Representative Decision-Making: Challenges to Democratic Peace Theory

Esra Cuhadar and Daniel Druckman

Introduction

This chapter continues our focus on the role of group and national identity in decisions to take collective action and asks about factors that influence those decisions (Druckman et al. 2010). As in the previous chapter, we approach this problem from the standpoint of the decision-maker who usually represents a group, organization, or nation. The interest is less about those decision-makers' own identities and attachments than about various drivers and constraints on their decisions to act.

The earlier findings suggested a two-factor theory of action. One factor refers to decisions taken in external conflicts such as violence and humanitarian actions. The decision drivers were severity of threat and extent of public support. Another factor refers to decisions taken in

internal conflicts such as nonviolent protests. The key drivers were the durability of national identity and severity of threat. Interestingly, the decision-maker's political system, as either democratic or autocratic, was only a weak influence on decisions to act in any of the scenarios, external or internal conflicts. This finding challenges a key hypothesis from democratic peace theory. It is the basis for the study reported in this chapter.

Two explanations for this finding are suggested. One is that the theory applies only to decisions to go to war; the empirical evidence provided by the democratic peace theory deals primarily with those decisions. There are numerous instances where democratic nations intervene militarily in the affairs of other democracies short of war (Hermann and Kegley 1995). Our scenarios dealt with decisions to act rather than the act itself. Another explanation is that the democratic peace theory applies to dyadic relations where both own and other regimes are taken into account (Russett 1993). Our earlier study focused only on the decision-maker's regime rather than on the pairing of regime types. These explanations are addressed in the current study. Two types of decisions are compared: reactions to an attack by another country and reactions to a humanitarian crisis involving the deployment of peacekeeping troops. A review of the democratic peace theory arguments precedes a discussion of the variables hypothesized to influence decisions for both types of actions. A set of hypotheses are presented before launching into the methods used and results obtained from the study.

E. Cuhadar (✉)
Esra Cuhadar, Assistant Professor,
Department of Political Science and Public
Administration, Bilkent University, Turkey
e-mail: esracg@bilkent.edu.tr

D. Druckman
Daniel Druckman, Professor, Department of
Government and Politics in the School of Policy,
Government, and International Affairs at George
Mason University in Fairfax, Virginia, an eminent
scholar at Macquarie University in Sydney,
and an honorary professor at the University of
Queensland in Brisbane, Australia
e-mail: dandruckman@yahoo.com.

Democratic Peace Theory

The finding that democracies do not go to war with one another is considered one of the most robust results in international relations during the last two decades (Levy 1988; Russett 1990). Since then, the discussion mainly focused on first why democracies do not go to war with one another and second how the concepts of democracy and war are conceptualized and measured.

Two arguments have been put forward about the decision, made by democracies, to refrain from initiating a war with other democracies. One is referred to as the institutional/structural explanation (Maoz and Russett 1993; Rummel 1983). Democracies favor peace because of the constitutional checks and balances that tie the hands of decision-makers as well as public constraints such as a democratic civil society that includes an antiwar electorate (Ungerer 2012: 16). These constraints remind decision-makers that they are likely to face high political costs for using force (de Mesquita and Lalman 1992). Democratic states are unable to act quickly, and this cautious attitude reduces the likelihood that a conflict will escalate into war (Hermann and Kegley 1995).

Another argument is referred to as the normative/cultural explanation (Maoz and Russett 1993; Doyle 1986). It emphasizes the constraining role played by societal norms favoring peaceful settlement of disputes. States externalize their domestic nonviolent means of conflict resolution by including other democracies within the same moral community. At the same time, they exclude nondemocratic states from the same shared norm of conduct (Ungerer 2012: 17).

In both structural and normative explanations, the common idea put forward is that democratic *structures* or cultural *contexts* constrain *democratic states* from choosing wars, and thus, they are less likely to escalate conflicts into full-fledged wars. After several decades of discussion, there remains a cloud of doubt regarding which of these mechanisms restrain democracies from waging large-scale war against other democracies, although the weight of evidence comes

down on the side of normative explanations (Rosato 2003; Ungerer 2012).

On a more fundamental note, Hermann and Kegley (1995) criticized the theory for not taking into account other types of military interventions undertaken by democracies against both democracies and non-democracies. The fact that democracies are not restrained from engaging in military actions short of war raises interesting questions about both the structural and normative explanations. The key is the dependent variable used in the empirical evaluations of the theory. But, the argument also encourages a closer look at the process leading to decisions about taking actions against other democracies short of war (Hermann and Kegley 1995). A decision-making perspective has received only limited attention in this literature. The research reported in this chapter is an attempt to fill the gap.

