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Abstract

In this dissertation, I develop a general level sociological theory of choice, which subsumes the classical expected utility theory of choice. I explain when the logic of habit (absence of utility) and when the various forms of instrumental, normative, and motivated rationality (presence of utility) would operate, and why. The key explanatory variable is the degree of contestation in the relevant action knowledge, held jointly at the individual and institutional levels. I offer various measurement standards with which one can systematically and rigorously measure the different logics of action.

To demonstrate the explanatory value of the sociological theory of choice, I derive contextualized propositions. The concrete context concerns an instance of alliance bargaining over the foreign policy stance toward a third-party. As conventional wisdom is that national leaders are playing the ‘two-level game,’ I argue that this particular context consists a hard test for my mid-level theoretical argument. Specifically, I address the following question: What explains the US allies’ joining behaviors in US-led military operations, especially when there is a lack of international institutional authorization to use armed force? I specify that the relative strengths of pre-existing ideas on the effectiveness of bilateralism, multilateralism, and the use of force in achieving national security objectives, held jointly at the individual and institutional levels, explain the US allies’ joining behaviors.
I test my argument against existing alternatives. I address the serious problem of equifinality by leveraging the differentially expected logics of action, and set up two rounds of critical tests. I employ a cross-national multi-methods research design. I focus on two US allies—the United Kingdom and the Republic of Korea—as they almost always receive US requests to join the operations of interest but remain vastly different from one another. I examine additional decision-making cases of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines. The findings of the two rounds of critical tests across three stages of the cross-national multi-methods research design overwhelmingly support my two-level ideational argument of US allies’ joining behaviors, specified from the sociological theory of choice.
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To my family
1. The Enigmatic Logic of Habit in International Relations Theory

The over-arching theme of this dissertation concerns the different logics of action as developed and conceptualized in International Relations theory. In particular, I delve into the logic of habit, conceptualized as the fast, taken-for-granted cognitive process generating observable action, including choice.\(^1\) On a general level, one can say that actions and choices were generated by the logic of habit, if those actions and choices were just simply so obvious and natural, within the minds and brains of individual actors under study. The logic of habit is non-rational in both senses of ‘instrumental’ and ‘procedural’ rationality.\(^2\) It is not instrumentally rational, in the sense that no utility drives the choice. It is not procedurally rational, because no analysis is involved, although post-hoc rationalizations are entirely possible. Even if cost-benefit parameters and the payoff structures were to change, the probability of serious deliberation over alternative courses of action would virtually be zero.

Most of the existing theories of international relations cannot account for the logic of habit, because we start with some sort of *utility* to explain the choices and intentions of the actors under study. In the social sciences more broadly, such utility or purpose is the baseline assumption most of the time and there is no place for the non-deliberative and non-utilitarian logic of habit, especially in decision-making frameworks. In the constructivist social science scholarship, however, the logic of habit—or the fast, taken-for-granted cognitive process generating choices and actions—is conceived and argued as possible. In the field of International

---

\(^1\) For instance, please see Porter (2018a), 46.

\(^2\) These two senses of rationality are explained in Simon (1978); Levy (1997); Rathbun, Kertzer, and Paradis (2017).
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Relations (IR), Hopf (2009) explains that naturalizing practices and identity understandings allow for the logic of habit, or the fast, taken-for-granted process, to generate momentous choices. Wendt (1992) describes such taken-for-grantedness in the human cognitive process as the third degree of cultural internalization, or the ‘constructivist hypothesis,’ while Johnston (2008) provides the socialization processes by which actor identities, preferences, beliefs, and the intervening cognitive processes change and can further evolve in non-teleological ways. The logic of habit has been empirically documented in great powers’ strategic choices— in Soviet foreign policy,3 UK foreign policy,4 US foreign policy,5 and US grand strategy.6 Further, the logic of habit is hypothesized to generate choices and actions in non-security domains of international affairs7 and operate within the minds and brains of ordinary citizens.8

Jervis (2017, Preface xxix) comes closest in sympathizing the uniquely constructivist cognitive process concept of the logic of habit, but adds that “Constructivists exaggerate the lack of self-consciousness” in taken-for-grantedness. Although this dimension of self-consciousness will be clarified in the subsequent section of this chapter, Jervis is right about constructivists pressing it a bit farther in that the logic of habit entails more than the subjective, actor level certainty. There is a kind of naturalistic certainty in the logic of habit. With subjective certainty, one is certain that it is. With naturalistic certainty, there is less of the self; it is. Two examples of such taken-for-grantedness are readily available from the social sciences that we practice. One

3 Please see Hopf (2002).
4 Please see Porter (2018b).
5 Please see Howard (2015).
6 Please see Porter (2018a).
7 Please see, Mitzen (2006); Hopf and Allan (2016), Chapter 1.
8 For instance, please see, Hayes (2015).
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equivalent example is our axiomatic assumption of utility or purpose in the choices and intentions of the actors under study. We are not only certain that some sort of utility drives the choices and actions—there is less of the pronoun; utility and purpose undergird the choices and actions of the actors under study. Another example is uncertainty. We are not just certain of the uncertainty of the social world—again, there is less of the pronoun; the social world is uncertain and probabilistic.⁹

In this dissertation, I attempt to make two major contributions to the social and cognitive sciences. One contribution is theoretical. I develop a general level sociological theory of choice, which subsumes the classical expected utility theory of choice. I consider it as a major theoretical contribution, because it accounts for the enigmatic logic of habit. The theory explains when the logic of habit (absence of utility), and when the various forms of instrumental, normative, and motivated rationality (presence of utility), would generate choice and why. Thus far, it had remained theoretically unclear when the logic of habit and the logics of non-habit would play out. Indeed, Hopf (2010, 544) notes that, “the logic of habit assumes, at least at this early stage of theorization, that all logics have their place in everyday life.” The general level sociological theory of choice addresses this theoretical gap by specifying conditions of when and why the different logics of action would unravel. The key explanatory factor is the degree of two-level contestation of the pre-existing action knowledge, held jointly at the individual and institutional levels.

There are some additional merits of the general level sociological theory of choice. First, it enriches our horizons of uncertainty. It not only provides a richer account of different kinds of uncertainty but also adds the possibility of a complete certainty. Specifically, the theory proposes

---

⁹ As Juanchich, Gourdon-Kanhukamwe, and Sirota (2017) show, there can be subjective, actor level uncertainty as well as naturalistic uncertainty.
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that there are naturalistic certainty/uncertainty as well as subjective certainty/uncertainty for the actors under study. In addition, the sociological theory of choice distinguishes at least three different kinds of biases in choices. Many IR scholars have been calling for an updated decision-making framework where biases are explicitly incorporated. Since the sociological theory of choice predicts and explains three different kinds of biases in choice, I believe that this is a huge gain in our understandings of decision-making in general. Further, the theory illuminates when and why individual level variables, including dispositions and traits, would matter most in explaining the final choice—thereby contributing to the agency-structure debates in various stripes. Moreover, the sociological theory of choice merges two traditionally separate levels of analysis—the institutional and the individual levels—together, and I believe that such two-level explanan offers one way of synthesizing the constructivist and psychological approaches to the study of IR.

The second major contribution of this dissertation is empirical. I draw upon a large body of literature in the thinking and reasoning field of the cognitive sciences to provide various measurement standards to operationalize the different logics of action. Because the intra-individual level cognitive processes are unobservable, it is scientifically vital to derive out the observable implications of the different types of cognitive processes in decision-making contexts in the most systematic and rigorous manner. In this dissertation, I offer some initial steps to systematically operationalizing all the different logics of action. I provide both experimental and observational measures of the different types of cognitive process generating choices and actions.

---

10 For instance, please see, Lake (2011); Hafner-Burton et al. (2017); Kertzer, Rathbun and Rathbun (forthcoming).

11 Wendt (1992); Shannon and Kowert (2011); Jervis (2017); and Kertzer and Tingley (2018) encourage studies that connect these ideational approaches at different levels of analysis.
I demonstrate the added value of the general level sociological theory of choice by deriving and testing contextualized propositions. The concrete context involves an instance of alliance bargaining. Specifically, I address the question of what explains the US allies’ joining behaviors in US-led operations that lack any international institutional authorization to use armed force? The universe of these episodes is a handful: 1) President Lyndon Johnson’s requests for troop contributions to the allied governments prior to the 1965 Operation Rolling Thunder in Vietnam, 2) President George W. Bush’s requests for the allied governments’ participation in the 2003 Operation Iraqi Freedom, 3) President Barack Obama’s requests on the allied governments for a joint military action against the Syrian regime’s chemical weapons military facilities in August 2013, 4) President Barack Obama’s requests on the allied governments to join the Operation Inherent Resolve onto Syria (September 2014 to November 2015), 5) President Donald Trump’s requests on the allied governments for a joint military action against the Syrian regime’s chemical weapons military facilities in April 2018, and most recently, 6) President Donald Trump’s requests on the allied governments for a joint military presence within Northeastern Syria in the spring of 2019.12

I chose this particular instance of alliance bargaining for three main reasons. First, I argue that the US allies’ joining decisions consist a hard case for the mid-level theoretical explanation, specified from the general level sociological theory of choice. My least-likely case argument is based on the following logic. Given the extraordinary salience of the issue at the time and the high international and domestic political costs associated with the non-default problem, one would expect that it is hard to observe the logic of habit within the minds and brains of the government decision-makers of interest. National leaders are expected to be actively playing

12 I build on the foundational dataset from Tago (2007). This dataset is also used by others in the existing literature.
what Putnam (1988) famously calls the two-level game, and it would be the least-likely time and place to observe the logic of habit in operation. Yet, if I find the logic of habit, or the fast taken-for-granted process, behind the participation or non-participation decisions, then such empirical observation would offer a strong support for the mid-level explanation derived from the sociological theory of choice.

Secondly, the study of alliance politics is most self-conscious about the serious problem of equifinality, not just in the outcome variables, but also in the explanatory variables themselves. To borrow Walt’s (2011, 104-105) constant reminders, “testing conjectures about contemporary alliances is complicated further by the need to distinguish between the effects of (1) the structural features of unipolarity, (2) America’s status as the single superpower, and (3) the particular policies adopted by specific US administrations.” The critical tests set up in this dissertation offer one way of adjudicating among the competing theoretical explanations. This particular way leverages the differentially expected logics of action. For instance, only the constructivist explanations would \textit{a priori} expect the logic of habit to be in operation. I showcase that the fine-grained focus on the intra-individual level cognitive process makes the much-needed critical empirical tests possible.

Finally, IR scholars have emphasized that constructivists should be interested in explaining the realpolitik domains in which the variety of realist explanations predominate.\textsuperscript{13} This precise domain of alliances in international relations has been traditionally dominated by neorealistic explanations.\textsuperscript{14} If I can show that my mid-level explanation of US allies’ joining behaviors, specified from the sociological theory of choice, outperforms the neorealistic as well as

\textsuperscript{13} For instance, please see, Fearon and Wendt (2002); Johnston (2008).

\textsuperscript{14} For instance, Waltz (1979); Walt (1985); Christensen and Snyder (1990); Morrow (1991, 2006); Snyder (1984, 1997); Cha (1999, 2016); Walt (2011); Christensen (2011).
other existing alternative explanations, then I can more fully demonstrate the explanatory value of the mid-level argument and the added value of the general level sociological theory of choice.

The practical policy implications of this dissertation are two-fold. First concerns the concrete context under study. The critical tests leveraging the differentially expected logics of action help refine our causal understandings of US allies’ joining behaviors in US-led operations that lack any international institutional authorization to use armed force. My mid-level argument, specified from the general level sociological theory of choice, provides a novel explanation of which US allies may be the most consistent in supporting and participating in US-led military operations and why. Similarly, it explains why some other US allies may be consistent in staying out of US-led operations that lack any international institutional authorization to use armed force. For those US allies that are expected to be more inconsistent, the explanation offers some policy guidance to focus on certain relevant beliefs of key decision-makers in government. The dissertation illuminates the different types of biases in choices and informs the strategies in alliance bargaining. Secondly, the dissertation also offers broader implications on alliance bargaining over other issue areas. These policy implications are derived in the conclusion chapter.

The rest of this introduction chapter is organized into five sections. First, I provide the definitions of the different logics of action as developed and conceptualized in IR theory. I also offer a useful typology of the types of cognitive process generating choice in a decision-making context, and discuss how this typology compares with Hopf’s seminal article on the logic of habit in international relations. Second, I briefly introduce my theoretical arguments. I first provide the general level sociological theory of choice and then specify the mid-level argument explaining the US allies’ joining behaviors in US-led military operations that lack any
international institutional authorization to use armed force. Third, I give various measurement standards by which one can systematically and rigorously operationalize the different logics of action. I offer both experimental and observational measures, and emphasize on the convergent validity across the measures. Then, I introduce the cross-national multi-methods research design of this dissertation. Lastly, I provide a dissertation overview.

I. Definitions and Typology

What are the different ‘logics of action’ in IR theory?

Though there are other narratives of the history of the discipline, if I can situate the logic of habit within the most common narrative of the four ‘Great Debates’ in IR, the logic of habit is part of the heterogeneous sequel to the very first logics of action debate in the 1990s.\(^\text{15}\) The first logics of action debate was between the logic of consequences and the logic of appropriateness. The logic of consequences means that actors deliberate over alternative courses of action to choose the strategy that maximizes the subjective expected utility, while the logic of appropriateness means that actors deliberate over norms and rules to make the most proper or appropriate choices.

Although the two logics seem to involve a similarly effortful, analytic rationality, there are significant differences between the two logics of action that it cannot be reducible to one. First, while there may be many informational and computational constraints, there are no social constraints in the logic of consequences. On the other hand, social constraints and social influences are key features of the logic of appropriateness.\(^\text{16}\) What this means is that, while there

\(^{15}\) For other narratives of the history of the discipline, please see, Schmidt (2013) and Lake (2013).

\(^{16}\) Please see Johnston (2008), Chapter 3.
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is theoretically no gap between private preference and final choice in the logic of consequences, there may be a distance between private preference and final choice in the logic of appropriateness. Such distinction is not trivial. The final choices generated through the logic of appropriateness may be different when made in isolation and in groups, and even the specific group dynamics may result in different choices. In contrast, the social environment is not theorized as to influence the final choices and actions generated through the logic of consequences.

In terms of bias, while there may be no biases in the choices made through the logic of consequences, the final choices generated through the logic of appropriateness are highly likely to be biased toward what is socially proper or appropriate. In international security studies, the most commonly known bias is due to motivated processing, or selective attention to incoming information. Although the logic of appropriateness and the motivated processes do not directly speak to each other, the two processes expect biases in choices and actions that the logic of consequences cannot account for. Yet, the key difference between the two is that in the former logic of appropriateness, the bias in choice is from social constraints, rather than from the motivated processing of the individual actors under study. In the logic of appropriateness, the information processing stream may be non-motivated, but it may still be socially impossible to adopt a particular strategy due to social psychological, role, or duty constraints. The levels of decision certainty may also be much lower, as there are personal doubts, reservations, and hesitations over the adopted strategy.

17 For bureaucratic politics dynamics, please see Marsh (2013) and Saunders (2017). For group dynamics in international institutions, please see Johnston (2008) and Fung (2019).

18 This is documented by Yarhi-Milo (2014); Jervis (2017); Kertzer, Rathbun, and Rathbun (forthcoming).
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The *logic of habit* can be seen as a part of the fourth ‘Great Debate’ between rationalism and non-rationalism/reflectivism in the history of the IR discipline.\(^{19}\) The logic of habit is non-rational in both senses of instrumental and procedural rationality. It is not instrumentally rational, because no utility undergirds the choice. It is not procedurally rational, because no analysis is involved, although post-hoc rationalizations are entirely possible, especially when the individual actors are prompted to give public justifications of their decisions. Even if the cost-benefit parameters and the payoff structures were to change, the probability of serious deliberation over alternative courses of action would virtually be zero. As such, behavior generated through the logic of habit is inconsistent with even the assumption of thin rationality of complete and transitive preferences.

There are many other fast cognitive processes well established in the study of IR and in the broader behavioral sciences. These include, but are not limited to, heuristics and intuitions,\(^{20}\) belief-based processes,\(^{21}\) practice-based varieties,\(^{22}\) emotion-based processing or hot cognition,\(^{23}\) and thinking dispositions.\(^{24}\) The logic of habit is unique in that certain actions and choices are so apparent and seemingly natural within the minds and brains of individual actors under study. For instance, Finnemore (2003) explains that states do not militarily intervene in order to collect sovereign debts anymore; such inactions are so obvious and seemingly natural. The unique

\(^{19}\) Please see Tickner and Waever (2009).

\(^{20}\) On heuristics and decision-making, please see, Mintz (2004); Poulsen and Aisbett (2013); Brooks, Cunha, and Mosley (2015). On pre-rational intuitions, please see, Hall and Yarhi-Milo (2012); Holmes and Traven (2015); Holmes (2018).

