (interdependence, cooperation, getting rid of stereotypes, empathy, diplomacy, commitment) are important in terms of showing that Obama has adopted the soft power of the US as the main tool of his policy. However, President Bush distrusted others and displayed a protective and evangelistic attitude towards his environment. In this analysis study of the leadership profile, which is thought to determine the US foreign policy, the personality traits of Bush and Obama showed a consistent fit with the qualitative data.

This study not only provides a window into the strategies and weaknesses of leaders, but also reveals how the perception of the operational environment translates into policy choices. Whether the problems are shaped by threat or within the framework of reconciliation has been a determining factor in foreign policy

outcomes. For this reason, it is claimed that perceptions, beliefs and ideas about actors play a decisive role in foreign policymaking.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

Author Contact Information

E-mail: yasemintutar2003@yahoo.com.tr

References and notes:

- A National Security Strategy for a New Century, (1997), <http://clinton2.nara.gov/WH/EOP/-NSC/Strategy/>
- A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement, (1996), <http://www.fas.org/spp/military/docops/national/1996stra.htm>.
- Bailey, A. T., (1968), *The Art of Diplomacy: The American Experience*, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Brezinski, Z., (1997), *Grand-Chessboard-American Primacy and its Geostrategic Imperatives*, Basic Books, New York, p.8.
- Business Week, (2003), pp.72-78 <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2003/09/20030912-13.html>
- Carothers, T., *Democracy Policy under Obama: Revitalization or Retreat?* s.5
- Cull, N.J., (2008) *Public Diplomacy: The evolution of a Phrase*.
- Drezner, W. D., (2005) "Values, Interests, and American Grand Strategy," *Diplomatic History*, 29(3), pp. 429-432.
- Erişen, C., (2012), *The Political Psychology of Turkish Political Behavior: Introduction by the Special Issue Editor*, 14(1), p.3.
- George H.W. Bush, (2001), *Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People*, <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/address-before-joint-session-the-congress-the-state-the-union-0>
- George, L. A., (1969), *The Operational Code: A Neglected Approach to the Study of Political Leaders and Decision Making*. *International Studies Quarterly*, 13(2), pp. 190-222.
- Hermann, M. G., (1980), *Explaining Foreign Policy Behavior Using the Personal Characteristics of Political Leaders*, *International Studies Quarterly*, 24(19), pp.7-46.
- Hermann, M. G., Preston, T., Korany, B., & Shaw, T. M. (2001) *Who leads matters: The effects of powerful individuals*. *International Studies Review*, 3(2), pp.83-131.
- Hermann, M. G. & Preston, T.P. (1995) *Presidents, Advisers, and Foreign Policy: The Effects of Leadership Style on Executive Arrangements*", *Political Psychology*, 15(1), pp.75-96.
- Hermann, M.G (1977), *A Psychological Examination of Political Leaders*, Cambridge University Press, New York: The Free Press.
- Hermann, M.G (1990) *Leader Personality and Foreign Policy Behaviour*", *Comparing Foreign Policies: Theories, Findings, and Methods*, James N. Rosenau, New York: Sage, pp.197.
- Hermann, M.G. (1999), *Assessing Leadership Style: A Traits Analysis*.
- Holsti, O. R., (1977), *The Operational Code as an Approach to the Analysis of Belief Systems*. Final Report to the National Science Foundation, Grant No. SOC 75-15368, Durham, NC.
- Hudson, M.V. (2005), *Foreign Policy Analysis: Actor-Specific Theory and the Ground of International Relations*, *Foreign Policy Analysis*, pp.1-30.
- Huntington, S., (1996), *Clash of Civilization*, Simon & Schuster
- Lefebvre, M., (2005), *American Dış Politikası, İletişim yayınları*, İstanbul.
- Leites, (1951) *The Operational Code of the Politburo*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lobe, J. (2008), *USA: Diplomacy, Multilateralism Stressed by Obama Team*, *Global Geopolitics News and Analysis*, <http://www.ipsnews.net/2008/12/us-diplomacy-multilateralism-stressed-by-obama-team/>
- Lord, C., (1998), *The Past and Future of Public Diplomacy*, pp. 49-79, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0030-4387\(98\)90050-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0030-4387(98)90050-3)
- Melissen, J., (2005), *The New Public Diplomacy Soft Power in International Relation*, London: Palgrave.
- Neack, Laura, Hey, Leanne & Haney, Patrick, (1995), *Foreign Policy Analysis: Continuity and Change in Its Second Generation*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Nicholas, J., C., (2009), *Public Diplomacy: Lessons from the Past*, CPDPerspectives on Public Diplomacy, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Nye, J.S., Jr (2004), *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*, New York: Public Affairs.