A variety of other conceptual and methodological problems have been identified. Conceptual problems include disregard for incentives (rather than constraints) that compel democratic leaders to opt for the use of force. We know little about the circumstances under which decision-makers choose to obey or challenge the constraints against war as well as which constraints they choose to consider (for a study on how democratically elected leaders respond to structural constraints, see Cuhadar et al. forthcoming). Focusing on incentives, Mintz and Geva (1993) showed that motivations for diverting attention from domestic problems often encourage democratic leaders to become adventurous in their foreign policy decisions, although the actions taken may differ for democratic versus autocratic foreign regimes. The first experiment on the topic was conducted by Rousseau (2005) with US college students. His study was similar to ours in two ways: It was conducted with college students and placed the students in the role of chief political advisor to the president in a fictional scenario. Rousseau randomly varied three variables: the southern neighbor's political regime (democratically elected government versus single-party dictatorship), the balance of military forces (strong versus weak), and the domestic political position of the president

the student was advising (strong versus weak). The students were then asked whether they would advise the president to use military force to settle the dispute. He found that they were less likely to recommend using military force against a democracy than against a dictatorship. A more recent survey experiment by Tomz and Weeks (2013) used public opinion polls in the UK and the USA. They found that individuals are less supportive of military action against democracies than against otherwise identical autocracies. They argued that this is because shared identity of democracy pacifies the public primarily by changing perceptions of threat and morality, not by raising expectations of costs or failure.

With regard to methodology, issues of reverse causation and collinearity have been discussed. On the former issue, it is plausible to suggest that peace causes democracy, particularly in cases involving the termination of civil wars (Tomz and Weeks 2013). Implementing peace agreements often give rise to democratic institutions. On the latter issue, possible confounding variables include shared security and economic interests as well as the development of capitalistic institutions (Mousseau 2003; Gleditsch 1992). These variables are likely to be correlated with democratic political structures and norms. These issues are unlikely to be resolved with events data sets where correlational statistics are used. They are addressed more directly with experimental approaches to the study of decision-making.

Decision Drivers

Democratic peace theory places its bets on the importance of regime type as the key driver of decisions to pursue war. The body of relevant empirical evidence addressing this variable has been based largely on analyses of events or actions. A much smaller set of experimental studies (Mintz and Geva 1993; Rousseau 2005) focused on decisions made prior to action. However, the experiments, like the events data analyses, have explored the sovereign factor of regime type. Both regime type (as an IV) and decisions (as a DV) are included in our research

as well. But they are construed as part of a research design that places them in a larger context that includes other variables.

The set of influences encompasses motivational, readiness, and identity variables along with regime type. Motivation is defined as the severity of threat coming from the target country. Readiness is the organization of resources and preparation for combat or conflict management in the face of external threat. These variables are also emphasized by Gurr and Davies (2002) in their research on collective action in ethnic conflict. The identity variables include durability and spread of constituent support for taking action. These variables are part of Druckman's (2001) three-factor theory of collective action and were included in our earlier study (Druckman et al. 2010). The third identity variable, referred to as type of identity, is defined as the extent to which identities are coerced or voluntary. It is operationalized in terms of the distinction between autocratic and democratic political regimes. This distinction connects identity theory to the democratic peace hypothesis. In this study, we create the dyadic version of the democratic peace theory by assessing the influence of both one's own national regime and the target country's regime.

Building on the Hermann and Kegley (1995) critique of democratic peace theory, we consider two versions of actions. One version consisted of a choice between mobilizing troops for war and placing troops on alert in the face of a threatening neighbor. This choice is highlighted in democratic peace theory. Another version consisted of a choice between sending and not sending peace-keeping troops to a country in the throes of a humanitarian crisis. This choice reflects decisions taken short of war and, as such, addresses the critique about the limited focus of the theory on military actions that lead to or plunge a democracy into war. Of particular interest is the question whether own or other's regime type is the key influence on decisions: Does regime type trump the impact of other factors on decisions to take action? Is regime type a stronger influence on decisions to go to war than on other military decisions short of war? These questions are a basis for the hypotheses to follow.

Hypotheses

A central tenet of democratic peace theory is that regime type is the key factor in decisions to respond to threats by going to war. Two hypotheses follow from this proposition:

H1: Democracies will choose to place troops on alert—rather than attack—when threatened by another democracy.