\(^{21}\) For instance, please see Yarhi-Milo (2014); Jervis (2017); Hafner-Burton et al. (2017); Kertzer, Rathbun, and Rathbun (forthcoming). On memories, please see, Vertzberger (1990); Khong (1992).

\(^{22}\) For instance, please see, Neumann (2007); Pouliot (2008); Adler and Pouliot (2011).

\(^{23}\) Please see, Rosen (2005); Lebow (2008); Markwica (2018).

\(^{24}\) Please see, Rathbun, Kertzer, and Paradis (2017).
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unconsciousness dimension associated with the obviousness in the logic of habit is also unique to doxa. To be sure, the individual actors certainly know of their own choices and actions to the extent that there is primary anoetic consciousness in animals. Yet, the logic of habit is different from the many other types of fast, cognitive processes in at least two aspects of self-consciousness. First, actors may have low levels of consciousness of the alternative courses of action. Actors may know of these other alternatives to the extent that these multiple strategic options are directly prompted upon the individual actors under study. However, there may be a lack of full attention or encoding of these alternative courses of action, simply because alternatives would seem outside of the actual. The level of consciousness or serious conception of these alternatives is expected to be low.

If one is able to seriously conceive of alternatives with a non-zero probability, then this is different from taken-for-grantedness. The logic of habit may seem closest to prior belief-based, intuitive processes. However, not all historical analogies, national narratives, and stereotypes are taken as obvious and actual. While some people may certainly take historical analogies and social stereotypes as true and actual, others may consciously apprehend them as analogies and stereotypes. Similarly, while some people may take some norms and conventions as given and natural, others may be conscious of the social historical roots of these norms and conventions. Likewise, the logic of habit is different from its closet logic of practice in that, in the former, choices and actions are seemingly natural, but in the latter logic of practice, choices and actions are understood as practice, custom, standard operation, or tradition. If social norms are understood as norms and rules, then it can be said that actions and choices were generated through the logic of appropriateness. The difference in practice and norms is nuanced, but it is generally accepted that the logic of appropriateness takes longer response time than the logic of
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practice.\textsuperscript{25}

As well, the logic of habit is different from default biases, in that not all defaults are taken as natural and reflective of the actual state of affairs. The general point of distinction between the logic of habit and the many other types of fast cognitive process is that when certain intuitive beliefs, practical knowledge, stereotypes, or defaults are taken to be natural and given, then this would exactly be an instance of the logic of habit. Yet, if they are conceived as practical knowledge, stereotypes, defaults, norms, and traditions, then the other fast processes in operation are qualitatively different from the logic of habit.

Second, there may be low levels of higher order self-consciousness of the objectified mode of representation.\textsuperscript{26} In other words, actors may be unconscious of their own fast, taken-for-granted cognitive process. For instance, people generally do not verbalize which things they take as actually natural or otherwise. It is rare to observe people say in everyday life, and especially in social and political settings, “I take X for granted,” “I take X as natural,” or “I take X as reality.” Such paucity in straightforward reality-based dictions stands in sharp contrast to explicit, more common phrases of other types of fast cognitive process. For instance, people can verbalize their intuitions through phrases, such as “my gut instincts say X,” “I feel X/I sense X/I just know that it is X,” “I am too tired or lazy to think right now,” and the like. People can also verbalize their fast processes based on prior belief-based heuristics, using phrases such as “X is intuitive” or “X is counter-intuitive.” People may also verbalize that, “X is our practice, custom, tradition, or standard operating procedure.” Further, people are capable of communicating their distinct emotions, or at the least, as Markwica (2018) argues, other people can read and communicate the

\textsuperscript{25} For instance, please see Fearon and Wendt (2002); Hopf (2010); Adler and Pouliot (2011); Holmes and Traven (2015).

\textsuperscript{26} Differences in higher order consciousness and primary consciousness are noted in Edelman and Tononi (2001); Burge (2010).
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emotions of the target actors under study.

In these two respects, the unconsciousness versus consciousness distinction commonly applied to the logic of habit can be more fruitfully applied in the following two dimensions: 1) low amount of attention paid to the alternatives (as they are non-actual) and therefore low level of consciousness of alternatives, and 2) low amount of higher order self-consciousness of the objectified mode of representation. Other similarly fast cognitive processes have higher levels of consciousness in these two dimensions: alternative courses of action can be seriously conceived, and there are higher levels of self-awareness of their own mode of the fast, cognitive process.

Thus far, I have defined and characterized the different logics of action as different types of fast and slow cognitive processes. Such definitions and conceptualizations accord with the dual-process accounts in the cognitive sciences. In the annual review, Evans (2008, 271) draws the conclusion that the generic dual-systems theory is currently “oversimplified and misleading” in that, “it is almost certainly wrong to think of Type 1 as one system,” and equally, “it is probably a mistake to think of Type 2 as the conscious mind, all of whose processes are slow and sequential.” Hence, instead of thinking about one uniform type of fast process and one uniform type of slow process, there are different kinds of both fast and slow processes.

A typology of the cognitive processes in decision-making

In the rest of this section, I offer a useful typology of four ideal-typical cognitive processes in decision-making contexts, where there are multiple conflicting response cues. This typology of cognitive processes is based on the conflict detection hypothesis and its experimental set-up from the thinking and reasoning field of the cognitive sciences. I will first explain why the thinking and reasoning field and its conflict detection set-up provide the most suitable basis for
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the typology of cognitive processes in decision-making, before describing the four ideal types of cognitive process. I conclude with a discussion on how this typology compares with Hopf’s conceptualization of the different logics of action.

There are largely three fields of dual process accounts in the cognitive sciences: 1) the judgment and decision-making field, otherwise known as the ‘heuristics and biases’ program, 2) the implicit social cognition field, and 3) the thinking and reasoning field. To begin with the judgment and decision-making field, judgment tasks involve basic laws of probability. The dual processes are measured by judgment quality, or in terms of deviations from a quantifiable optimum or accuracy. If choices deviate from the optimum, then decisions are deemed to have been produced by a heuristics-based, fast cognitive process. For instance, Kahneman and colleagues describe three general-purpose heuristics—availability, representativeness, and anchoring and adjustment—that underlie any intuitive judgments.\(^\text{27}\) These intuitive judgments, as well as pre-rational split-second decisions based on gut instincts, are different from taken-for-grantedness in that the choices and actions are not deemed as seemingly natural. There is some uncertainty. On the other hand, if the final choice does not deviate from the optimum, then it is deemed to have been produced by a procedurally slow and effortful process.

Another field in the dual-process accounts literature involves implicit social cognition, including the experimental tradition of the well-known Implicit Attitude Test (IAT). Here, the implicit and automatic versus explicit and controlled processes are measured with response time and valence matching.\(^\text{28}\) Such stereotype-based, implicit processes may at first seem quite close to the taken-for-granted process. However, they are qualitatively different if such prior belief-based processes are not taken as natural and real. For instance, even if individuals exhibit

\(^{27}\) Please see Kahneman and Gilovich (2002), Chapter 1.

\(^{28}\) Please see the seminal paper by Greenwald, McGhee, and Schwartz (1998).
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unconscious, automatic processes toward certain topics or subjects, as long as they do not take them for granted, as not constitutively actual, then such measures are invalid for operationalizing the qualitatively different kind of fast, taken-for-granted process. In other words, no matter how automatic and implicit, if individuals are able to conceive of other alternative understandings, then such seriously non-zero probability of alternative conceptions make it fundamentally different from the logic of habit.

Finally, the other experimental research tradition in the dual-process accounts literature is the thinking and reasoning field. In this field, there are numerous tasks intended to examine the different types of reasoning process that lead to individual level judgments. These tasks include, but are not limited to, 1) conditional reasoning, in which participants are asked to make inferences about conditional relationships (e.g. if the car runs out of gas, then it stalls), 2) complex conditional reasoning, in which participants are asked to determine what follows from two or more conditional statements (e.g. if something is a rose, then it has a gebber; if something has a gebber, then it is a flower), 3) stereotype and base-rate task, in which participants are asked to answer in which category the stereotypically described person belongs to, and 4) belief-logic syllogisms, in which participants are asked to evaluate the validity of conclusions drawn from logic statements.

In the thinking and reasoning field, there is sound empirical support for the ‘conflict detection hypothesis,’ which states that successful conflict detection causally triggers the slow and controlled, analytical process. Pennycook, Fugelsang, and Koehler (2015) write that one of the key pieces of evidence for the conflict detection hypothesis is a causal increase in response time from non-conflict to conflicting response cue conditions. Conflict detection is claimed to be highly efficient, in that most people are able to detect conflict and increase response time.
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especially when conflicting response cues are directly prompted upon the individual reasoners.30 I find such conflict detection set-up to be most suitable in thinking about the typology of cognitive processes in decision-making for two main reasons. First, the presence of conflicting response cues resemble the multiple policy options prompted upon the individual actors in foreign policy decision-making contexts. The conflict detection set-up already has in place these multiple response cues, representative of the multiple strategic options.

Given the resemblance of the decision-making contexts, where there are multiple response cues, the conflict detection set-up significantly narrows down the types of fast cognitive process generating the final choice. Second, and relatedly, this precise set-up of multiple response cues demonstrates that the logic of habit can operate in decision-making contexts. Specifically, the conflict detection hypothesis enables the unique isolation of one type of fast cognitive process: the logic of habit. The operation of other types of fast, intuitive cognitive processes are ruled out in this conflict detection set-up, as the direct presence of conflicting response cues efficiently triggers the slow and analytic process. For instance, in non-conflict settings, many other types of fast cognitive process are expected to play out in addition to the logic of habit. Yet, when moving across the non-conflict to conflicting response cue conditions, these other fast cognitive processes are ruled out as the slow, analytical processes are triggered most of the time.

However, there can be a categorical failure of conflict detection. I argue that such categorical failure of conflict detection, exhibited by the most biased subset of participants, can be understood as taken-for-grantedness of the default response. Within the conflict detection set-up, because individual judgments on various reasoning tasks depend heavily on the variable strengths of stereotype-based intuitive processes, a categorical failure of conflict detection might

30 This is suggested by De Neys and Bonnefon (2013).
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occur if the individual reasoners believe the vivid stereotypical descriptions to be actually true and reflective of the natural state of affairs. Taken-for-grantedness can be thought of as maximal strength of truthiness so as to be in accordance with actuality. In such cases, it would be virtually impossible to conceive of alternatives, because these alternatives would mean something other than the actual. Such unimaginability or serious conception of the alternatives is a key characteristic of taken-for-grantedness, which would contribute to the categorical failure of conflict detection.

I use the conflict detection hypothesis and its experimental set-up to build a typology of four ideal-typical cognitive processes in decision-making contexts, where there are multiple response cues. The conflict detection set-up not only resembles the real-world foreign policy decision-making contexts, where there are multiple policy response options, but also helpfully narrows down the wide range of different kinds of fast cognitive process. Figure 1.1 below illustrates the different types of cognitive process in a conflicting response cue condition. As Figure 1.1 shows, there can be many Initial Response (IR) cues, from a minimum of two to a number of ‘n’ cues. Because these responses are different and conflicting from each other, the efficient and successful conflict detection would causally trigger the slow, analytic processes. Yet, we would still expect to see a fast cognitive process generating the default Initial Response 1 (IR1), when there is a categorical failure in conflict detection. Without any conflict detection, no analytic process is causally triggered. The initial response is produced rapidly. This is the bottom right box.
The Enigmatic Logic of Habit

Figure 1.1. Illustration of the Conflict Detection Hypothesis

![Figure 1. Three-stage dual-process model of analytic engagement. T1 = Type 1 “intuitive” processing. T2 = Type 2 “analytic” processing. IR = initial response. IR’s are numbered to reflect alternative speeds of generation. IR1 is the most salient and fluent possible response. IR, refers to the possibility of multiple, potentially competing, initial responses. AR = alternative response. IRn refers to the possibility of an alternative response that is grounded in an initial response.](image)

**Taken-for-granted Process**

I argue that the ‘categorical failure in conflict detection’ can be thought of as taken-for-grantedness of the default Initial Response 1. In base-rate tasks employed in the thinking and reasoning field, such default responses involve stereotypical descriptions. When there is a categorical failure in conflict detection, certain stereotypical descriptions are conceived as true and reflective of the actual state of affairs. It may be virtually impossible to conceive of alternatives, because these alternatives would mean something other than the actual. Such unimaginability, or absence of serious conception of the alternatives, is a key characteristic of the logic of habit.

As the Figure illustrates, the taken-for-granted process is conceptualized as a fast process

---

31 Figure 1 is from Pennycook, Fugelsang, and Koehler (2015), 63.
generating the default Initial Response 1 in a matter of split-seconds (milliseconds). No analytic process is causally triggered. The IR1 is taken-for-granted as obvious and natural.

**Non-Motivated Process**

When there is efficient and successful conflict detection, various types of slow, analytic process are triggered. In the conflict detection set-up, one form of such slow, analytical, and controlled process can be characterized as *non-motivated*, because alternative responses are considered even-handedly and such unbiased thinking could result in the change of the Initial Response. Such response change requires additional processing to inhibit and override the default response. Pennycook, Fugelsang, and Koehler (2015, 40) write that this process is “perhaps the most prototypical analytic process and, as such, has dominated the literature on reasoning.” In IR theory, such non-motivated process is closest to the logic of consequences. This type of slow, analytic process is expected to take the longest response time, as shown by the bottom left box.

**Motivated Process**

Pennycook, Fugelsang, and Koehler (2015) explain that another type of slow and controlled process causally triggered by the multiple conflicting response cues is rationalization. Rationalization is a form of slow, analytical process where, despite successful conflict detection, the individual reasoner focuses on justifying or elaborating the first initial response without seriously considering the alternative responses. Whether implicitly or explicitly, the adopted response is already quickly predetermined or desired even before equally weighing the pros and cons of alternative responses. Right from the beginning, the different courses of action have different probabilities of adoption, because the psychological need for consistency or the motivation to arrive at particular conclusions are likely to yield confirmation and disconfirmation.
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Attention is selectively given to information that confirms the already preferred strategy, while attention is selectively given to information that disconfirms the diametrically opposed, non-adopted strategy. This leads to a response in line with what would typically be considered bias, but that has been bolstered by effortful, analytic reasoning. This motivated process is focused on verifying, and not falsifying, the default response. Because the slow, analytic thought is triggered in a motivated way, the response time is expected to be longer than the taken-for-granted process but shorter than the non-motivated process. Response change is expected to be very low. This is the bottom middle box.

Socially Constrained Process

I include another form of slow, analytical, and controlled cognitive process and situate it in this typology of cognitive processes in decision-making. Here, the social constraints affect the unequal probability of adoption of strategies. For example, for normative or social reasons, it may be socially impossible to adopt a particular strategy. Such unequal probability against the non-adopted strategy is different from the motivated reasoning or rationalization process just described, because in the above case, the individual was personally motivated to adopt and confirm the initially preferred strategy. However, in this socially constrained cognitive case, the individual decision-maker may not be personally motivated to adopt the adopted strategy. Rather, they may be socially constrained to adopt the strategy, when in private they may have doubts, reservations, and hesitations over the adopted policy. As such, in different social, role,

---

32 Such processes are already well documented and established by Yarhi-Milo (2014); Jervis (2017); Kertzer, Rathbun, and Rathbun (forthcoming).

33 According to Johnston (2008), this is a key difference.
or group environments, the change in response may be possible. The different social and role circumstances may also affect the response time. Still, this socially constrained process involves the slow, analytic process, and so the response time is expected to be longer than the taken-for-granted process and to depend on the distance between the privately preferred and the socially prescribed choice.

In sum, I provide four ideal-typical cognitive processes in decision-making contexts, where there are multiple response cues. These cognitive processes generating actions and choices are: 1) taken-for-granted process, 2) non-motivated process, 3) motivated process, and 4) socially constrained process. Although one may argue that the logics of either instrumental or normative rationality are similar enough that they do not need distinction, I have explained earlier that there are no effects of social constraints on choice in the logic of consequences, while there are independent effects of social constraints on choice in the logic of appropriateness. In this vein, the socially constrained process can procedurally analyze the material consequences of the alternative courses of action, and the non-motivated process can procedurally analyze the normative, or even religious, concerns of the alternative courses of action but the former produces biases in choices due to social constraints.

This typology of cognitive processes in decision-making closely follows Hopf’s three logics of action: 1) the logic of consequences, 2) the logic of appropriateness, and 3) the logic of habit. The biggest update to this original conceptualization of the logics of action is the addition of the motivated process, or the logic of rationalization, into the conceptual framework of various logics of action. I explain how the four ideal-typical cognitive processes compare with

---

34 Johnston (2008) and Fung (2019) demonstrate such differences in China’s foreign policy choices at international institutions across time and cases.