- Nünlist, C., (2016) “The Legacy of Obama’s Foreign Policy Strategy”, *CSS Analyses in Security Policy*, 188, p. 2.
- Obama, B., (2016), Remarks by President Obama in Address to the People of Europe, <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2016/04/25/remarks-president-obama-address-people-europe>
- President Bush Delivers Graduation Speech at West Point, (2002), <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2002/06/print/20020601-3.html>,
- Posner, E., (2009), “Think Again: International Law- Obama Will Respect International Law More Than Bush Did? NO”, *Foreign Policy Magazine*, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2009/09/17/think_again_international_law, 17 Eylül 2009.
- Rosenau, J., (1990), *Turbulence in World Politics: A theory of change and continuity*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey, pp.10-11.
- Russo, D., (1972), *The Major Political Issue of The Jacksonian Period and the Development of Party Loyalty in Congress 1830-1840*, *American Philosophical Society* 62(5) pp.3-51 <https://doi.org/10.2307/1006140>
- Schafer, M., & Walker, S. G. (2006), *Beliefs and Leadership in World Politics: Methods and Applications of Operational Code Analysis*, Hampshire: Palgrave, McMillan.
- Tuch, H. N. (1990), *Communicating with the World: U.S. Public Diplomacy Overseas*, New York, St. Martin’s Press.
- Walker, S., (1983), *The Motivational Foundations of Political Belief Systems: A Reanalysis of the Operational Code Construct*, *International Studies Quarterly*, pp. 179-20.
- Waller, M., (2008), *The Public Diplomacy Reader*, Washington, The Institute of World Politics Press, pp.241.
- Walton, D., (2003), *Le monde n’est pas un village*, *L’Express*, pp. 69.
- Williams, P., (2016), “President Obama’s Approach to the Middle East and North Africa: Strategic Absence”, *Case Western International Journal of Law*, 48(1)5, pp. 92-93
- Colin Dueck, (2011), “The Accommodator: Obama’s Foreign Policy,” *Policy Review*, 169, p.13.
- Jeffrey Mankoff, (2009), “The Tricky Us–Russia “Reset” Button,” *Council on Foreign Relations*. <https://www.cfr.org/expert-brief/tricky-us-russia-reset-button>
- William M LeoGrande, (2015), “Normalizing Us–Cuba Relations: Escaping the Shackles of the Past,” *International Affairs* ,91(3), pp. 473-488.
- Thomas Friedman, (2015), “Obama Makes His Case on Iran Nuclear Deal,” *The New York Times*, 14 Temmuz 2015, <https://www.nytimes.com/2015/07/15/opinion/thomas-friedman-obama-makes-his-case-on-iran-nuclear-deal>. Html.
- Vaughn P., Shannon and Jonathan W. Keller, (2007), ‘Leadership Style and International Norm Violation’ *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 3, pp. 79–104. https://georgewbushwhitehouse.archives.gov/infocus/bushrecord/documents/Selected_Speeches_George_W_Bush.pdf
- <https://www.americanrhetoric.com/barackobamaspeeches.htm>
- <https://millercenter.org/the-presidency/presidential-speeches>

CITE THIS ARTICLE AS: TUTAR Necmiye., Re-assessing leaders and foreign policy characteristic in the USA: A case of George W. Bush and Barack Obama. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Development Research*. Volume 6 (1), 2022.pp. 78-102.doi: 10.30546/2523-4331.2022.6.1.78