H2: Democracies will choose to attack or mobilize for war when threatened by an autocratic government.

The theory also suggests that regime type does not influence decisions about actions short of war. The following hypotheses follow from this proposition:

H3: Democracies will send peacekeeping forces to manage conflicts in or provide aid to both democratic and autocratic nations.

H4: The regime type of the other nation more strongly influences decisions to go to war than for decision short of war.

Other theoretical perspectives challenge the above hypotheses. Realism suggests that the key factors in decisions to use force—including military and peacekeeping troops—are the severity of threat and readiness for combat rather than regime type. This perspective suggests the following hypotheses:

H5: The more severe the threat from another nation, the more likely a target nation will act irrespective of type of regime.

H6: Readiness for action will encourage nations to act irrespective of regime type.

Another variable investigated in our earlier study was spread of popular support for national action. This variable was shown to strongly influence decisions for collective action in both violent and humanitarian situations (Druckman et al. 2010). It derives from a body of work referred to as representation theory and emphasizes the impact of constituencies on decisions in negotiation and in collective action situations (e.g., Druckman 2006). The key hypothesis is as follows:

H7: Wide popular support within a nation will encourage decisions to act irrespective of regime type.

A final variable is suggested from the literature on identity theory. Referred to as durability of identity, this variable is also hypothesized to influence collective decisions to act in the face of a threat. By durability we refer to the extent of commitment to the nation varying from strong to weak national identities. Strong identities are easier to mobilize for combat. They are also more likely to sustain participation in the campaign (Druckman 2001). Durability would encourage taking action in response to a threat from another nation as summarized by the following hypothesis:

H8: More durable national identities will encourage decisions to take action irrespective of regime type.

An attempt is made to evaluate this set of hypotheses. In particular, we are interested in comparing predictions from democratic peace theory (hypotheses H1–H4) with those that emanate from other theoretical sources (H6–H8). A key question is whether regime type is a stronger or weaker influence on collective decisions than the other variables also hypothesized to influence actions (threat, readiness, spread, and durability): Do democracies act differently in response to other democracies or to autocracies? Or are decisions to act by democracies influenced more by other factors? (same paragraph). These questions are addressed with an experimental methodology that facilitates the task of sorting the hypothesized influences in terms of their relative contribution to decisions. We turn now to a discussion of these methods.

Approach

Our focus on the democratic peace hypothesis highlights the role of regime type in decisions made to pursue or restrain from going to war

against a threatening nation. Thus, we are interested in comparing the decisions made by leaders in democratic countries confronting actions taken by other democratic or autocratic nations. This distinction is the key variable in this study.

Participants, in their roles as democratic decision-makers, are confronted by one of the two scenarios, a threat from a democratic or autocratic country. The decision task is embedded in two types of narratives, referred to as violent threat or humanitarian missions. In the violent threat narrative, role players were faced with a threat on their border and asked to choose between mobilizing their troops to attack and placing the troops on a readiness alert (see Appendix 1). In the humanitarian narrative, role players were faced with a crisis in another country and asked to choose between sending and not sending peacekeeping forces to aid that country (see Appendix 2). For both narratives, the other nation's regime type was either democratic or autocratic. Thus, the study was construed as a 2×2 design with the other nation's type of political system (democratic, autocratic) and type of narrative (violence, peacekeeping) as the variables.

The narratives provided information about four other aspects of the situation. One refers to motivation and is defined in terms of the severity of the threat, as an aggressive force on their border or as a severe crisis. Another is referred to as efficacy and is defined in terms of readiness of troops for combat or for peacekeeping. A third variable is spread, defined in terms of popular support for the military or peacekeeping campaign. The fourth variable is durability, defined as a strong identity among the citizens of the nation being represented. Unlike our previous study, reported in Druckman et al. (2010), each of these variables is geared in the direction of action, for example, an intense threat, a force ready for combat, widespread support, and durable identities. Thus, these factors are construed as background information rather than variables. This design decision serves to highlight regime type as the key variable. The comparison of interest is the relative importance of the other nation's regime type (which is varied) versus each of the other factors (which is not varied) as influences

on decisions. Since each of the factors is geared toward action, this may be considered a strong test of the democratic peace hypothesis: Does the other's regime type influence decisions in situations of severe threats, high readiness, and so on? This focus does however preclude comparisons of impacts of the five factors, for example, high versus low threat severity compared to high versus low readiness.