35 These three logics of action are in Hopf (2016) Chapter 1, and also in Abdelal et al. (2009) Chapter 1.
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one another. Just as how this typology notes of the different types of slow cognitive process in decision-making, this typology notes of the many other types of fast cognitive process in decision-making. The logic of habit, or the taken-for-granted process, is one type of fast cognitive process. This typology based on the research of the thinking and reasoning field, and specifically on the conflict detection hypothesis, ensures the unique isolation of the logic of habit from the many other types of fast cognitive process.

II. Arguments in Brief

The Sociological Theory of Choice

Under the framework of standard rationalist models, the enigmatic logic of habit would mean that the actors do not deliberate over alternative courses of action, because certain actions and choices are seemingly natural. By situating the logic of habit within the classical ‘choice’ framework, the sociological theory of choice is in direct dialogue with the expected utility theory of choice. Such parallel framing and labeling of the sociological theory of choice signal that the classical sociological theories can also explain choice, including but certainly not limited to foreign security policy decisions.

To explain the non-deliberative and non-utilitarian logic of habit, I bring in Berger and Luckmann’s (1966) classical treatise on the sociology of knowledge and make some theoretical modifications. What these modifications do is that they allow for the sociological theory of choice to explain precisely when the different logics of action, or different types of cognitive process, would generate choices and why. One of the unique features of this theoretical framework is that it adds certainty to our existing models based on axiomatic uncertainty. It further distinguishes between naturalistic certainty and actor level certainty as well as naturalistic
uncertainty and actor level uncertainty.

Berger and Luckmann’s core insight on taken-for-grantedness is that when there is a complete symmetry between the institutional and the individual levels, what was originally institutionalized by human actors may appear as naturalistic reality. In the general level sociological theory of choice, I too jointly analyze the institutional and the individual levels. The institutional level provides the baseline reality to the actors of interest. In terms of Waltz’s (1959) three images of IR, the individual level of analysis is the first-image. The institutional level of analysis is close to the second-image of the state, but I allow for the differentiation and variation in the institutional level across individual actors under study. Accordingly, the first modification I make to the institutional level of analysis is that the institutional level to which the individual actors refer to for baseline reality may differ across individuals.

Next, the second theoretical modification that I make in the sociological theory of choice is the limitation of scope of the pre-existing knowledge. Specifically, I introduce the notion of ‘action knowledge.’ The classical treatise has a quite broad scope in that it is about the sociology of knowledge in its entirety. In the sociological theory of choice, not all the pre-existing social ideas matter in explaining the specific choices and decisions. Among the pre-existing ideas, there is a subset of ideas and beliefs that are relevant to the choice problem at hand. One needs to specify which of the ideas and understandings are relevant to the decision problem under study. This is not to argue that only the few number of pre-existing ideas matter; rather, the sociological theory of choice argues that the few number of relevant ideas are the primary ideas that matter at the minimum. Across time and space, there may be other relevant understandings that comprise this action knowledge.

---

36 This notion of action knowledge is used in the field of developmental psychology, as one of the foundations of social cognition. For instance, please see, Johnson (2010).
Constructivist IR explanations emphasize identities as the primary explanatory variables of choices and actions. In the sociological theory of choice, such identity understandings can also be part of the pre-existing knowledge. However, not all aspects of identity understandings may matter for the choice problem at hand. If it is about a foreign security policy, then the security dimensions of the self and other may be more relevant than the other economic or cultural dimensions of the existing identity understandings. All these dimensions—security, economy, and culture—could be defined and understood in a similar way, making such distinction unnecessary, but these different dimensions need not flow in one direction. For instance, one may be an important economic partner but not a security partner. One’s friend may not necessarily be a security partner. A security partner may not necessarily be liked. Thus, action knowledge includes the most relevant parts of the identity understandings and the domain of the decision problem should inform which dimensions are the most relevant.

In this theoretical notion of action knowledge, there may be other pre-existing ideas and beliefs that could inform the decision problem. These ideational factors could be specifically about the domain of the action problem. They could be longstanding beliefs or more emergent beliefs. The conceptual relationships among the pre-existing ideas, identity understandings, and action knowledge are illustrated in Figure 1.2A below. The outermost circle is the universe of pre-existing ideas, which includes national identity understandings, national narratives, historical analogies, stereotypes, as well as more newly emerging understandings. For each decision problem, there is a set of action knowledge, made up of the most relevant ideas. This action knowledge is much smaller than the universe of pre-existing ideas. If other states were involved, the dimensions of national identity understandings of these other states, particularly relevant to the decision problem, would be part of the action knowledge.
Finally, given this minimum set of relevant ideas that make up the pre-existing action knowledge, I employ the notion of ‘contestation’ in this action knowledge.\textsuperscript{37} The relevant ideas could be held in a way in which there is no contestation in action knowledge. In some cases, we simply know what to do and what not to do. In other instances, we may not know what to do. One needs to specify how the relevant ideas can be arranged so that there is either contestation or non-contestation in action knowledge. One way to put such analytical order is to theorize on the relative strengths of the relevant ideas that form the basis for this action knowledge. For instance, if one belief is clearly stronger than the others, then there may be non-contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge; we just know what to do and what not to do. If the strengths of the relevant beliefs are similar, then there may be a contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge.

To get at the rich distinction of subjective actor level certainty/uncertainty and

\textsuperscript{37} This notion of ‘contestation’ comes from one of the dimensions of identity as a variable, in Abdelal et al. (2009), Chapter 1.
naturalistic certainty/uncertainty, I look at the degree of ideational contestation at both the individual and institutional levels of analysis. If there is non-contestation at both levels, there is complete non-contestation in the action knowledge and these actions may seem obvious and natural. The logic of habit, or the fast, taken-for-granted cognitive process, may likely generate the choice. If there is individual level contestation within the set of action knowledge, there may be private reservations and doubts. Still, given the institutional level non-contestation, socially constrained process may lead to biases in choice, particular in government offices with role and duty constraints. In isolated environments, however, there would not be as much social constraints or influences. Finally, the two levels of analysis may each have non-contestation in the action knowledge, but there may be contestation across the two levels. In this case, the individual actor recognizes such conflict and conflict detection will likely trigger the slow, analytical, and controlled cognitive process. Again, given the institutional level non-contestation in the action knowledge, socially constrained process may lead to biases in choice. In isolation, the individual would be free to choose the individually preferred choice.

If the institutional level has high levels of contestation in action knowledge, then individual level non-contestation would allow for motivated processing. Biases in choices will likely result from selective attention and high levels of confidence from confirmation and disconfirmation biases. Although there may be high levels of subjective certainty, there is no naturalistic certainty in this case. If there is also individual level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge, there may be a sense of naturalistic uncertainty and the final choice would be most indeterminate. Non-motivated process is highly likely and the final choice may be contingent upon the concrete events that unfold on the ground.
The Mid-Level Theory of US Allies’ Joining Behaviors

The mid-level contextualized argument on US allies’ joining behaviors specifies the above three key parts of the general level sociological theory of choice. First, I specify the institution level for each of the individual actors under study. For the president, I specify the institution as his or her national security team. For the politically appointed advisers, I specify the institution as the bureaucratic organizations that they head. For the career officials, I specify the institution as their home agencies. For the president’s own national security advisers, who are neither administration secretaries nor career bureaucrats, I specify the institution as the political party, and if further required, the faction of the political party from which the chief executive is from.

Second, I specify which of the pre-existing ideas would matter for this particular decision problem. The decision problem involves the use of force abroad, and so it is within the national security policy domain. Therefore, the relevant ideas in this domain are the pre-existing beliefs on the effectiveness of national security strategies. While some states stress on the importance of the US alliance in ensuring national security, other states believe that maintaining and keeping with the international institutional rules and norms help ensure national security. Still, other states equally focus on both strategies of bilateralism and multilateralism, or none. As the particular decision problem involves the use of force abroad, the pre-existing beliefs about the effectiveness of the use of force in achieving national security objectives are also relevant for this particular decision problem under study.

The third theoretical component that I specify is the relative strengths of these relevant ideas. I argue that if beliefs on the effectiveness of bilateralism with the United States are stronger than those on multilateralism, and there is high belief in military effectiveness, then
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there is no contestation in the action knowledge. Actors will know that support and participation in US-led military operations, even if lacks any international institutional authorization to use armed force, is the action to take. On the other hand, if beliefs on the effectiveness of multilateralism are stronger than those on bilateralism, and there is weak belief in military effectiveness, then there is no contestation in the action knowledge towards non-participation. In all other combinations of the relative strengths of these relevant ideas, there is contestation in action knowledge.

With these theoretical specifications, my mid-level argument on US allies’ joining behaviors in this particular context is as follows. If there were institutional level non-contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge, then the individual leader level degree of contestation in the action knowledge would not matter as much. We would expect participation or non-participation, regardless of the individual leader in office. If there were institutional level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge, then the individual leader level beliefs would matter more. If there were individual level non-contestation in the action knowledge, motivated processes will likely lead to either participation or non-participation decisions. There would be high actor level certainty, but there will not likely be naturalistic certainty. If there is also an individual level contestation in the action knowledge, then the final choice outcome is most indeterminate and non-motivated process will likely play out. There would be a seemingly naturalistic uncertainty in this case. In brief, I argue that the degree of two-level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge, held jointly at the individual and institutional levels, is the main variable explaining the US allies’ joining behaviors.
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III. Measurement Standards and Operationalization

The major difficulty in measuring the different logics of action lies in the unobservable nature of the intra-individual level cognitive processes. One may expect that the most direct measurement is to ask subject(s) of inquiry of their self-perceived types of cognitive process through the survey or interview methodologies, but there are concerns for false consciousness, confusion, or denial. Recent evidence suggests that people recognize the operation of biases in human judgment, except when that bias is their own.\(^{38}\) In other words, while people may recognize motivated reasoning in others, they may not recognize motivated reasoning in their own cognitive processes. For example, individuals could say that their views are “objective,” when they are really subjective and motivated. In the case of the taken-for-granted process, it is hard for individuals to have higher order self-consciousness of the objectified mode of representation in the first place. Hence, there are concerns over direct self-reports on the types of cognitive process.

One could also employ other direct, brain measurement techniques, such as functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) and electroencephalography (EEG). The direct measurement of brain activities in the forms of neural activation, oxygen blood flow, and electrical activity does not by itself give the state or type of the cognitive process. These brain-based measures have to be used with other behavioral measures, and the convergent validity across various measures would increase the confidence in the validity of measurement and operationalization of the different logics of action.\(^{39}\) Other physiological measures, such as eye tracking and skin conductance response (SCR) tests, could potentially help measure the different

\(^{38}\) For instance, please see, Pronin (2007).

\(^{39}\) Botvinick, Cohen, and Carter (2004); Klein et al. (2007); and Banks and Hope (2014) employ brain scans and monitoring techniques within the conflict detection framework.
types of cognitive process in decision-making contexts. Again, these other neurobiological measures would help enhance the confidence in the measurement validity and the findings of the study. In this dissertation, however, I will focus on behavioral measures due to high costs in collecting these other possible neurobiological and physiological measures. I derive out the observable behavioral implications of the different logics of action. I focus on three measures from the thinking and reasoning field of the cognitive sciences—1) response time, 2) response change, and 3) decision certainty—and use an inductively uncovered text classification scheme to measure the different logics of action. This final text-based measure provides a key observational measure. The convergent validity across all four measures would increase the confidence in the measurement validity.

**Response Time**

The conflict detection hypothesis states that successful detection of multiple conflicting response cues causally increases response time. Conflict detection is claimed to be highly efficient, in that most people are able to detect conflict and increase response time. However, Pennycook, Fugelsang, and Koehler document a categorical failure in conflict detection, and I argue that such particularly biased subset of participants, who exhibit conflict detection failure, are those engaged in a taken-for-granted process. Thus, I operationalize the fast, taken-for-granted process with no causal increase in response time from non-conflict to conflicting response cue conditions. The absence of causal increase in response time does not necessarily only mean the logic of habit. The response time in baseline conditions may be long to begin with and there may be ceiling effects, especially in ten-minute survey experiments. However, if I do find a causal increase in response time from non-conflict to conflicting response cue conditions,

---

40 Ball et al. (2006); De Neys, Moyens, and Vansteentwegen (2010) use physiological measures within the conflict detection framework.
then this would not be the logic of habit.

Pennycook and colleagues show that those who exhibit the categorical failure in conflict detection take the shortest amount of time in choosing the response in conflicting response cue conditions. In contrast, the subset of participants who exhibit response decoupling takes the longest amount of time in choosing the final response in conflicting response cue conditions. Thus, comparatively speaking, there are two extremes across individual decision-makers. At the one end, those who take certain choices and actions for granted would quickly make their individual level choices. At the other end, those engaged with non-motivated processes would most slowly make their individual level choices. Motivated and socially constrained processes would fall somewhere in between these two extremes.

Through process tracing, one could observe which members of the administration made their individual level choices most quickly and most slowly. Although response time cannot be measured with an absolute scale of time (e.g. seconds, days, or weeks), response time can be measured in relative terms, especially across the individual members of the administration. From the standpoint of the government-level decision, one can observe how far ago the individual members of the administration have made up their minds. The farthest one can trace this back could mean either taken-for-granted or motivated processes. The closest in time to the final government level decision could mean either socially constrained or non-motivated processes. As I discuss later in this section, no one measure can be an authoritative indicator of the types of cognitive process. The convergence across various measures would only increase the validity in measurement.

**Response Change**

From the same conflict detection set-up, I look at another measure: response decoupling,
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or response change. This second measure has to be absolutely consistent with the first measure to be clearly indicative of the type of cognitive process. For the taken-for-granted process, it has to be the case that there is no response change from non-conflict to conflicting response cue conditions. Thus, I measure the logic of habit, or the fast taken-for-granted process, with both no causal increase in response time and no causal change in response.

If there are response changes across the non-conflict and conflicting response cue conditions, then this indicates other types of cognitive process. A priori, I expect response changes to be most likely for the socially constrained and non-motivated processes. If individuals are in isolation, response change is very possible, but in a social or role context, socially constrained process will likely lead to bias in choice. Response change is highly likely for the non-motivated process, because the final choice is indeterminate to begin with.

Observationally, one could examine the post-decision time period to observe the differential prospects of response changes. A priori, the most likely observation is as follows. Those decision-makers who carried socially constrained processes are most likely to show response changes, when they are out of office. In contrast, those decision-makers who had taken-for-granted or motivated processes are not likely to show response changes. Only those who had non-motivated process may show response change. Although we can certainly expect to find response change, it is not necessarily required. One can slowly and even-handedly think through alternative options and still make the same choice. Again, these observational data on response change in the post-decision time period must be consistent with the observational data on response time in the decision period.

**Decision Certainty**

Within the same conflict detection set-up, there is another standardized measure: decision
certainty, or decision confidence, levels. Conflict detection experimental studies show that there is a causal decrease in decision certainty from non-conflict to conflicting response cue conditions, and this also holds for those exhibiting taken-for-grantedness. Researchers call this subset of participants “biased but in doubt.”41 Yet, the tasks used in these studies involve either logical or probabilistic inconsistency. When there are no logical or probabilistic accuracy attached to the decision problems, such as those choice problems in foreign policy decision-making, then I would expect the following. I expect those with either naturalistic or subjective certainty to not show a causal decrease in decision certainty across non-conflict to conflicting response cue conditions. Only those with either naturalistic or subjective uncertainty, as operationalized by contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge, would show a causal decrease in decision certainty. Hence, I measure the logic of habit, or the fast taken-for-granted process, with the convergent validity in the three measures: 1) no causal increase in response time, 2) no causal change in response, and 3) no causal decrease in decision certainty, across non-conflict to conflicting response cue conditions. If any of these three conditions were not satisfied, then this would indicate that the type of cognitive process is not the logic of habit.

Next, I measure the socially motivated process, especially in isolated survey experimental settings, with the convergent validity in the three measures: 1) possible increase in response time, 2) possible response change, and 3) possible decrease in decision certainty, across non-conflict to conflicting response cue conditions. Then, I measure the motivated process with the following three experimental measures: 1) possible increase in response time, 2) unlikely-possible response change, and 3) no causal decrease in decision certainty, across non-conflict to conflicting response cue conditions. Finally, I measure the non-motivated process with the following three experimental measures: 1) possible increase in response time, 2) possible response change, and

41 Please see De Neys, Cromheeke, and Osman (2011).
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3) possible decrease in decision certainty, across non-conflict to conflicting response cue conditions.

In observational studies, it is difficult to obtain an absolute measure of decision certainty from a scale of 0 to 100 percent. Observationally, I rely on convergent validity in the two aforementioned measures and the text-based measure below.

Text Classification

One method used to explicitly gain information about the intervening cognitive processes is the Verbal Protocol. Developed by Ericsson and Simon (1984, 1993), the method probes the subjects’ cognitive processes during various tasks. The advantage of verbal self-reports, which can be concurrent or retrospective, is that the data reveals rich contextual details that the other scaled measures cannot provide. I follow the standard protocol in retrospective self-reports, because one tends to observe the retrospective justifications of policy choice made by the national leaders and advisers. This text-based measure is the key link that is the same measure for both experimental and observational data.