Participants were students at Bilkent University majoring in political science or international relations. The study was performed as part of a course requirement. One-hundred and four role players were assigned randomly to one of the four dyadic conditions: Equivalent political science classes were assigned the violence or humanitarian narratives with 42 receiving the former and 62 receiving the latter package; there were no systematic differences between these classes. They were asked to play the role of a national decision-maker facing a collective action decision whether to send military or peacekeeping forces in the face of a crisis. Following the decision, they were asked to make pair comparison judgments about the five factors highlighted in the scenarios. In order to prevent any priming effect, the explanation about the matrix was not given until the participants finished reading the scenarios. The entire process took about 45 min to complete.

The paired comparison mechanics require a "more or less important" comparison for all pairs of factors, a total of 15 comparisons. For example: "Is your country's (Aland) political system more/less important in your decision than the political system of the opponent country (Zland)?" The last page of the survey included open-ended questions asking participants to elaborate on their paired comparison judgments.

These judgments are coded and analyzed according to the procedure given in Guilford (1954: 554–558). The method produces values on a psychological scale. The procedure gives the number and proportion of times each element is judged as being more important than each of the other elements. A proportions matrix is then converted into areas of the normal curve (z-scores). Based on Thurstone's law of comparative judgment, the procedure is suited especially for

similar elements such as colors judged for pleasantness, samples of handwriting judged for excellence, or vegetables judged for taste. In this study, as in Druckman et al. (2010), we asked participants to judge the *different* elements for importance. To the extent that the pairwise comparisons can be made, we have confidence that the resulting scales are meaningful. The result is an ordering of the six elements. An advantage of this procedure is that it allows for direct comparisons of situations and actions, which is the goal of this study. Furthermore, it allowed us to come up with a ranking for four different conditions that render conclusions about the hypotheses stated above.

Results

The results are organized in the order of the hypotheses stated above. We begin with the two key hypotheses from democratic peace theory:

H1: Democracies will choose to place troops on alert—rather than attack—when threatened by another democracy.
H2: Democracies will choose to attack or mobilize for war when threatened by an autocratic government.

Answers to the question about decisions in the face of violent threats address these hypotheses. In the democratic-democratic (DD) condition, 24 % of the role players decided to mobilize in preparation for war, while 76 % decided to put the army on readiness alert. This result supports hypothesis 1. Thirty-eight percent of the role players in the democratic-autocratic (DA) condition decided to mobilize the nation's army in preparation for war, while 62 % decided to put the nation's army on readiness alert. This result supports hypothesis 2. More role players decided to mobilize for war in the DA condition, a difference of 14 %. Additional analyses provide further support for these hypotheses. Seven of eight role players in the DA condition who chose to mobilize also indicated that the key source for this decision was the other nation's regime type (autocratic). Only 3 of 13 who chose the alert option indicated that the other's nation

Table 1.1 Decision by source for the violent threat DA condition

		Decision	
		Mobilize	Place on alert
Source	Own nation	1	10
	Other nation	7	3

Table 1.2 Violence narrative

Democratic–autocratic dyad		Democratic–democratic dyad	
Threat	0	Own system	0
Spread	.03	Threat	.07
Other's system	.13	Durability	.18
Readiness	.27	Spread	.20
Durability	.41	Readiness	.28
Own system	.42	Other's system	.29

(autocratic) drove the decision. This is shown below in Table 1.1. The relationship between decision choice (mobilize or alert) and source for decision (own versus other) is strongly significant by chi-square (chi-square = 8.24, 1 df, $p < .004$, two-tailed). The relationship between decision and source for the DD condition is not significant. These findings provide support for the democratic peace theory explanation.

Further evidence comes from the pair comparison data shown in Table 1.2. As can be seen from the rankings, the other nation's political system is modestly important (ranked third out of six factors) in the DA condition but least important in the DD scenario. Thus, the other's regime is somewhat important for decision-makers in the DA condition but is unimportant in the DD condition. Of note also are the relative rankings of own nation's political system, in this case a democracy: It is the most important factor in the DD condition but least important in the DA condition.

Hypothesis 3 deals with decisions short of war.
H3: Democracies will send peacekeeping forces to manage conflicts in or provide aid to both democratic and autocratic nations.

Answers to the question about decisions in the face of humanitarian crises address this hypothesis. Eighty-seven percent of the role players in DD condition indicated that they would send peacekeeping troops to the nation in crisis. Ninety percent of the role players in the DA

Table 1.3 Humanitarian narrative

Democratic–autocratic dyad		Democratic–democratic dyad	
Spread	0	Own system	0
Readiness	.18	Spread	.09
Own system	.20	Economy/history	.22
Durability	.36	Readiness	.26
Economy/history	.51	Durability	.59
Other's system	.55	Other's system	.97

Table 1.4 Democratic–autocratic dyads

Violent narrative		Humanitarian narrative	
Threat	0	Spread	0
Spread	.03	Readiness	.18
Other's system	.13	Own system	.20
Readiness	.27	Durability	.36
Durability	.41	Economy/history	.51
Own system	.42	Other's system	.55

Table 1.5 Democratic–democratic dyads

Violent narrative		Humanitarian narrative	
Own system	0	Own system	0
Threat	.07	Spread	.09
Durability	.18	Economy/history	.22
Spread	.20	Readiness	.26
Readiness	.28	Durability	.59
Other's system	.29	Other's system	.97

condition gave the same answer. These data provide strong support for the hypothesis: The other nation's regime does not influence this decision. Further support for this hypothesis comes from the pair comparison rankings shown in Table 1.3. The opponent's political system is the least important factor in both conditions.

Hypothesis 4 compares the two narratives: violent threats and humanitarian missions.

H4: The regime type of other nation more strongly influences decisions to go to war than for decision short of war.

The pair comparison data shown in Tables 1.4 and 1.5 address this hypothesis for the DD and DA conditions. As can be seen in Table 1.4 (the DD condition), the other nation's political system is the least important factor for both the violent threat and humanitarian narratives. As can be seen in Table 1.5 (the DA condition), the other

nation's political system is modestly important (ranked third of six factors) for the violent threat but least important for the humanitarian narrative. Thus, contrary to this hypothesis, regime type is relatively unimportant in both narratives.

Hypothesis 5 deals with the importance of the severity of threat.

H5: The more severe the threat from another nation, the more likely a target nation will act irrespective of type of regime.

This hypothesis is addressed with the pair comparison data shown in Table 1.2. Threat is the most important factor motivating the decision made in the DA condition and second most important factor in making the decision about troops in the DD condition. These data provide strong support for the hypothesis. Further analyses reinforce support for this hypothesis. Nineteen of 21 role players in the DA/violent scenario indicated that threat was more important than own regime type. Only two indicated that country's own regime type was more important than threat. For the seven people who said they will mobilize troops in the DA/violent scenario, all indicated that threat was more important. The comparison between other's regime type (autocracy) and threat for those who chose to mobilize troops in the DA condition (eight representatives) shows that those who think other's regime type (autocracy) is most important and those who think severity of threat is most important are equal. However, threat is less relevant as a factor in the humanitarian narrative. As shown in Table 1.3, that factor (referred to as economy/history) is ranked third in the DD condition and fifth in the DA condition.

Hypothesis 6 deals with the troops' readiness for taking action.

H6: Readiness for action will encourage nations to act irrespective of regime type.

This hypothesis is also addressed with the pair comparison data shown in Tables 1.2 and 1.3. Readiness is among the least important factors in both the DA and DD conditions of the violent threat narrative. It is among the more important factors in the DA, but not the DD, condition for the humanitarian narrative. Thus, the hypothesis receives only marginal support.

Hypothesis 7 concerns the spread of popular support for collective action.

H7: Wide popular support within a nation will encourage decisions to act irrespective of regime type.

This hypothesis is generally supported across the narratives and conditions. Spread is particularly important in the humanitarian narrative as shown in Table 1.2. It is relatively important in the DA condition of the violent threat narrative but less important (ranked fourth of six factors) in the DD condition.

The final hypothesis concerns the durability of national identity.

H8: More durable national identities will encourage decisions to take action irrespective of regime type.

The pair comparison ratings shown in Tables 1.2 and 1.3 address this hypothesis. Across the narratives and conditions, durability is a less important source of decisions. The highest ranking for this factor is third in the DD condition of the violent threat narrative. Thus, it is among the least important factors in both types of narratives (see also Tables 1.4 and 1.5).

Taken together, the data suggest that the other nation's regime motivates decisions to mobilize troops for attack when the other nation is autocratic. Overall, however, across the various conditions, the other's regime is relatively unimportant as a source of decisions. The threat posed by the other nation is, however, very important in the violent threat narrative, and the spread of public support for actions is a strong source of decisions in three of the four narratives/conditions. Interestingly, one's own political system, democracy in these scenarios, is the most important factor for the DD (but not the DA) condition for both narratives. We turn now to a discussion of these findings.