I follow the standard protocol to have subjects practice on mock tasks before beginning the real task. Subjects need practice carrying out the instructions, because they can either misunderstand what they have been asked to do or are simply unable to carry out the task. It is very rare that subjects do not spontaneously verbalize in a normal fashion after a couple of practice problems. For the mock tasks, I probe the taken-for-granted cognitive process with a statement on the appropriateness of New Years celebration. Arguably, many people may take the New Years celebration for granted. Yet, although it may seem obvious, actual, and natural, New Years celebration still remains a choice. I probe the motivated cognitive process with a statement on increases in corporate tax, and probe the socially constrained and non-motivated processes
with a statement on biogenetic engineering.

I inductively uncovered two dimensions of bias in the texts. The first dimension of bias is the absence of the text about the non-preferred action, and the second dimension of bias is the imbalance of substantial reasons. Based on the combination of these dimensions, I classify texts into different types of cognitive process and have a fifth, text-based measure. I classify taken-for-granted process with the absence of the text about the non-preferred action, and with the imbalance of reasons for the stated, preferred action. In other words, there are only positive aspects and reasons for the preferred action. As well, I uncovered that taken-for-granted process could also be verbalized as mere regurgitation of the position without any justifications.

Motivated process is measured with presence of non-preferred action, but an imbalance of substantial reasons. Specifically, only negative aspects are attached to the non-preferred action, while only positive aspects are attached with the preferred action. Though the preferred policy may have some negative aspects, it is usually reasoned and stated in terms of the non-preferred action having even more negative aspects. In essence, there are no positive aspects attached to the non-preferred action. Socially constrained process is measured with the absence of the text about non-preferred action, but there is a balance of reasons for the chosen action. In other words, for the action that is mentioned, there are both positive and negative aspects discussed. Other unique words for socially constrained process explicitly involve doubts and hesitations. Finally, a non-motivated process is measured with the presence of the non-adopted action and a balance of reasons. In particular, positive aspects are attached to the non-adopted policy. I also measure unsure and undecided as non-motivated process, as the non-motivated process is the most indeterminate in choice. I use these two dimensions of bias to classify observational texts into types of cognitive process.
In sum, if the text-based measure is consistent with the above three standardized measures from the conflict detection experimental studies, then such consistency in the four measures increases my confidence in the measurement validity of the types of intra-individual level cognitive process. Although no one measure provides an authoritative indicator of the type of cognitive process, the sufficiently different ranges and combinations of the four measures allow researchers to systematically and rigorously operationalize the different logics of action, or types of cognitive process in both experimental and observational decision-making contexts.

IV. Research Design

In this dissertation, I employ a cross-national within-case research design, as this design reduces the inferential error that may arise from using either design alone.\textsuperscript{42} I chose to compare two US allies—the United Kingdom (UK) and the Republic of Korea (ROK)—because they are vastly different from one another due to different domestic political histories, international and diplomatic histories, national narratives, and individualist versus collectivist cultures. This means that I can generalize any similar results from the critical tests using the two country cases with higher confidence. I conduct the critical empirical tests in multiple stages, using mixed methods.

Multi-Stage Mixed-Methods Study

I first start with survey experiments on adult UK and ROK citizens to check for the convergent validity of the measures and test my hypotheses with large-N samples. Systematic and valid measures of the types of cognitive process are vital for the critical tests derived in this dissertation study. The strength of randomization in controlled experiments is that it ensures a

\textsuperscript{42} George and Bennett (2005) conclude that the combination of the cross-national and within-case research designs is ideal.
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clean causal inference of treatment effects, which in this case are the effects of conflicting response cue conditions. The various measures of the types of cognitive processes—response time in seconds, response change, decision certainty in a scale from 0 to 100 percent, and open-ended responses to write-aloud tasks—can be most precisely obtained and operationalized through survey questionnaires. With the survey questionnaires, I am also able to operationalize the subgroups of theoretical interest in a highly precise manner. In addition, I am able to conduct hypothesis tests on large-N samples of individuals. The large-N citizen samples provide the statistical confidence of not only the measures of the types of cognitive process but also the propositions of the mid-level explanation specified from the sociological theory of choice.

However, there are substantial critiques of the experimental studies. One of the frequent critiques of the experimental studies is that experiments cannot replicate the high-stakes, intense pressures of the international strategic environment. Another critique concerns the difficulty of generalizing from non-elite samples to the target populations of government decision-makers. Although citizens are different from government decision-makers, because my central dependent variable of interest lies in the cognitive processes generating the final choices, controlled experiments with citizens still offer a suitable method to test my hypotheses. The other concern is about the social environmental differences. While the government decision-makers are in a social group setting, the individual survey participants respond to the survey in isolation from each other. This concern is not as grave for two main reasons. First, because the unit of my theory concerns both individual and institutional levels, I specify the institutional level per
individual, even for the citizen participants. Second, I am aware of when the social environmental conditions would make the most difference in choices. I will make this concern as explicit as possible.

There are strengths and weaknesses in the experimental method, and I employ various observational methods to complement the survey experimental method. Once I have a sure footing on the measures of the different types of cognitive process, I move on to the actual government decisions in the UK and the ROK. I focus on the specific case of US allies’ joining decisions in the 2003 Iraq War. I consider it as allied participation in the 2003 Iraq War if troops were deployed to Iraq prior to the UN Security Council Resolution 1483 in May 2003. If there were staunch opposition, non-participation, or even just diplomatic support during this period between March-May 2003, then I consider it as non-participation, or staying out, of the 2003 Iraq War. In this second stage of the empirical research, I use the primary observational and interview data to operationalize the different types of cognitive process for the target population of government decision-makers under study. I look at the variations of response time across the government decision-makers, differential prospects of response change in the post-decision time period, and variations in the text-based measures.

Moreover, I address the causal implications of my mid-level explanation of US allies’ joining behaviors. As it is generally tough to experimentally manipulate ideational factors—be they strategic beliefs, identity understandings, local meanings, personality traits, or dispositions, it remains difficult to experimentally test for the causal effects of different degrees of ideational contestation. Here, I address this limitation of the experimental studies by employing the within-individual cross-issues research design to explore the causal implications of my mid-level argument. Fixing the individual decision maker, I explore how the same actor provides
justifications and reacts to different foreign policy issues.

Finally, the last stage of the research design involves external validity test. I examine two additional paired comparisons: Australia-Canada and New Zealand-Philippines decisions in 2003. The first pair, Australia-Canada, match my original UK-ROK pair in terms of the degrees of institutional level contestation in action knowledge. Like the UK, Canada has had institutional level contestation in action knowledge in 2003. Like the ROK, Australia has had institutional level non-contestation in action knowledge in 2003. These additional cases should be similarly explained by my mid-level theoretical argument. I also examine the untested theoretical case where there is institutional level non-contestation in action knowledge towards non-participation in the 2003 Iraq War. I look at the cases of New Zealand and the Philippines and test if my mid-level theoretical argument explains their non-participation decisions in March 2003.

V. Overview of the Dissertation

In this chapter, I introduced the central theme of this dissertation: the different logics of action, or types of cognitive process, as developed and conceptualized in International Relations theory. With the general level sociological theory of choice, I explained when the logic of habit and the logics of non-habit would play out and why. I argued that the specific instance of alliance bargaining is a hard test for my mid-level argument, specified from the general level sociological theory of choice. I briefly introduced my theoretical arguments and provided various measurement standards, by which one can systematically and rigorously operationalize the types of cognitive process. I explained the cross-national multi-methods research design of this dissertation study. Ultimately, this dissertation advances a two-level ideational argument of
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choices and actions, including US allies’ joining behaviors in US-led operations that lack any international institutional authorization to use armed force.

In Chapter 2, I first develop the general level sociological theory of choice, which subsumes the expected utility theory of choice. Then, I focus on the specific context and review the existing explanations on the US allies’ joining behaviors in US-led military operations that lack any international institutional authorization to use armed force. I provide my own mid-level theoretical argument, specified from the general level sociological theory of choice. I set up two rounds of critical tests to adjudicate among the competing theoretical explanations. The details and findings of these critical empirical tests are reported in chapters 3-5.

In Chapter 3, I present the cross-national survey experiments that I fielded on adult citizens in the UK and the ROK in May-June 2018. I measure the key explanatory variable—the degree of two-level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge—in a very precise manner. I also measure the dependent variables—both the choice outcomes and the types of cognitive process generating these choices—in a relatively precise manner. I find strong cross-national support for my mid-level theoretical argument against the existing alternative explanations.

In Chapter 4, I move on to conduct the critical tests with the target population of government decision-makers for the crucial case of the UK and the ROK governments’ 2003 Iraq War participation decisions. Employing the within-individual cross-issues research design, I also test the causal implications of my mid-level explanation of the US allies’ joining behaviors. I use a variety of primary, secondary, and interview data to measure the different types of cognitive process for the individual decision-makers of interest. Again, I find strong cross-national support for my two-level ideational argument against the alternative explanations.
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In Chapter 5, I examine additional country cases for external validity. These additional cases ensure against potential biases stemming from the focus on two main cases. I chose two paired comparisons based on the theory. Canada should be similar to the UK, while Australia should be similar to the ROK, in that the relevant institutions’ degrees of contestation in action knowledge are high in the former pair and low in the latter pair of US allies. Thus, I test if my argument also explains the Iraq War non-participation and participation decisions for Canada and Australia in 2003, respectively. I also examine the untested theoretical case where there is institutional level non-contestation in action knowledge towards multilateralism and non-participation. I look at the cases of New Zealand and the Philippines and test if my argument explains their non-participation decisions in March 2003. The findings from these two additional paired-comparisons also support my two-level ideational argument against the alternatives.

In the conclusion Chapter 6, I summarize the findings across the empirical chapters, discuss the limitations of this dissertation study, and propose future research directions. First, I conclude that the logic of habit is in operation, even in the high-stakes non-default case of alliance bargaining over the foreign security policy stance against a third-party. Although it is expected that national leaders be actively playing the two-level game, participation and non-participation choices for certain individual decision-makers are made through the non-deliberative and non-utilitarian logic of habit. Moreover, the patterns of different logics of action are best explained by the two-level ideational argument derived from the sociological theory of choice. I argue that the pre-existing ideas held jointly at the individual and institutional levels are indispensable explanatory variables of choices and actions. Still, this dissertation study was limited to US alliances in a single international time period. We do not know if the argument can be extended to non-US alliances, or to different time periods.
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Nonetheless, there are broader implications of this dissertation study on other timely areas of intra-alliance bargaining (e.g. burden-sharing, interoperability, coalitional trade sanctions). This dissertation study suggest that for each of the policy problem at hand, researchers and analysts would have to uncover which ideas and understandings are the most relevant social ideational factors that make up the pre-existing action knowledge. If other states were involved, identity understandings of these other states, especially pertinent to the policy domain, would need to be considered as part of this action knowledge. But again, the key explanatory variable would be the degree of two-level contestation in this action knowledge, and depending on this factor, both the final choice outcome and the type of cognitive process generating that choice can be predicted, explained, and understood. Bargaining and negotiation strategies would thus be further implicated. Future research directions lie in testing the scope conditions, amassing replicability, as well as more rigorous testing of the causal implications of the two-level ideational arguments.
2. A Sociological Theory of Choice: Application to Alliance Politics

In the previous chapter, I introduced the central theme of this dissertation: the different logics of action as developed and conceptualized in International Relations (IR) theory. I explained that most of the existing theories of international relations just could not account for the logic of habit, or the fast, taken-for-granted cognitive process, because some sort of utility or purpose is the baseline of the actions and intentions of the actors under study. To help explain the enigmatic logic of habit, I first clarified the characteristics of the various logics of action and offered a typology of four ideal-typical cognitive processes in decision-making. I also provided various measurement standards by which one can systematically and rigorously operationalize the different logics of action, including the logic of habit.

In this chapter, I provide more theoretical meaning behind the different logics of action. I develop a general level sociological theory of choice, which subsumes the expected utility theory of choice. The added value of the sociological theory of choice is manifold. First, the sociological theory of choice explains when the logic of habit (absence of utility) and when the various forms of instrumental, normative, and motivated rationality (presence of utility) would generate choice, and why. The key explanatory variable is the degree of two-level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge. In the sociological theory of choice, utility or purpose is the not the baseline; taken-for-grantedness in the human cognition is certainly possible and explicitly explained. Second, the sociological theory of choice enriches our horizons of uncertainty. It not only adds the possibility of complete certainty but also provides a richer account of different kinds of certainty and uncertainty. Specifically, there are naturalistic certainty/uncertainty as well as subjective certainty/uncertainty for the actors under study. Third, the sociological theory
of choice distinguishes at least three kinds of bias in choice. Further, the theory illuminates when and why individual level variables, including dispositions and traits, would matter most in explaining the final choice, and when the final choice would be theoretically indeterminate.

I demonstrate the explanatory value of the sociological theory of choice by deriving and testing contextualized propositions. The specific context involves an instance of alliance bargaining: what explains the US allies’ joining behaviors in US-led operations that lack any international institutional authorization to use armed force? In the previous chapter, I have argued that this particular context makes a hard test for the sociological theory of choice and the mid-level theoretical argument specified from it. Given the high salience of the non-default decision problem, I argued that it is a least-likely place to observe the logic of habit, which would lend the strongest possible support for the sociological theory of choice. In addition to the high-salience, non-default decision-making context, neorealist explanations have traditionally dominated the analysis of states’ alignment behaviors. If I can show that the two-level ideational argument, specified from the sociological theory of choice, outperforms the objectivist or single-level explanations in the domain of foreign security policy, then the explanatory value of the general level sociological theory of choice would be markedly demonstrated. Finally, the topic of alliance politics is already in high demand of critical tests adjudicating the competing theoretical explanations. The critical empirical tests conducted with a cross-national multi-methods research design in this dissertation would help advance the existing debates on alignment choices.

This theory chapter proceeds in four steps. First, I develop a general level sociological theory of choice, which subsumes the expected utility theory of choice. Then, I focus on the specific context of US allies’ joining behaviors in US-led military operations that lack any international institutional authorization to use armed force and review the existing explanations.
Next, I provide my mid-level theory of US allies’ joining behaviors specified from the general level sociological theory of choice. Lastly, I set up two rounds of critical tests to adjudicate among the competing theoretical explanations. The details and findings of these critical tests are reported in the empirical chapters 3-5.

I. Sociological Theory of Choice

Under the framework of standard rationalist models, the logic of habit would simply mean that the actors do not seriously deliberate over alternative courses of action, because certain actions and choices are so apparent and natural. Yet, no senses of utility or purpose undergird these actions and choices, although post-hoc rationalizations are entirely possible. The existing rationalist explanations of human behaviors, based on the expected utility theory of choice, just cannot account for the non-deliberative and non-utilitarian logic of habit. In this section, I develop a sociological theory of choice, which accounts for both logics of habit and non-habit. By following the ‘choice’ framework, the sociological theory of choice is in direct dialogue with the existing expected utility theory of choice. Such framing and labeling also signal that the classical sociological theories can explain choices.

To develop the general level sociological theory of choice, I build on Berger and Luckmann’s (1966) classical treatise on the social construction of reality and make three major modifications. Before I introduce the three major modifications, a brief summary of the original argument is in order. In their treatise, Berger and Luckmann argue that there are three dialectical moments in social reality. The first moment is ‘externalization,’ a process by which humans build institutions and construct the institutional reality. The authors (1966, 60) stress that,
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“however massive it may appear to the individual,” the objectivity of the institutional world is a humanly produced and humanly constructed objectivity.

The second moment is ‘objectivation,’ a process by which the externalized products of human activity attain the character of objectivity. The institutional world is objectivated, because institutions set up stable patterns and imply historicity. Berger and Luckmann (1966, 55) explain that institutions, “by the very fact of their existence, control human conduct by setting up predefined patterns of conduct, which channel it in one direction as against the many other directions that would theoretically be possible.” The very existence of an institution effectively deletes myriad of other possibilities and the patterned equilibrium seems independent of perspectives. On how historicity may give rise to objectification, I quote the authors (1966, 60):

“An institutional world, then, is experienced as an objective reality. It has a history that antedates the individual’s birth and is not accessible to his biographical recollection. It was there before he was born, and it will be there after his death. …. The institutions, as historical and objective facticities, confront the individual as undeniable facts.”

The third moment is ‘internalization,’ by which the objectivated social world is retrojected into individual consciousness in the course of socialization. In this third moment, there is a complete symmetry between reality as institutionally defined and reality as apprehended in the individual’s consciousness. Berger and Luckmann write that internalization can be deemed successful if the sense of inevitability is present for the individual most of the time. The authors argue that each of these three moments corresponds to an essential characterization of the social world. Berger and Luckmann (1966, 61) write that, “Society is a human product. Society is an objective reality. Man is a social product,” and insist that an analysis of the social world that leaves out any one of these three moments would be distorting.