Discussion

Democratic peace theory was initially formulated in two versions: (a) the monadic and (b) the dyadic proposition (Russett 1993). Although these two propositions differ in the extent to which the regime type of the target state is considered important, they both suggest that democracies are less likely to go to war. According to the monadic proposition, democracies in general are more reluctant to engage in military action (Maoz and Russett 1993). This proposition suggests the importance of institutional constraints in a democracy. They serve to restrain decision-makers from going to war regardless of the regime type of the other country (Russett 1993). According to the institutional approach, democracies favor peace because of the constitutional checks and balances that tie the hands of decision-makers and the existence of a democratic civil society. These constraints present decision-makers with the prospect of high political costs for using force (de Mesquita and Lalman 1992). Moreover, democratically elected leaders are unable to act quickly, and this cautious foreign policy behavior reduces the likelihood that a conflict will escalate into war (Hermann and Kegley 1995).

In contrast, the dyadic proposition suggests that democracies are more pacific only when they confront other democracies. The pacifying effect of a democracy was also argued for lower-level conflicts and disputes. Our results indicate stronger support for the dyadic version of the democratic peace theory. Regime type matters most when the threat comes from an autocratic country: Respondents in the DA condition indicated more support for mobilizing troops when threatened compared to respondents in the DD condition. Regime type is important not because the country receiving a threat is a democracy but because the threatening country is an autocracy. However, despite this difference between the two conditions, a minority of role players in both the DA and DD conditions favored military action against the threatening country. This can be interpreted as modest support for the monadic proposition. Respondents' ranking of the variables in the DD condition further strengthens this point. The country's democratic system is regarded as the most important factor by the respondents in the DD condition, whereas the country's democratic regime is not important when the country is threatened by an autocratic country. In sum, our study supports the dyadic proposition in democratic peace theory, but it does not disconfirm the monadic argument. Being a democracy was regarded as the most

important variable when the country was faced with a threat from another democracy.

The higher ranking of the other's regime in the DA condition encourages a closer look at in-group–out-group dynamics in threatening situations. The key factor may be shared or unshared identity evoked by the other's regime type. In our study, the kind of identity, as fluid or strong, was not ranked as being important by the respondents. However, even though durability was regarded as being relatively unimportant, shared identity in the DD condition may make respondents less likely to support military action, while unshared identity may facilitate support for military action. This may be the reason why regime type of the other country is ranked as being more important in the DA than in the DD condition. Thus, unshared identity may be triggering out-group bias, whereas shared identity may be triggering in-group favoritism. This line of thought has been largely ignored by the democratic peace theory literature. Further research is encouraged to ascertain the role played by shared or unshared identity as explanatory processes that help to navigate the difference between monadic and dyadic versions of the theory.

Democratic peace theory has isolated the effect of regime type in order to create a parsimonious theory of militarized state behavior. It has often been regarded as a robust theory that supports the liberal approach to understanding militarized interstate disputes. Our results challenge these assumptions by showing that the effect of regime type is contingent on several conditions, including the other's regime, the severity of threat, and spread of support. Threat is an important factor in all of the conditions. An autocratic counterpart enhances the severity of threat and increases the likelihood of military action.

These two variables are further consolidated when we add spread as a third variable. Thus, it is necessary to understand the relationships among the three variables in future research concerning democratic peace theory. How does threat and regime type interact and what happens when public support or lack of support is included in the scenario? Our results spotlight these variables. More broadly, they address several theoretical traditions relevant to state behavior: liberal and realism paradigms as well as representation theory.

The addition of representation theory raises other interesting questions. For example, does popular support strengthen the will of democratic decision-makers to embark on violent foreign adventures against authoritarian regimes as was the case with the Iraq war? Does a lack of popular support reduce the motivation of decision-makers to react to threats from authoritarian regimes? Does a lack of popular support result in domestic friction that hampers mobilization and effective campaigns as was the case with the Vietnam War? These questions move the democratic peace debate in the direction of multiple, contingent causation for national decisions. They can be explored as hypotheses to be evaluated with experimental methods. This approach is especially useful for untangling relationships (relative variance explained) and discerning paths (mediating variables) among the three variables.

This study presents thought-provoking results on another contested issue within democratic peace theory: decisions that require mobilizing army in situations short of war. The results obtained in the humanitarian conditions showed that the other country's regime was considered to be relatively unimportant. Thus, the argument about the "shared" versus "unshared" identity distinction may be less relevant in these situations. Spread in the form of support for action is the most important factor in both DA and DD conditions of the humanitarian narrative. This finding corroborates the argument developed in the democratic peace literature favoring the role played by constitutional checks and balances in constraining the actions taken by decision-makers (Ungerer 2012). However, this is not because these constraints make democracies act slowly or cautiously. Rather, these constraints remind decision-makers that they are likely to face high political costs when their actions are not supported by the public. This is evident by the importance of spread in both conditions of this narrative: It is the most important factor in the DA condition and second most important in the DD condition. It is also evident in the results for ranking of own political system, ranked as most important in the DD condition and third in the DA condition.

In humanitarian situations, it appears that one's own system is a more important influence on

actions than the other's system. When there is need for humanitarian intervention, states most likely do not externalize their domestic nonviolent means of conflict resolution by including only other democracies within the same moral community. They treat both democracies and autocracies with the same shared norm of conduct based on the framing of a humanitarianism intervention rather than on the basis of a framing of "us" versus "them." The way that contexts (violent threats, humanitarian missions) influence the perception of the "other" (as part of or outside of a shared moral community) is an interesting topic for further research.

Appendix 1: Violence Narrative

The Situation

You are a national decision-maker from Aland, which has a _democratically_ elected government where citizens are encouraged but not required to show loyalty to the government. You are faced with the following situation and must make a decision.

Your country has had a history of _contentious relations_ with a neighboring country, Zland, which has a _nonelected autocratic regime_ (replaced with elected democratic regime for the DD version) where citizens are required to show loyalty to the government. They have _mobilized their troops_ along your border. Your _sophisticated, well-organized, and trained army_ is ready for action. _Your public is generally unified_ with regard to most government policies including the suggestion that action be taken against Zland, and most of your citizens have strong ties to the nation which they regard as their primary group identity. The majority of your citizens consider themselves to be strongly nationalistic.

You must now decide whether to act against this threat. Based on the information you received above, will you mobilize your army for action against your neighbor Zland or only put them on readiness alert? (Circle one.)

You will notice that there are six underlined elements in this situation. These must be taken into account in making your decision: _your nation's Aland political system, the severity of the external threat, the sophistication of your army, the spread of support throughout your population, and the strength of your citizens' identity within the nation, and the political system of the threatening country, Zland._ We ask you to compare these features of the situation in terms of their relative importance in influencing your decision. This is done with the following procedure.

The matrix below lists each of the elements along the side and at the top. You will compare each element with each of the other elements as a pairwise comparison. For example, if you think that your nation's Aland's political system is a more important influence on your decision than the severity of the threat, circle _more_; if the army's sophistication is less important than the severity of the threat, circle _less_, and so on. Please make a decision of more or less influence on your decision for each of the 15 comparisons. Remember you are being asked to compare the row factor with each factor in the five columns.

	The political system of threatening country (Zland)	Threat	Military sophistication	The spread of citizen support	The strength of citizens' identity within your nation
Is your country's (Aland) political system	More/less	More/less	More/less	More/less	More/less
Is threatening country's (Zland) political system		More/less	More/less	More/less	More/less
Is the severity of Threat			More/less	More/less	More/less
Is military sophistication				More/less	More/less
Is the spread of citizen support for policies					More/less

A more or less important factor in your decision than:

Please answer the following questions in a few sentences:

1. What was the most important factor and *why*?
2. Did your country's (Aland) and the threatening country's (Zland) political systems influence your decision? *Why* and *how*?

Appendix 2: Humanitarian Narrative

The Situation

You are a national decision-maker from Aland, which has a democratically elected government where citizens are encouraged but not required to show loyalty to the government. You are faced with the following situation and must make a decision.

A far away country, Zland, which has a non-elected autocratic regime (replaced with an elected democratic regime in the DD version) where citizens are required to show loyalty to the government, is a failed state and relies on the support of international community, including your country, to provide security and to distribute humanitarian aid to its impoverished people, whose survival is threatened by the local warlords in the country. Your country is a well-developed nation, which historically has been a major contributor to international peacekeeping and humanitarian operations. Your military and civilian supports are well trained in peacekeeping and humanitarian operations. Public opinion polls show there is widespread support among your citizens for sending your peacekeepers on a humanitarian mission to Zland and most of your citizens regard their national identity as one of their several group identities. The majority of your citizens regard themselves as internationalists.