In short, Berger and Luckmann’s core insight on taken-for-grantedness is that when there is a complete symmetry between the institutional and the individual levels, institutionalized
knowledge may appear as naturalistic. I make three major modifications to this main sociological insight. First, I allow the institutional level to vary across individual actors under study. The ‘institution’ to which individuals may refer to for baseline reality may be different, depending on the individual actor under study. Second, I narrow the scope of the institutionalized knowledge to contextually relevant action knowledge. Finally, I make this action knowledge a variable: there can be varying degrees of contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge pertaining to the domain. Once these modifications are incorporated, I simultaneously examine the degree of contestation in action knowledge, jointly held at the individual and institutional levels of analysis, and such degree of two-level contestation in action knowledge is the key independent variable explaining choice as well as the intervening cognitive process generating the choice.

Two Levels of Analysis

Although there are three moments of externalization, objectivation, and internalization, there are just two levels of analysis in Berger and Luckmann’s treatise: the institutional and the individual levels. I too keep these two levels of analysis. By ‘individual’ level, I mean the first-image in Waltz’s (1959) three images of IR. By ‘institutional’ level, I mean any aggregate group that provides the baseline reality to the individual actor under inquiry. This group does not necessarily have to be the state, or the second-image, and the aggregate group(s) in this ‘institutional’ level can vary across individual actors.

This is where I make my first major modification to the classical treatise on the sociology of knowledge. To illustrate within the domain of foreign security policy, for the president, I specify the aggregate group in this institution level as his or her national security team. The national security team is not only a policy reference group for the president; the national security team provides the baseline reality for the president’s foreign security policy. For the politically
appointed foreign policy advisers, such as the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, I specify the aggregate groups in this institution level as the bureaucratic organizations that the secretaries head, respectively. For the career officials, I specify the aggregate groups in this institution level as their home agencies. For the president’s own national security advisers, who are neither secretaries nor career bureaucrats, I specify the aggregate groups in this institution level as the political party, and if further required, the faction of the political party from which they, and presumably the chief executive, are affiliated with. For ordinary citizens, I specify the aggregate groups in this institutional level as their preferred political parties.¹ Their preferred political parties could define the national interest and offer the baseline reality, not just for foreign security policy, but also for a host of other domestic public policies.

In Berger and Luckmann’s classical sociological treatise, the institutions seem to be identical for all members of the society, but in my general level sociological theory of choice, the aggregate groups in the ‘institutional’ level may differ across individual actors under inquiry. As well, fixing the individual actor, the aggregate groups in this institutional level may also change depending on the circumstances and the domain under study. It is also not restricted to state institutions. Political organizations, non-governmental organizations, inter-governmental organizations, and social movements could be the institutional level, which provides the baseline reality for a policy domain for the individual actor under study.

As such, there is a difference between scientific reality and the institutionally provided, baseline reality for each individual actor, and this difference is crucial. Whereas all individuals and the aggregate groups are part of the scientific reality, not all individuals and all the aggregated groups may be a part of the baseline reality for each of the individual actors under study.

¹ For instance, please see, Brody 1991; Zaller 1992; Bartels 2002; Berinsky 2007; Baum and Groeling 2009; Kreps 2010; Baum 2013.
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study. Some other aggregate groups and individuals can easily be sifted outside of the situated reality for each of the individual actors under study. Thus, when I denote ‘baseline reality,’ it does not refer to the scientific reality; rather, it refers to the reality, which may be differentially conceived, by each individual actor under study.

**Action Knowledge**

The second major theoretical modification that I make in developing the general level sociological theory of choice is the limitation of the scope of the pre-existing knowledge, defined as meanings and understandings. Specifically, I introduce the notion of ‘action knowledge.’^2^ The classical treatise is truly broad in that it is about the sociology of knowledge in its entirety. In the sociological theory of choice, not all of the pre-existing knowledge matter in explaining the specific decision problem. Among the pre-existing ideas, meanings, and understandings, there is a narrower subset, which is directly relevant to the decision problem at hand. Although one needs to specify which of the ideas, meanings, and understandings are relevant to the decision problem under study, this narrower subset of ‘action knowledge’ should *a priori* consist of the meanings and understandings directly related to the particular action itself (e.g. use of force), as well as those directly related to any of the actors involved in the decision problem. This is not to argue that only the select few numbers of pre-existing meanings and understandings matter. Rather, these meanings and understandings are those that explain choice *at the minimum*. Across time and space, there may be other ideas and beliefs that need be additionally included this narrower subset of action knowledge.

Societal constructivist IR scholarship concentrates on the domestic identity relationships

---

^2^ This notion of action knowledge is used in the field of developmental psychology, as one of the foundations of social cognition. For instance, please see, Johnson (2010).
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between a state and its society and how these stand with regard to other states. How a state understands one’s own national identity determines foreign policy choice, and how a state understands another state’s identity determines the foreign policy directed towards that state. In the sociological theory of choice, identity understandings of the self and of the other(s) could be a part of the subset of ‘action knowledge,’ but I need to make some clarifications. One’s own national identity understandings and others’ national identity understandings may be broader than the relevant action knowledge, but still smaller than the universe of social ideas, meanings, and understandings.

The conceptual relationships among the pre-existing universe of ideas, identity understandings, and action knowledge are illustrated in Figure 2.1 below. The outermost circle is the universe of pre-existing social ideas, meanings, and understandings, which includes national narratives, historical analogies, stereotypes, identity understandings, as well as more emergent understandings. For each decision problem, there is theoretically a set of pre-existing ideas that make up the action knowledge. This action knowledge is much smaller than the universe of human knowledge, and depending on whether or not the decision problem involves another actor, the relevant identity understandings of that other actor are part of the action knowledge. Because identity understandings of others may be broader, only the relevant parts of such understandings would be part of the action knowledge.

---

3 For instance, please see Hopf (2009), 285.

4 Please see Hopf and Allan (2016), Chapter 1.
Even though the pre-existing ideas, meanings, and understandings are emphasized, this ideational argument should not be misunderstood as idealist argument. Even though the relevant action knowledge could comprise of ideals and norms, they could just as well be about realistic ideas and understandings.

**Contestation in Action Knowledge**

Given the much narrower subset of action knowledge, I employ the notion of ‘contestation’ in this action knowledge.\(^5\) The relevant understandings could be held in such a way in which there is no contestation in action knowledge: in some instances, we just know what to do and what not to do. Yet, in other instances, we may not know what to do. Action knowledge is not only a variable across individual actors, but it could change over time per individual actor under study. Social ideas, meanings, and understandings, including “identity discourse,” could change over time, and individual actors may be persuaded.

---

\(^5\) This notion of ‘contestation’ comes from one of the dimensions of identity as a variable, in Abdelal et al. (2009), Chapter 1.
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One needs to specify how the relevant understandings are arranged so that there is either ‘non-contestation’ or ‘contestation’ in the pre-existing action knowledge. One way for such conceptual arrangement is to theorize on the relative strengths of the relevant meanings and understandings that comprise the action knowledge. To illustrate, if one understanding is clearly stronger and more predominant than the others, then there may be ‘non-contestation’ in the pre-existing action knowledge. In these instances, one could know what to do or what not to do. However, if understandings and meanings that comprise the action knowledge are equally strong and equally present, then there may be ‘contestation’ in this action knowledge. In these instances, one may not necessarily know what to do.

The Independent Variable: Degree of Two-Level Contestation in Action Knowledge

Now I model the degree of contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge, held jointly at the individual and institutional levels. Figure 2.2 below illustrates what I mean by the degrees of two-level contestation. The three columns represent the different degrees of contestation in the action knowledge at the individual level. In column (1), the individual actor may know what to do, and in column (3), the individual may know what not to do. In both cases, there is individual level non-contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge. In contrast, in the middle column (2), there is individual level contestation in the action knowledge and the individual actor does not know what to do. Likewise, the three rows represent the different degrees of contestation in the action knowledge at the institutional level of analysis. Again, this ‘institutional’ level is the aggregate group that provides the very baseline reality to the individual actor under study. The aggregate group level meanings and understandings make up the institutional level action knowledge. In rows (1) and (3), there is institutional level non-contestation in action knowledge.
Sociological Theory of Choice

At the aggregate group level, it is clear what to do and what not to do. In the middle row (2), there is institutional level contestation in action knowledge. It is not clear what to do. The actual aggregate group at this institutional level may be different across actors and vary across time.

**Figure 2.2. The Independent Variable: Degree of Two-Level Contestation in Action Knowledge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Level Non-Contestation (Action)</th>
<th>Individual Level Non-Contestation (Action)</th>
<th>Individual Level Contestation</th>
<th>Individual Level Non-Contestation (Non-Action)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Complete Two-Level Non-Contestation</td>
<td>(2) Single-Level Contestation at the Individual Level</td>
<td>(3) Cross-Level Contestation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Single-Level Contestation at the Institutional Level</td>
<td>(5) Complete Two-Level Contestation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Cross-Level Contestation</td>
<td>(8) Single-Level Contestation at the Individual Level</td>
<td>(9) Complete Two-Level Non-Contestation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The resultant nine boxes are the different degrees of two-level contestation, which is the key explanatory variable in the general level sociological theory of choice. This degree can vary widely. The extreme degrees are on the diagonal from boxes (1), (5), and (9). At one end of the two extremes, there is a complete two-level non-contestation in pre-existing action knowledge. This is represented by boxes (1) and (9). An individual actor just knows what to do, and what not
to do. At the other end of the two extremes, there is a complete two-level contestation in the action knowledge. This is represented by box (5). An individual actor does not know what to do.

In between the two extremes are single-level contestations or cross-level contestations. In boxes (2) and (8), there is individual level contestation in the action knowledge, while there is institutional level non-contestation in the action knowledge. The single-level contestation is at the individual levels of analysis. In boxes (4) and (6), there is institutional level contestation in the action knowledge, while there is individual level non-contestation in the action knowledge. The single-level contestation is at the institutional levels of analysis. In boxes (3) and (7), there is non-contestation in action knowledge at both levels of analysis; however, there is contestation across the two levels in that what the individual actor and the aggregate group know in terms of action or non-action is diametrically opposite from one another. Thus, there is cross-level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge.

In decision-making contexts, where there are at least two different courses of action or policy options, the degrees of two-level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge help explain not only the final choice outcomes, but also the cognitive processes generating these final choices. The two-level ideational argument does not presume a certain type of deliberating actor. There can be many different types of deliberation (e.g. non-motivated process, motivated process, socially constrained process), as well as fast taken-for-grantedness. Figure 2.3 below summarizes the theoretical expectations on these types of cognitive process as well as the kinds of uncertainty and certainty associated with the final choice outcomes. The dependent variables are relatively more integrated, from the mind, brain, to behavior, or from the unobservable logics of action to observable choices and actions.
Although the degree of two-level contestation in pre-existing action knowledge, held jointly at the individual and institutional levels, is the causal factor behind the type of cognitive process in decision-making, it is not necessarily the only explanatory, or causal, variable for the final choice. Other moderating variables, such as individual level attributes or social environments, or specific events on the ground may help explain the final choice outcomes. Nonetheless, I maintain that the degree of two-level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge, held jointly at the individual and institutional levels, can be theorized as the causal
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explanatory variable for the type of cognitive process generating the final choice as well as the primary explanatory variable.

To start with the extreme cases, when there is a complete, two-level non-contestation in action knowledge, action or non-action will be adopted through the logic of habit. The action choice is simply so obvious and natural. In this case, as represented by Figure 2.3 box (1), there is naturalistic certainty. Similarly, when there is two-level non-contestation in action knowledge of what *not* to do, then this choice of non-action would also be adopted through the logic of habit. The particular non-action is so apparent and actual. As represented by box (9), there is naturalistic certainty of such non-action choice, and by this, I mean that the particular absence of action is seemingly natural for the actors under study. In these extreme cases, as represented by boxes (1) and (9), no utility undergirds the choice, and analytic thought process is absent.

In sharp contrast, when there is a complete, two-level contestation in action knowledge, the final choice outcome would be realized through the logic of either instrumental or normative rationality. The slow, serial, non-motivated process is highly likely, while the final choice remains most indeterminate. There is naturalistic uncertainty, as represented by box (5). As theory is insufficient in explaining the final choice outcomes, historical analyses that involve process-tracing methods would be best suited to account for the final choices.

Next, I move on to single-level contestations. When there is individual level contestation in action knowledge, while there is institutional level non-contestation in action knowledge, there is subjective actor level uncertainty. These are the cases in boxes (2) and (8). There are doubts, reservations and hesitations, but the individual actors under study cannot seriously conceive of the alternative actions. There is subjective actor level uncertainty, but this uncertainty is qualitatively and quantitatively different from naturalistic uncertainty in box (5). The aggregate
group offers what to do or what not to do, and when in social environments, the socially constrained process would generate action choices that match the prescriptions of the aggregate group. Social influences are expected to be highly likely, and the social environments may be a critical variable in directly affecting the final choice. In isolation, it is very possible that individual actors would choose alternative responses.

On the flip side, when there is individual level non-contestation in action knowledge, while there is institutional level contestation in action knowledge, there is high subjective, actor level certainty. These are the cases in boxes (4) and (6). Still, this subjective certainty is qualitatively and quantitatively different from naturalistic certainty in boxes (1) and (9). Although the aggregate group cannot provide what to do or what not to do, the individual actor knows what to do or what not to do. Motivated processes would generate such action choices. Although all of the nine boxes involve the perceptions of the individual actors under study, rather than the reliance on the objectivity of action parameters, including but not limited to signals and the information environments, the prior-belief driven perceptions and misperceptions of individual actors are best situated in boxes (4) and (6).

When there is cross-level contestation in action knowledge, the direct effects of social environments are expected to be the greatest. In social environments, the logic of social influences is highly likely to unfold and the socially constrained process would generate the final action as prescribed by the aggregate group. Yet, in private, the actors would highly prefer to choose otherwise. Although there is individual level non-contestation in action knowledge in boxes (3) and (7), the subjective actor level certainty may not be as high as that in the cases of boxes (4) and (6). This is because the alternative action knowledge provided by the aggregate group lowers the subjective, actor level certainty.
Finally, I note where the logic of practice can be situated in the sociological theory of choice. When there is institutional level non-contestation in action knowledge, we can further distinguish the action knowledge into “formal” and “informal.” So far, I have assumed and explained the case of the former, where the institutional level action knowledge has been and is formalized into rules and institutions. Just as there are informal institutions, practices, and norms maintained by political groups, when the institutional level non-contestation in action knowledge is informal, then the logic of practice will likely generate the choices in boxes (1) and (9). In these cases, the individual actors under study know that the action choices that they choose to adopt are due to practices, procedures, and standards, rather than due to seeming naturalness or actuality. There is no naturalistic certainty.

The distinctions between the logic of practice and the logic of habit have already been noted. For instance, Hopf (2010, 544) explains that, “the logic of practice is more reflective and agential than the logic of habit and, consequently, expects far more change in the world.” Indeed, the actors may have higher order self-consciousness of the logic of practice. Similarly, Abdelal et al. (2009, 22) note that “semiconscious choice would mean options are barely considered, or only fleetingly considered, and are dismissed out of hand.”

**On the Exogeneity of the Independent Variable**

I argue that the key explanatory variable of choice—the degree of two-level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge—is an exogenous variable, which pre-dates the decision problem. In other words, the key explanatory variable does not depend on the final choice outcomes or on the cognitive processes generating choice. In addition, the two levels of analysis captured by the independent variable help immunize the explanatory variable from the omitted

---

6 Levitsky and Helmke (2006) make this distinct between formal and informal institutions most clearly.
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variable bias. For instance, one could ask whether certain individual, cultural, or organizational dispositions affect not only the degree of contestation in action knowledge but also the types of cognitive processes generating choice, and potentially the final choice outcomes.

Individual dispositions or biological traits could affect the degree of individual level contestation in action knowledge. For instance, those with high epistemic motivation may tend to hold individual level contestation in action knowledge, while those with low epistemic motivation may tend to hold individual level non-contestation in action knowledge. As well, those with high cognitive ability could hold individual level contestation in action knowledge, while those with low cognitive ability could hold individual level non-contestation in action knowledge. Dogmatism and conservatism are other sets of domain-general individual dispositions. Yet, because the key explanatory variable of the sociological theory of choice has the degree of institutional level contestation in action knowledge modeled into the variable, there is exogeneity in the independent variable. The aggregate group level contestation in action knowledge does not depend on a particular individual actor’s dispositions or traits. Hence, there is some exogeneity to the key explanatory variable.

Likewise, the cultural or organizational dispositions and orientations could potentially affect the degree of institutional level contestation in action knowledge. For instance, those aggregate groups embedded within collectivist cultures or hierarchical organizational structures may tend to hold institutional level non-contestation in action knowledge, while

---

7 Rathbun, Kertzer, and Paradis (2017) find this thinking disposition, or epistemic motivation, to explain the variation in instrumental rationality.

8 For instance, please see, Jost et al. (2003); Jost (2017).

9 For instance, please see, Triandis (1995).

10 For instance, please see, Mansfield (1973).
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those aggregate groups embedded within individualist cultures or horizontal organizational
structures may tend to hold institutional level contestation in action knowledge. Again, because
the key explanatory variable of the sociological theory of choice has the degree of individual
level contestation in action knowledge modeled in to the variable, there is some exogeneity to the
key explanatory variable.

The sociological theory of choice does not explain the origins, or the changes, of the
degrees of contestation in the action knowledge at each of the two levels of analysis. The
sociological theory of choice takes the degree of two-level contestation in the action knowledge
as the independent variable explaining the final choice outcomes and the cognitive processes
generating choice. Still, both primary and secondary socialization, as well as dispositions and
traits, could explain the degree of individual level contestation in the pre-existing action
knowledge. As well, insights from historical institutionalism, as well as cultural and
organizations orientations, could explain the degree of institutional level contestation in the pre-
existing action knowledge.

In terms of changes in the degrees of contestation in the action knowledge at each of the
two levels of analysis, socialization processes help explain the changes in the degree of
individual level contestation in action knowledge. Individual level dispositions and traits are
more constant, and so they cannot explain the changes in the degree of individual level
contestation in the action knowledge, unless these individual dispositions and traits themselves
change. In rows (1) and (3), where there is institutional level non-contestation in action
knowledge, individual actors could be socialized and persuaded by the aggregate group. When
there is institutional level contestation in action knowledge, however, the socialization processes
cannot be at work, precisely because there is nowhere for the individual actors to converge to. As
well, critical junctures and theories of institutional change can help explain the institutional level contestation in action knowledge.\(^{11}\) Again, the cultural and organizational dispositions are thought to be more constant, and so they cannot explain the institutional level contestation in the relevant action knowledge, unless these orientations themselves change.

**The Added Value**

The *content* of the action or policy choices is truly limitless. It could include diversity policy in educational and professional environments, lobbying by major firms, hedge fund trading by banks, vote buying by political campaigns, and war initiation and termination choices of states. It could also include peace, stability, and cooperation strategies. For all of these seemingly analytically-generated policy choices, there may be a complete two-level non-contestation in the action knowledge. Certain actions and choices may just be so obvious and natural. The sociological theory of choice makes it conceptually and theoretically possible for various logics of action, including the non-deliberative and non-utilitarian logic of habit, to generate the same set of observable choices. The degree of two-level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge is the exogenous, independent variable, which explains when the different logics of action would generate choice and why.

The sociological theory of choice offers a richer set of certainty and uncertainty to work with. In fact, the addition of certainty into the standard rationalist models based on uncertainty is a unique feature of the sociological theory of choice. When there is a complete, two-level non-contestation in action knowledge, there can be naturalistic certainty. When there is individual level non-contestation in action knowledge, but an institutional level contestation in action knowledge, there can be subjective, actor level certainty. Similarly, when there is a complete,

\(^{11}\) On institutional change, please see Thelen and Mahoney (2009).
two-level contestation in action knowledge, there can be naturalistic uncertainty. When there is individual level contestation in action knowledge, but an institutional level non-contestation in action knowledge, there can be subjective, actor level uncertainty. Subjective certainty/uncertainty are both qualitatively and quantitatively different from naturalistic certainty/uncertainty.

In addition to expanding the possible logics of action as well as providing a richer set of certainty and uncertainty, the sociological theory of choice illustrates at least three different kinds of biases in choice. One durable bias stems from habituation, or taken-for-grantedness, of both material and non-material kinds. Another bias is due to motivated processing, or selective attention to incoming information. The other bias results from social constraints; here, the actor under study knowingly makes the biased choice due to social psychological, role, and duty constraints.

Of these three biases, biases in choice stemming from social constraints are theorized to be more malleable. The individual actor under study simply needs to be in isolation from the aggregate group that provides the baseline reality. However, this may not be entirely feasible under some circumstances. As long as the institutional level non-contestation in action knowledge remains intact, it may be extremely difficult to alter the socially influences and ameliorate the bias—assuming that the bias is an unfavorable one. Hence, an outsider could try to induce changes in the institutional level non-contestation in the action knowledge. In this case, those target individual actors in Figure 2.3 box (2) and (8) could move into box (5), where non-motivated processes are likely to unfold. However, the final choice outcome is still indeterminate in box (5), and the winds need to blow in the outsider’s favor. Yet, if the target individual actors had been in boxes (3) and (7), their moves into boxes (6) and (4), respectively, could potentially
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bring about changes in the final choices.

Next, those who exhibit motivated processes in boxes (4) and (6) may be persuaded with the right amount of targeted persuasion. Again, such persuasion strategies do not necessarily entail changes in the cost-benefit parameters, signals, or other information environmental features; rather, they should target the relevant understandings and ideas held at the individual actor level. Direct contestation of these relevant meanings and understandings should be prompted upon the target individual actors, in order to induce changes in the final choices. Such targeted ideational persuasion would help move previously motivated individual actors from box (4) to (6), and vice versa.

It has been long theorized that habituated biases are the hardest to change.\footnote{This is commonly noted in Bourdieu (1977); Hopf (2010); Porter (2018a).} The sociological theory of choice explains why this may be the case. First, even if one were to engage in direct contestation of the relevant meanings and understandings held at the individual actor level, the individual decision-maker under study would only move over from Figure 2.3 box (1) to boxes (2) or (3) in the first row, and from box (9) to boxes (8) and (7) in the third row. The final choice still depends on their social environments, given that the institutional level non-contestation in action knowledge is maintained. Again, the feasibility of removing the social influences and constraints is a serious question. Even if an outsider successfully induces changes in the institutional level non-contestation in action knowledge, as long as the individual level understandings remain unchanged, the target individual actors would only move from box (1) to (4) or from box (9) to (6). They would now engage in motivated processing.

An outsider would need to successfully target changes in both levels of analysis to bring about changes in the final choices. If the target individual actors move into box (5), however, the
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final choice is still indeterminate, and the winds need to blow in the outsider’s favor. The move from box (1) to (6) or from box (9) to (4) is more challenging and effortful than the other moves, precisely because habituated biases need changes in both levels of analysis.

Finally, the sociological theory of choice further specifies when the individual level attributes would matter the most in determining the substance of the final choice and why. When there is individual level contestation in action knowledge while there is institutional level non-contestation in action knowledge, or when there is cross-level contestation in action knowledge, as in Figure 2.3 boxes (2), (3), (7), and (8), individual level attributes may matter the most in determining the final choice outcomes. Specifically, the individual actor under study should carry certain self-monitoring attributes and leadership styles to either accede or push through with their own preferred choice outcomes.

Overall, the value added by the general level, sociological theory of choice is multifaceted. In one dimension, it explains the enigmatic logic of habit and allows various logics of action to generate the same observable choice. The pre-existing ideas, meanings and understandings that make up the relevant action knowledge are theorized to directly impact the final choice outcomes. A new exogenous variable—the degree of two-level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge—is offered as a key explanatory variable of human choices and actions. While this exogenous independent variable causes the particular type of cognitive process in decision-making contexts, it stands as an indispensable, primary explanatory variable for the final choice outcome. The sociological theory of choice also enriches our understandings of certainty and uncertainty, and it advances our understandings of biases in choices. Further, it specifies when the individual level attributes would matter most in final choice outcomes and why.
II. A Concrete Case of Alliance Bargaining

To empirically demonstrate the explanatory value of the sociological theory of choice, I chose to explain the foreign security policy decisions in an alliance bargaining context. Can the mid-level argument specified from the general level sociological theory of choice best explain the participation and non-participation decisions of US allies in US-led military operations that lack any international institutional authorization to use armed force? Even though the sociological theory of choice can explain many other choices, I have argued that this particular instance of alliance bargaining makes it a good test for the sociological theory of choice for three main reasons.

First, I have argued that in this non-default, high-stakes decision-making context, it is least-likely to observe the logic of habit in operation in the minds and brains of individual decision-makers. Thus, it consists a hard test for the sociological theory of choice and the mid-level theoretical argument specified from it. I also explained that the particular topic of alliance politics is most self-conscious about the perennial problem of equifinality, not just in the final choice outcomes, but also in the explanatory variables themselves. Critical empirical tests have been in high demand. Finally, the substantive topic of alliance politics has been historically dominated by neorealistic explanations. If the two-level ideational argument can better the existing alternatives, then this dissertation study on alliance politics would markedly demonstrate the explanatory value of the sociological theory of choice.

Framework for Literature Review

In reviewing the literature on the substantive topic of US allies’ joining behaviors, I use and clarify Wendt’s framework for thinking about and organizing the existing explanations of
US allies’ participation and non-participation decisions. Wendt offers two axes: 1) on the x-axis is the materialism-idealism debate, and 2) on the y-axis is the individualism-holism debate. I clarify the x-axis of materialism-idealism a bit more. This x-axis, according to Wendt, is the difference that ideas make, and so I re-label it to objective-subjective. If something is deemed objective, it should speak for itself. No social ideas or discourses about it, or perceptions, would make a difference. The original label of materialism-idealism may be misleading and confusing, because materialism is not just about security and economic interests. Material arguments can be made about familial, cultural, and even religious arrangements. Likewise, idealism is not just about ideals, norms, and values. Ideas can be about both non-material and material kinds. Accordingly, whether it is national security, economy, culture, or religion, the analysis is better captured with the label of objective-subjective. I keep the y-axis of individualism-holism as it is. It captures the difference that structures make.

Figure 2.4 below illustrates this framework. Theories in the upper-left quadrant are objective holist. In IR theory, neorealism and neoliberal institutionalism would fall here. Wendt adds World Systems Theory and Neo-Gramscian Marxism in this upper-left quadrant as well. Macroeconomic theories and cultural theories that take cultures as objective givens would also fall in here. Theories in the upper-right quadrant are subjective holist, or intersubjectivist. In IR theory, Wendt writes that the social theory of international politics falls in the upper-right, and adds the English School, World Society, Postmodern IR, and Feminist IR in this domain. Likewise, social constructivist theories of macroeconomics and culture would fall in here.

---

13 For instance, please see Becker (1981); Young (1997).
Figure 2.4. Theoretical Framework: Four Quadrants and the Fifth Way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Subjective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Holism</strong></td>
<td>Objective Holist</td>
<td>Intersubjectivist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individualism</strong></td>
<td>Objective Individualist</td>
<td>Subjectivist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moving onto the lower row, theories in the lower-left quadrant are objective individualist. In IR theory, classical realism and liberalism would fall in here. Individuals are assumed to have certain objective orientations. Microeconomic theories and rationalist IR arguments would also fall in here, as these theories have objective individualist ontologies. Theories in the lower-right quadrant are subjective individualist, or subjectivist. In IR theory, perceptual, behavioral, and neurobiological theories would fall in here. There is not one kind of rational actor, realist actor, or idealist actor. Individuals are heterogeneous, even within one socially constructed time and place. Human subjectivity, perceptions, or individual level understandings are key.

Hopf also makes the distinctions among intersubjectivity, subjectivity, and objectivity clear. Hopf (2009, 279) explains that while intersubjectivity is the reality generated within a community, society, or group, or shared understandings of the world out there, it cannot be reduced to either objective reality—that is, the reality that is out there independent of our perceptions of it, or subjective reality, the reality each one of us perceives as individuals. Hopf further notes that, if it were the former, one would need to catalog the objective indicators, while if it were the latter, one would need to focus on the minds of the individual decision makers. Yet,
to recover the intersubjective reality, one would need to look for the positions and ideas that are taken-for-granted for a society at the time.

To situate the general level sociological theory of choice, and the mid-level theory of US allies’ joining behaviors that I will specify below, within this framework of theoretical quadrants, my theoretical perspective combines the upper and lower right quadrants. I see it as a nexus between ideational holism (or intersubjectivity) and ideational individualism (or subjectivity). Such theoretical synthesis between social constructivism and political psychology has been long called for by IR scholars.\(^{14}\) More recently, Wendt also brings the individuals back in and introduces holographic individuals.\(^{15}\)

Yet, my sociological theory of choice and the two-level ideational arguments are in direct dialogue with objectivity—the left hand side of the framework—too. The sociological theory of choice is not only developed in a ‘choice’ framework, wherein at least two conflicting response cues are directly prompted upon the individual decision-maker—but it also explains when and why objectivity, or naturalistic certainty/uncertainty can be achieved. In other words, although the key explanatory variable combines subjective holism (intersubjectivity) and subjective individualism (subjectivity), objectivity is theoretically absolutely possible. While naturalistic certainty and the logic of habit are possible, naturalistic uncertainty and the logics of either instrumental or normative rationality are also possible.

**Existing Theoretical Explanations**

In this literature review, I organize the existing explanations of US allies’ joining behaviors by using the above framework of theoretical quadrants. I will start with objectivity, or

---

\(^{14}\) Wendt (1992); Shannon and Kowert (2011); Jervis (2017); and Kertzer and Tingley (2018) encourage studies that connect these ideational approaches at different levels of analysis.

\(^{15}\) Please see Wendt (2010, 2015).
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the left hand side of the framework. To begin with the upper-left, or the objective holist, quadrant, the main explanations are based on neorealism. The objective systemic variable of anarchy is a key explanatory factor. In this concrete case of alliance politics, there is a classical alliance security dilemma, which is the tension between the twin dangers of abandonment and entrapment posed by a state’s own alliance partner.\(^\text{16}\) Snyder (1984) writes that the most important determinant of the resolution to the dilemma is relative dependence on the alliance. If a state is more dependent on the alliance than its ally, then the costs and risks of abandonment will outweigh those of entrapment. Walt (2011) argues that while those regional powers, such as France and Germany, can afford to oppose US efforts to obtain UN Security Council authorization, lesser powers in new Europe are not able to do so. As well, Walt (2011, 123) writes that while the European Union member states have the European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP) as an alternative option for ensuring security “without having to depend on US military assets,” other allies with no other outside options may have higher levels of alliance dependence and join the US-led operations lacking international legitimacy.

There are two other explanations based on the balance-of-threat theory. Again, the objective systemic variable of anarchy is a key explanatory factor, and threats are theorized to be self-evident, objective indicators. One common balance-of-threat argument explains that security-maximizing US allies facing existential regional threats would prefer to cooperate and participate in US-led operations, even in the absence of the international institutional authorization to use armed force. Walt (2011) explains that states with existential threats would desire US protection and want closer alignment with the United States than those without such regional threats. With territorial threats from Russia, Marton and Eichler (2013) show that the Central and Eastern European countries are most keen on troop contributions to military

\(^{16}\) On the alliance security dilemma, please see Snyder (1984, 1997).
operations overseas, when the United States is in the lead or when the United States explicitly values their contribution.

Another balance-of-threat argument explains that states would prefer to align with the United States and participate in the US-led operation lacking any international institutional authorization to use armed force, when there is high level of threat from the target of the operation. Here, the self-evident, objective threat is directly from the target of the operation. Employing the operational code analysis, Malici (2005) tests the target threat and alliance cooperation proposition for the case of the 2003 Iraq War. Malici shows that the US-UK shared high threat from Saddam Hussein’s Iraqi regime, while France did not share such threat. Similarly, in examining the UK, France, and Italy’s participations in US-led operations in Kosovo, Afghanistan, and Iraq, Davidson (2011) shows that when national leaders’ saw high threat from the target of the US-led operations, they participated and balanced against the threat.

Next, I move down to the lower-left, or objective individualist, quadrant. Theories in this quadrant do not focus on objective systemic condition of anarchy. There are two groups of rationalist arguments that fall in this quadrant. One group of explanations is based on objective domestic political conditions, given the office-seeking incentives of government decision-makers. Studies on electoral institutions,\textsuperscript{17} number of whistleblowers,\textsuperscript{18} parliamentary veto rights,\textsuperscript{19} as well as election cycles, political instability, and economic recessions\textsuperscript{20} demonstrate why some US allies participate or stay out of US-led operations lacking the international institutional authorization to use armed force. Various domestic political constraints are the objective

\textsuperscript{17} For instance, please see Chan and Safran (2006).

\textsuperscript{18} Please see Kreps (2010); Baum (2013).

\textsuperscript{19} Please see Mello (2014), pp. 32-36.

\textsuperscript{20} Please see Tago (2014).
independent variables explaining the variations in the final choice outcomes across countries and across time. However, a theoretical account of the preferences of allied government decision-makers is problematically overlooked. Indeed, the underlying assumption seems to be that the US allied government decision-makers would prefer to cooperate and join the US-led operations, as the aforementioned list of domestic political variables aims to explain the variations in the disconnect from such implied government preferences and the final choice outcomes.

Yet, if allied government decision-makers, such as Canada’s Liberal Party Prime Minister Justin Trudeau and his advisers, did not want to participate in the US-led military operations, lacking any international institutional authorization to use armed force, to begin with, then it is hard to say that the Canadian public opinion, electoral institution, state of the economy, or any other domestic political constraints causally explains Prime Minister Trudeau’s troop withdrawal and non-participation decisions in 2015 and 2018. Although one might argue that this group of rationalist explanations is asking and answering a different set of questions, a theory of foreign security policy preferences seems crucial for causal inference. Preferences cannot be overlooked.