You must now decide whether you want to send your peacekeepers on a humanitarian mission to Zland which aims at providing security and humanitarian assistance to the people there. Based on the information you received above, will you send your peacekeepers to Zland to help the people there or not take any action at all? (Circle one.)

You will notice that there are six underlined elements in this situation. These must be taken into account in making your decision: *your nation's (Aland's) political system, the economic situation and the historical record of your country, the training and readiness of your peacekeepers, the spread of support throughout your population for your actions, the strength of your citizens' identity within the nation, and the political system of the host country, Zland.* We ask you to compare these features of the situation in terms of their relative importance in influencing your decision. This is done with the following procedure.

The matrix below lists each of the elements along the side and at the top. You will compare each element with each of the other elements as a pairwise comparison. For example, if you think that your nation's (Aland's) political system is a more important influence on your decision than the economic situation and historical record of the country, circle *more*; if the peacekeeper's readiness is less important than the spread of support, circle *less*. Please make a decision of more or less influence on your decision for each of the 15 comparisons. Remember you are being asked to compare the row factor with each factor in the five columns.

	The political system of host country (Zland)	Your economy/historical record	Your peacekeeper's readiness	The spread of citizen support	The strength of citizens' identity within your nation
Is your country's (Aland) political system	More/less	More/less	More/less	More/less	More/less
Is host country's (Zland) political system		More/less	More/less	More/less	More/less
Is your economy /historical record			More/less	More/less	More/less
Is your peacekeepers' readiness				More/less	More/less
Is the spread of support					More/less

A more or less important factor in your decision than:

Please answer the following questions in a few sentences:

1. What was the most important factor and *why*?
2. Did your country's (Aland) and the host country's (Zland) political systems influence your decision? *Why* and *how*?

References

Cuhadar, E., Kaarbo, J., Kesgin, B., & Ozkececi-Taner, B. (forthcoming). Examining leaders' orientations to structural constraints: Turkey's 1991 and 2003 Iraqi war decisions. *Journal of International Relations and Development*

De Mesquita, B., & Lalman, D. (1992). *War and reason: Domestic and international imperatives*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Doyle, M. W. (1986). Liberalism and world politics. *The American Political Science Review, 80*, 1151–1169.

Druckman, D. (2006). Group attachments in negotiation and collective action. *International Negotiation, 11*(2), 229–252.

Druckman, D. (2001). Negotiation and identity: Implications for negotiation theory. *International Negotiation, 6*(2), 281–291.

Druckman, D., Cuhadar, E., Beriker, N., & Celik, B. (2010). Representative decision making: Constituency constraints on collective action. In F. Aquillar & M. Galluccio (Eds.), *Psychological and political strategies for peace negotiation: A cognitive approach*. New York: Springer.

Gleditsch, N. P. (1992). Democracy and peace. *Journal of Peace Research, 29*, 369–376.

Guilford, J. P. 1954. Psychometric Methods. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gurr, T., & Davies, J. (2002). Dynamics and management of ethnopolitical conflicts. In J. Davies & E. Kaufman (Eds.), *Second track/citizens' diplomacy*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.

Hermann, M. G., & Kegley, C., Jr. (1995). Rethinking democracy and international peace: Perspectives from political psychology. *International Studies Quarterly, 39*, 511–33.

Levy, J. S. (1988). Domestic politics and war. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History, 18*(4), 653–673.

Maoz, Z., & Russett, B. (1993). Normative and structural causes of democratic peace, 1946-1986. *The American Political Science Review, 87*(3), 624–638.

Mintz, A., & Geva, N. (1993). Why don't democracies fight each other? An experimental study. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution, 37*(3), 484–503.

Mousseau, M. (2003). The nexus of market security, liberal preferences, and democratic peace: Interdisciplinary theory and evidence. *International Studies Quarterly, 47*, 483–510.

Rosato, S. (2003). The flawed logic of democratic peace theory. *American Political Science Review, 97*, 585–602.

Rousseau, D. L. (2005). *Democracy and war: Institutions, norms, and the evolution of international conflict*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Rummel, R. J. (1983). Libertarianism and international violence. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 27*(1), 27–71.

Russett, B. M. (1990). *Controlling the sword: The democratic governance of national security*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Russett, B. M. (1993). *Grasping the democratic peace: Principles for a post-Cold War world*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Tomz, M., & Weeks, J. (2013). Public opinion and the democratic peace. *American Political Science Review, 107*(4), 849–865.

Ungerer, J. L. (2012). Assessing the progress of the democratic peace research program. *International Studies Review, 14*, 1–31.