Another rationalist argument is based on material side-payments from alliance bargaining. The payments provided to third parties generally take on two forms: deployment subsidies and political side deals. While deployment subsidies are offered to developing states that lack the resources to deploy efficiently, political side deals are used to bring the developed states on board in the multilateral military coalition. Henke (2019) concludes that without these payments, international cooperation in the security sphere would occur much less frequently. Tago (2008) also emphasizes on the importance of material incentives in state decisions to join US-led operations but argues that negative military linkages are far more effective than positive

---

21 On side-payments in this particular context of alliance bargaining, please see Henke (2019).
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ones. In particular, when examining the role of American economic linkage in shaping the US-led coalition for 2003 Iraq War, Newnham (2008) finds that material linkages, ranging from foreign and military aid to access to US markets, successfully led some countries to join. Similarly, Wivel and Oest (2010) show that even though Pacific microstates faced low threat from Saddam Hussein’s Iraq, the security and economic gains provided by United States were a critical factor behind their decisions to give diplomatic support for the US-led operation in 2003.

Now, I move onto subjectivity, or the right hand side of the framework. I start with the upper-right, or intersubjectivist, quadrant. The key explanatory variables in this quadrant are shared ideas. There are at least two approaches. One approach is based on shared ideas about identity understandings. Vucetic (2011) asks whether a state’s membership in the Anglosphere, a group of English-speaking nations, influences its likelihood of participation in US-led operations and finds that in the post Second World War period, with all else constant, English-speaking states are indeed more likely to join US-led operations than those states outside of the Anglosphere. Vucetic (2011, 30) argues that Anglosphere is like a security community, or a family of nations, where cooperative norms and behaviors stem from, “not simply an outside threat, economic interdependence, shared democratic institutions or some combination of these factors,” but from shared collective identity. Similarly, in the conflict joining literature, Corbetta (2010, 2013) argues that both security considerations and homophilous ties are joint determinants of joining behavior of states and shows that state decisions to join an ongoing conflict are indeed a product of both security concerns and social affinity between the joiner and initiator states.

The shared identity understandings can also travel in the other way of refusing to support US-led operations that lack any international institutional authorization to use armed force.
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For instance, decision-makers may give norms based arguments against participation and troop contributions to US-led operations without any international legitimacy. Finnemore (2009) argues that when states deeply internalize norms of the international institutional rules-based order, they may resist US actions if the United States disregards these rules.

Another explanation is based on shared ideas about the effects of balance-of-power and democracy on peace. Several studies on the strategic cultures of US allies point to the strategic beliefs on the effectiveness of bilateralism with the United States in achieving national security objectives. For instance, McLean (2006) shows that Australia’s security has been traditionally seen as a function of tight alliances with the great and powerful English-speaking friends, such as the UK and the US. Kim (2014) shows that the ROK’s bilateral alliance with the United States has traditionally been one of key pillars of the ROK state’s strategic thought. As well, in explaining why Poland decided to deploy troops to the US-led counter-ISIS campaign in both Iraq and Syria, Doeser and Eidenfalk (2019) argues that the Polish state’s core military strategic beliefs, such as strong belief in territorial defense, need for reliable security guarantees, and fear of abandonment by alliance partner—all rooted in historical experiences—explain Poland’s high level of dependence on NATO, and especially, on the United States.

Similarly, Porter (2018b) contends that ideas that illiberal regimes are a threat to world order and peace contributed to Britain’s 2003 Iraq War participation decision. He argues that the idealist ideas that the Middle East needs to be modernized in order to achieve durable peace, order and stability in the region are ill-founded and dangerous, but that these ideas contributed to the UK’s participation decision. He shows that these ideas were widely shared not just by the Labour party and the government but also by the members of the Conservative party.
Finally, I move down to the lower-right, or subjectivist, quadrant. Here, the subjectivist explanations focus on the foreign policy orientations of the individual decision-makers. If leaders have hawkish views to start with, then they are more likely to pursue security-maximization by aligning with the United States. In fact, this is the single most commonly cited explanation for the UK Prime Minister Tony Blair’s decision to go to war in Iraq in March 2003. On the other hand, if national leaders are cooperative internationalists to begin with, then they are more likely to abide by the international institutions and rules-based order.

For the specific case of the US-led Iraq War in 2003, O’Connor and Vucetic (2010) argue that differences in dominant strategic culture among elites in Canada and Australia explain the differences in the two states’ participation decisions. Even within a single country case of Canada, leaders held different foreign policy views and made different participation and non-participation decisions, with regard to joining US-led operations that lack any international institutional authorization to use armed force. For instance, while Lester Pearson decided not to send troops to Vietnam, his Conservative counterpart, John Diefenbaker, preferred military support for US policy in Vietnam. Again, while Jean Chretien decided not to join the US-led Iraq War in 2003, without any authorization from the UN Security Council, his Conservative counterpart, Stephen Harper, supported Canada’s participation in the US-led coalition of the willing in 2003. In fact, Harper diplomatically supported Obama’s planned air strikes against the Syrian regime’s chemical weapons capabilities in August 2013 and joined the US-led counter-ISIS air strikes into Syria by March 2015, which is even prior to the critical international events.

22 Please see Porter (2018b), pp. 6-8.
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Still, when Justin Trudeau became Prime Minister, he immediately announced and planned to withdraw combat troops from the counter-ISIS operations in Iraq and Syria.\textsuperscript{23}

III. Mid-Level Theory of US Allies’ Joining Behaviors

Three Specifications

In this section, I offer a novel explanation of US allies’ joining behaviors that represents the ‘fifth’ way of synthesizing the intersubjectivist and subjectivist approaches to the study of IR. From the general level sociological theory of choice, I specify the three major theoretical parts and derive the mid-level theoretical argument in the specific context of US-led operations that lack any international institutional authorization to use armed force. The three theoretical specifications I make can apply to any other policy domains or decision-making contexts—and not just to alliance politics, or even to international relations.

First, I specify the ‘institutional’ level for each of the individual actors under study. For the president, I specify the aggregate group in the institution levels as the national security team, which is usually comprised of the politically appointed secretaries or ministers, high level career bureaucrats, and the president’s national security adviser. For the politically appointed secretaries, I specify the aggregate group of the institutional level as the bureaucratic organizations that they head. For the career officials, I specify the aggregate group of the institutional level as their home agencies. For the president’s own national security adviser, who are neither administration secretaries nor career bureaucrats, I specify the aggregate group of the institution level as the political party, and if further required, the faction of the political party from which

they, and presumably, the chief executive, are affiliated with. For ordinary citizens, I specify the aggregate group of the institutional level as their preferred political parties.

Second, I specify which of the pre-existing ideas, meanings, and understandings would make up the narrower subset of ‘action knowledge.’ As I explained earlier, ideas about the action itself and the actors involved should be relevant to the decision problem. Because the decision problem involves the use of force, or the deployment of troops abroad, understandings on the use of force need to be taken into account. Two other actors are involved in the decision problem. First, the United States is requesting the allied governments to join the operation, and so identity understandings of the United States should be relevant. Second, international institutions, and particularly, the United Nations, is involved in this decision problem, as the US-led operation is lacking the critical authorization of the UN Security Council to use armed force. Identity understandings of the United States and the United Nations are relevant, but those aspects that directly relate to the domain of national security should be especially relevant.

The third theoretical component that I specify is the degree of ‘contestation’ in such pre-existing action knowledge. How can this subset of relevant ideas and understandings be arranged so that there is either non-contestation or contestation in action knowledge? In this mid-level theory of US allies’ joining behaviors, I make the argument that the relevant ideas and understandings can be arranged as follows. If the understanding that the United States is an indispensable security partner is stronger and more predominant than the understandings that the United Nations and multilateralism is key to national and international security, then there may be non-contestation in action knowledge. If there is the understanding that the use of force is an effective state strategy in achieving various interests, then such belief in military effectiveness—combined with the stronger belief in bilateralism—can be conceptualized as non-contestation in
action knowledge towards the action of participation in US-led operations, even when lacking any international institutional authorization to use armed force.

On the flip side, the understandings that the UN Security Council and multilateralism is key to national and international security may be stronger and more predominant than the understanding that the United States is an indispensable security partner. If there is weak belief in military effectiveness, then such weak belief in military effectiveness—combined with the stronger belief in multilateralism—can be conceptualized as non-contestation in action knowledge towards the action of non-participation in US-led operations that lack international legitimacy. Here, I note that the effectiveness of bilateralism or multilateralism could be thought of as pre-existing strategies, or they could also be thought as relevant parts of identity understandings. However one actualizes the language of it, the two approaches highlight the social constructivist nature of these pre-existing ideas.

All other combinations could be conceptualized as contestation in action knowledge. First, if there is equally strong or equally weak belief in both bilateralism and multilateralism, then there is contestation in action knowledge. In the former case, although the United States is an indispensable security partner, international institutions and rules are equally important in maintaining national and international security. In the latter case, the United States is not necessarily an important security partner, and there is weak belief in the effectiveness of international institutions, rules, and norms. In either case, the belief in the efficaciousness of the use of force does not necessarily impact the degree of contestation in action knowledge.

Regardless of the strength of the belief in military effectiveness, it will be conceptualized as contestation in action knowledge. It is just not clear whether or not one should participate in US-led operations lacking any international institutional authorization to use force.
Next, when the belief in bilateralism is stronger than that of multilateralism, the strength of belief in military effectiveness matters. If this is strong, then there is no contestation in action knowledge towards the action of participation and troop deployment to US-led operations. However, if the belief in military effectiveness is weak, there may be some contestation in action knowledge. Such doves may prefer to support US initiatives and US perspectives in other non-military ways. Thus, there may be a contestation between supporting the United States and participating in the US-led operation abroad.

Likewise, when the belief in multilateralism is stronger than that of bilateralism, the strength of belief in military effectiveness matters. If this is weak, then there is no contestation in action knowledge towards the action of non-participation and refusing to contribute troops to US-led operations that lack international legitimacy. However, if the belief in military effectiveness is high, then there may be some contestation in action knowledge. Such hawks may prefer to employ or display the use of force for various reasons, including but not limited to status or influence concerns. Thus, there may be a contestation between refusing to support the United States and also employing the use of force in times of security crises.

The Contextualized Two-Level Ideational Argument

With the theoretical specifications made from the general level sociological theory of choice, I look at the key explanatory variable: the degree of two-level contestation in action knowledge. Figure 2.5 below looks at the individual and institutional level contestation in the relevant action knowledge. Figure 2.5 column (1) and row (1) is where there is non-contestation in action knowledge towards the action of participation in US-led operations, even when there is a lack of international legitimacy. Column (3) and row (3) is where there is non-contestation in action knowledge towards the action of non-participation and refusing to contribute troops to US-led operations.

---

24 On status concerns, please see Davidson (2011), Chapter 2.
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action knowledge towards the action of non-participation in US-led operations lacking any international institutional authorization to use armed force. The middle column (2) and row (2) is where there is contestation in action knowledge.

Figure 2.5. Theoretical Expectations: Final Choice Outcomes, Types of Cognitive Process, and Kinds of Uncertainty/Certainty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Level</th>
<th>Individual Level Non-Contestation (Participation)</th>
<th>Individual Level Contestation</th>
<th>Individual Level Non-Contestation (Non-Participation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Contestation</td>
<td>(1) - Likely Choose Participation through Taken-for-granted Process - Objective Certainty, Subjective Certainty = Naturalistic Certainty</td>
<td>(2) - May Choose Participation through Socially Constrained Process - Objective Certainty, Subjective Uncertainty</td>
<td>(3) - May Choose Participation through Socially Constrained Process - Objective Certainty, Subjective Certainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contestation</td>
<td>(4) - Likely Choose Participation through Motivated Process - Objective Uncertainty, Subjective Certainty</td>
<td>(5) - Choose Participation/Non-Participation through Non-Motivated Process - Objective Uncertainty, Subjective Uncertainty = Naturalistic Uncertainty</td>
<td>(6) - Likely Choose Non-Participation through Motivated Process - Objective Uncertainty, Subjective Certainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Contestation (Non-Participation)</td>
<td>(7) - May Choose Non-Participation through Socially Constrained Process - Objective Certainty, Subjective Certainty</td>
<td>(8) - May Choose Non-Participation through Socially Constrained Process - Objective Certainty, Subjective Uncertainty</td>
<td>(9) - Likely Choose Non-Participation through Taken-for-granted Process - Objective Certainty, Subjective Certainty = Naturalistic Certainty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The resultant nine boxes show both the expected action choices and the types of cognitive process generating the choice. To start with, when there is complete, two-level non-contestation in action towards the action of participation in US-led operations lacking international
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legitimacy, as in box (1), the individual actor under study is highly likely to make a participation decision. This action of participation is highly likely to be generated by the fast, taken-for-granted process. Alternative courses of action, such as non-participation, political support, or financial contribution, may be swiftly bypassed, as they are non-actual. The participation decision is not only reached quickly and non-deliberatively, but also reached in a non-utilitarian manner in that the participation choice is just simply obvious. Obviousness is the reason, rather than relative power or security maximization. When prompted to justify choice, however, the individual actors under study are entirely able to come up with post-hoc rationalization. They are also likely to engage in selective attention and motivated processes.

Similarly, in box (9), where there is a complete, two-level non-contestation in action knowledge towards the action of non-participation and refusing troop contribution to the US-led operation lacking international legitimacy, the individual decision-maker under study is highly likely to make a non-participation decision. Again, this non-participation choice is highly likely to be generated by the logic of habit, or the fast taken-for-granted process. Even if alternative courses of action were available in the menu of policy options, these other policy choices of participation or deployment of non-combat troops could be swiftly bypassed, as they are non-actual. The non-participation decision is not only reached quickly and non-deliberatively, but also reached in a non-utilitarian, taken-for-granted manner. Staying out of the operation is just simply obvious, and such actuality-based reason is powerfully different from other normative or instrumental reasons. There is absence of utility or a sense of purpose. Still, when prompted to justify the non-participation choice, the individual actors under study are entirely capable of coming up with non-actuality based reasons, and they may engage in selective attention and motivated processing.
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Next, when there is individual level contestation in action knowledge, while there is institutional level non-contestation in action knowledge, as in the boxes of (2) and (8), the social environmental features are key. If the individual actor under study is in isolation from others, including the individual’s aggregate group at the institutional level, then the individual actor may not necessarily make participation and non-participation decisions in boxes (2) and (8), respectively. They may think through the costs and benefits and make the final choice. However, if the individual actor under study is in a social setting, or in an official role position, then there may be heavy social influences. The actors may likely engage in socially constrained process, whereby the final choices are biased towards participation and non-participation decisions in boxes (2) and (8), respectively.

Likewise, when there is cross-level contestation in action knowledge, as in the boxes of (3) and (7), the social environmental features are critical. If the individual actor under study is in isolation from others, then the individual actor is highly likely to make non-participation and participation decisions in boxes (3) and (7), respectively. However, if the individual actor under study is in a social setting, or in an official role position, then there are serious social influences. The actors are likely to engage in socially constrained process, and the final choices are expected to be biased towards participation and non-participation decisions in boxes (3) and (7), respectively. These final choices are the polar opposites of those expected choices in isolation.

As a further theoretical note, I expect the cases of boxes (3) and (7) to be naturally rare. Cross-level contestation in action knowledge is expected to be unstable for various cognitive dissonance and social psychological reasons. Through socialization processes, it is more likely that individual actors are socialized into boxes (1) and (2) or boxes (8) and (9), rather than in boxes (3) or (7). Individuals in boxes (3) and (7) could also exit their institutional level aggregate
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groups and find new aggregate groups who would provide alternative versions of reality.

Nevertheless, when leaders are elected into office, the rare cases of boxes (3) or (7) are entirely possible. Concrete examples of illustration are the elections of US Presidents Donald Trump in 2016 and Jimmy Carter in 1976.

In boxes (2), (3), (7) and (8), I expect individual level dispositions and traits, such as leadership style\textsuperscript{25} and self-monitoring,\textsuperscript{26} to have an independent causal impact on the final choices. For instance, those leaders who tend to listen to his or her advisers would show the effects of social influences and constraints. As well, high self-monitors may show the socially constraining effects. The final choices will likely be biased towards the prescribed action choices. On the other hand, those leaders who do not listen to his or her advisers may not necessarily show the effects of social influences and constraints. Low self-monitors may also not demonstrate any effects of social constraints. In such cases, there is a possibility that final choices are different from the institutionally prescribed action choices.

Moving onto the middle row (2), where there is institutional level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge, there is no institutionally prescribed action choice to begin with. When there individual level non-contestation in action knowledge, as in the boxes (4) and (6), then the individual actor under study is highly likely to make participation and non-participation choices in boxes (4) and (6), respectively. It is highly likely that they would engage in selective attention and motivated processes. There is high subjective, actor level certainty, but this high level certainty is qualitatively and quantitatively different from the naturalistic certainty in comparable boxes (1) and (9). The critical difference here would be that the actors under study may know about the alternative courses of action. Given that alternative courses of action do

\textsuperscript{25} For instance, please see, Keller and Foster (2012); Kaarbo (2018).

\textsuperscript{26} Please see Yarhi-Milo (2018), Chapter 2.
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register and are not considered as non-actual, obviousness is not the reason. There are substantial reasons for the preferred action choice, and substantial reasons against the non-preferred alternatives.

Finally, when there is a complete, two-level contestation in action knowledge, as in box (5), the individual actor under study is highly likely to engage in non-motivated process. The final choice outcome is most indeterminate, and it may depend on the concrete events and their interpretations on the ground. As such, there is no bias in choice *a priori*. The decision problem is embedded within naturalistic uncertainty, which is qualitatively and quantitatively different from the subjective, actor level uncertainty in other boxes (2), (3), (7) and (8).

**Addressing the Aggregation Problems**

In the domain of government decisions, including but not limited to foreign security policy decisions, there is an aggregation problem. In Levy’s (1997, 102) words, states are collective decision-making body, and we cannot automatically assume that the concepts and hypotheses about individual decision-making apply equally well for collective decision-making. One can also call equate this aggregation problem as Allison’s bureaucratic politics model. In the bureaucratic politics model too, there is no unitary actor. Rather, Allison (1969, 707) argues that many actors are players, “who focus not on a single strategic issue but on many diverse intra-national problems as well, in terms of no consistent set of strategic objectives but rather according to various conceptions of national, organization, and personal goals, making government decisions not by rational choice but by the pulling and hauling that is politics.” Thus, I need to elaborate on how I see the individual level decision-making get applied to the collective decision-making body of the state.
First and foremost, I believe that foreign security or national security policy decisions can be argued as the chief executive’s individual level decision. The final decision to support or refuse US requests for participation in the operation is also made by the chief executive. Leader level approaches to the study of foreign security policy have long made this argument.\textsuperscript{27} In addition to seeing the state decision as essentially an individual level decision, I already have the collective decision-making body modeled into the key explanatory variable, for at least the chief executive. For the president, I specified that the aggregate group in the institutional level of analysis is the national security team. If there really is pulling and hauling, this is captured as institutional level contestation in action knowledge, for the chief executive. If such pulling and hauling is absent, this is captured as institutional level non-contestation in action knowledge. As the president and his or her national security team are modeled simultaneously into the independent variable explaining the final choice, my key explanatory variable at the chief executive’s individual level decision-making takes the collective actor aspect into account.

The mid-level theory of US allies’ joining behaviors, specified from the general level sociological theory of choice, offers more details on this state, or chief executive, decision-making. Even if there really is back-and-forth at the collective level, as long as the president has individual level non-contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge, the chief executive will likely engage in selective attention and motivated processing. Pulling and hauling, and further informational updates, may not likely change the motivated processes and the biases in choice. Yet, if the president has individual level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge, as was the case in President Barack Obama’s foreign security policy in the Middle East, pulling and hauling, as well as updates in information and changes in payoff structure could have

\textsuperscript{27} For instance, please see, Saunders (2011); Horowitz, Stam, and Ellis (2015); Holmes (2018); Yarhi-Milo (2018).
independent impacts on the final policy decision. Still, even in this case, the collective actor problem and its back-and-forth may not be the primary or sole issue. There is a complete, two-level contestation in action knowledge, which makes the final choice indeterminate and allows for the non-motivated process to work.

When pulling and hauling is absent, or in other words, when most of the key members of the president’s national security team prioritize the same policy option, the chief executive could quickly reach the state/individual level choice through the logic of habit. The final choice may just seem natural and obvious. However, if the president holds individual level contestation in action knowledge, or if there is cross-level contestation in action knowledge, as it seems to be case in President Donald Trump’s foreign policy views, the president’s own dispositions and traits may have an independent causal effect on the final decision outcomes. Given that the social constraints are in operation for the president in office, the final choice may depend on the president’s own social dominance orientation, leadership, or self-monitoring style. If the president tends to listen to his or her advisers or scores high on self-monitoring, then the final choice is likely to be biased toward the institutionally prescribed choice. If the president tends not to listen to his or her advisers or scores low on self-monitoring, then the final choice may not necessarily reflect the social effects of the institutional level non-contestation in action knowledge.

It becomes empirically important to accurately measure and operationalize the degree of the president’s institutional level contestation in action knowledge. This is simply the degree of convergence in the individual level choices and policy preferences of the members of the president’s national security team (NSC). Again, I believe that the individual level decision-making can be applied to explain the individual NSC members’ choices and policy preferences.
Once I examine the individual NSC members’ choices and policy preferences, I can look at the
degree of convergence or divergence of the final individual level policy preferences across the
members of NSC.

Finally, I address the strategic aspect of the aggregation problem. In writing about the
potential application of prospect theory in the study of IR, Levy (1997, 102) points out that,
because international relations is a strategic interaction between collective state actors, one must
explain how the choices of two or more states interact to generate dyadic and international
outcomes. Snyder (1997) conceptualizes this concrete case of alliance politics as alliance
bargaining over foreign policy positions against the target of the operation. Indeed, this is a
strategic setting that involves at least two parties: the United States and allies. However, in the
case of US allies’ participation and non-participation decisions, the concrete choices, actions,
and interactions with the United States should potentially have independent effects on the allied
governments’ final choice outcomes, only when there is a complete, two-level contestation in
action knowledge, for the chief executive. Again, when there is a complete two-level
contestation in action knowledge, the final choice is most indeterminate and it can closely follow
the concrete events, including costly signals and side-payments, on the ground. Thus, in Figure
2.5 box (5), the strategic choice aspect may directly have an effect on the final choice outcome.

In all the other eight boxes of Figure 2.5, however, the strategic choice dimension is of
less concern. In boxes (1) and (9), the final choice is highly likely to be generated through the
logic of habit. As well, in boxes (4) and (6), the final choice is highly likely to be generated
through the motivated process. In these cases, the choices, actions, and interactions of the
strategic alliance bargaining setting have little to no impact on the final choice outcomes. In
boxes (2), (3), (7) and (8), where the socially constrained processes are likely to play out, the
features of the strategic alliance bargaining setting may get picked up by the individual decision-maker under study, but these strategic features play out alongside the individual leader level orientations and leadership style to affect the final choice outcomes.

The mid-level theory of US allies’ joining behaviors and the general level sociological theory of choice are theories of individual level decision-making. I have argued that in the domain of foreign security policy, the state decision is ultimately the chief executive’s decision, and so the individual level decision-making can hold. My theoretical arguments for the chief executive, in particular, also already model the relevant collective decision-making body as part of the primary explanatory variable. The strategic interactive aspects potentially have a direct impact on the final choice, only when there is a complete, two-level contestation in action knowledge. The strategic interactive aspects may have some effect, when there is leader level contestation in action knowledge or when there is cross-level contestation in action knowledge, but this effect is moderated by the leader’s own dispositions, traits and leadership style. In all, although the theoretical arguments advanced in this dissertation are at individual level decision-making, they can address the aggregation problems.

IV. Critical Tests

The perennial problem of equifinality stems from the complication that it is hard to test the objective, subjective, and intersubjective dimensions of the explanatory variables. In the domain of alliances, Walt (2011, 104-105) best describes this serious problem of equifinality, explicating that “testing conjectures about contemporary alliances is complicated further by the need to distinguish between the effects of (1) the structural features of unipolarity, (2) America’s status as the single superpower, and (3) the particular policies adopted by specific US
In this dissertation, I argue that this serious problem of equifinality can be dealt with by specifying the theoretically expected intervening cognitive processes generating the observable choice, precisely because competing theoretical explanations would expect different types of cognitive processes at work. A priori, no other theoretical explanation besides the constructivist explanations would expect to observe the non-deliberative and non-utilitarian logic of habit within the minds and brains of individual decision-makers under study. Therefore, the empirical observation of the logic of habit would lend the strongest possible support for the constructivist, or intersubjectivist, arguments. Although the single-level intersubjectivist arguments in the upper-right quadrant of Figure 2.4 certainly allow for all logics of action to have their place, it is not clear when and why different logics of action should unfold. My two-level ideational argument, which synthesizes the intersubjective with the subjective, offers a quite elaborate set of expectations on both the final choice outcomes and the intervention cognitive processes. My hypotheses, specifying the independent variable and the dependent variables, are summarized in Figure 2.5. If I find support for such an elaborate set of expectations, then this would arguably be a promising support in the synthetic direction.

In this section, I set up two rounds of critical tests. First and foremost, I will check if the key explanatory factors do explain the final choice outcomes. Given that the competing theoretical expectations on the substantive choice outcomes are similarly well supported, I will then check for the underlying cognitive processes generating the choices. In this second round of critical tests, I derive the differentially expected logics of action. Though only the constructivist explanations would expect to observe the logic of habit, I derive alternative explanations of when and why one may expect to observe the logic of habit. I conduct these two rounds of critical tests
through the cross-national multi-methods research design.

**Critical Test 1—The Choice Outcomes**

I first check if the key explanatory variables of the competing theoretical accounts do indeed explain the final choice outcomes. In particular, if I find support for my theoretical expectations on both the substance of the final choice outcomes and the intervening cognitive processes of these choices, then I argue that my two-level ideational argument has passed a significant level of empirical support. My two-level ideational argument is quite elaborate in that it has nine expectations, as shown in Figure 2.5, each with different combinations of final choices and cognitive processes. If there is empirical support for such elaborate and complex expectations, then I again emphasize that such findings would lend significant support for the ‘fifth’ approach, or the synthesis of intersubjectivity and subjectivity, in the study of international politics. The cross-national (my main country pair of the UK and ROK are least like each other) multi-methods research design would further increase confidence in the empirical evidence.

**Critical Test 2—Different Logics of Action**

Next, I derive out how the competing theoretical explanations would differentially expect the intervening logics of action. A priori, only the intersubjectivist arguments would expect the logic of habit to be in operation in the actors under study. Yet, I derive out how the competing arguments would also explain the logic of habit, if one were to empirically observe it.

To begin with the objective holist, namely neorealist, explanations of US allies’ joining behaviors, some participation or non-participation decisions may just be self-evident and actual, precisely because of the high levels of need for US capabilities, or clear existential regional threats. In such a complete information game, the strategy to be taken is so obvious and certain,
and it may not require deliberation or further rationales at the split-second. For these reasons, the neorealist explanations would expect that it is more likely to find the logic of habit in the South Korean government’s decision-making on the participation issue. South Korea has high levels of alliance dependence and high levels of material need for US capabilities, as there is a clear existential threat from North Korea.

In the case of the UK, where there is no clear consensus on alliance “dependence” or material need for US capabilities to ensure national security, the complete information game may nonetheless play out in the following way. Those who are highly informed about the threat levels of the target of the operation would obviously want to balance against the threat and join the US-led operation, even when there is a lack of international institutional authorization to use armed force. In the UK case, I would expect those with high levels of information to potentially exhibit the non-deliberative and non-utilitarian logic of habit. High levels of information on the development of nuclear weapons, uses of chemical weapons, and violent extremist plots may prompt individual actors to take alignment with the United States as apparent and natural. Again, in a complete information game, the strategy to be taken is obvious and it may not require deliberation and further rationales at the split-second.

Moving onto the objective individualist, or rationalist, explanations of the US allies’ joining behaviors, certain domestic political conditions may allow for the fast, taken-for-granted cognitive process to play out within the minds and brains of individual decision-makers. There are two such cases. Assuming that the executive branch prefers to cooperate with the United States—a key security partner—government leaders not facing any serious domestic political competition will quickly and habitually cooperate with the US and participate in the US-led operation, even when it lacks international legitimacy. Without any serious political constraints,
the logic of habit may unfold and generate participation choice. In another case, which still assumes that the executive branch prefers to cooperate with the United States, when government leaders are faced with serious domestic political competition, they will quickly and obviously stay out or pull out of the US-led operation, especially given the high salience of the issue and the strong domestic public opposition.\(^{28}\) In these two cases, the clear political conditions and incentives should make participation and non-participation decisions obvious and actual.

According to the interstate bargaining literature, the US government may have also made it clear what the payoff structures for the allied governments’ decisions would be. The US government could use both carrots and sticks. The United States could make either the side-payments or withdrawals of economic or military aids as clearly and publicly as possible. Thus, I combine these two domestic and interstate political games for the allied government decision-makers. If the carrots and sticks from this interstate bargaining game travel in the same direction as the domestic political incentives, then the operation of the non-deliberative and non-utilitarian logic of habit may even be more likely. If the carrots and sticks from this interstate bargaining game travel in the opposite direction as the domestic political incentives, then the potential operation of the logic of habit may be stalled. The logic of consequences, in either types of instrumental or normative rationality, is highly likely.

Lastly, I consider how the subjectivist theoretical explanations would explain the logic of habit, if one were to empirically observe the fast, taken-for-granted cognitive process. If government decision-makers have strong attitudes and beliefs, then such prior strength in attitudes and beliefs might explain the obviousness in final choice.\(^{29}\) Similarly, if leaders have

\(^{28}\) For instance, please see the studies on public opinion and the 2003 Iraq War, Walgrave and Rucht (2010); Sobel, Furia, and Barratt (2012); Baum (2013).

\(^{29}\) Please see the review on attitude strength by Howe and Krosnick (2017).
consistent, theory-driven beliefs and attitudes, then such prior consistency in beliefs and attitudes might explain why certain choices and actions are just apparent. I derive two further sets of testable and falsifiable propositions. If individual decision-makers have strong and consistent attitudes towards security cooperation with the United States, then the institutional level of analysis should not make a difference in the expected logic of action. Whether one is conservative or liberal, head of national intelligence agency or defense department, if one has strong and/or consistent attitudes and beliefs, then such prior strength and consistency alone should allow for the logic of habit.

This expectation should similarly hold for the strong and consistent attitudes towards non-participation in US-led operations lacking any international institutional authorization to use force. Whether one is conservative or liberal, head of national intelligence agency or defense department, if one has strong and/or consistent attitudes and beliefs against unilateral military actions, then such prior strength and consistency should similarly allow for the logic of habit, or taken-for-grantedness in non-participation. In short, the different institutional levels should not make a difference, if the key explanatory variable is focused on the subjective, actor level of analysis.
3. Cross-National Survey Experiments in the UK and ROK

The research design employed to conduct the two rounds of critical tests derived in the previous chapter is the cross-national, multi-methods design. I chose to compare two US allies—the United Kingdom (UK) and the Republic of Korea (ROK)—as they are vastly different from one another. This particular pair of US allies allows me to generalize any similar results with much more confidence. I first start with cross-national survey experiments, primarily to check for the convergent validity of the measures and conduct the critical empirical tests with large-N samples. The randomization in controlled experiments also ensures a clean causal inference of treatment effects, which in this case are the effects of conflicting response cue conditions. The variables of interest are measured with relatively high precision.

In this chapter, I present the cross-national survey experiments on the UK and ROK adult citizens. I chose the national samples that map onto my target populations of government decision-makers. This survey experimental chapter proceeds in four steps. First, I present the samples and the survey experiment design. Then, I describe how I measure the variables of interest. Next, I report the findings of the two rounds of critical tests. Finally, I end with a discussion on the implications of the cross-national survey experimental findings.

I. The Survey

The Sample

I administered two online survey experiments in May-June 2018: one in the UK and one in the ROK. Survey Sampling International (SSI) fielded the UK study to 2,127 adults and a
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local Internet survey firm, *Embrain*, administered the ROK study to 1,797 adults. I screened out survey participants based on citizenship and partisanship. I screened out non-citizens, because the hypothetical scenarios in the experiments concerned the UK and ROK government decisions and non-citizen respondents may not necessarily react to the experimental treatments in the scenarios. This was a particular problem for the UK survey, as there were EU nationals working in the UK, international students, refugees, etc. who had signed up to be panelists for SSI. The South Korean Internet survey firm confirmed that all panelists have ROK citizenship.

I also screened out those who are Independents or show most political favorability towards minor political parties, because my experimental manipulations involved the two major political parties. In both samples, there were more respondents who preferred the leftist major political party, which is Labour party in the UK and Democratic party in the ROK. In the UK sample, 827 respondents preferred Conservative party while 1,300 respondents preferred Labour party. In the ROK sample, 484 respondents preferred Liberty Korea (rightist) party while 1,313 respondents preferred Democratic (leftist) party.

My samples are not national probability samples. For instance, the individuals in my samples are those who have Internet access, own smartphones, and have voluntarily registered themselves for the survey firms. As shown in the tables comparing sample and population characteristics in Appendix A.1, the UK sample has more females and is geographically balanced, while the ROK sample has more males and has a few exceptions of overrepresented urban centers. Both UK and ROK samples are younger, more educated, and more ideologically rightist than their respective populations. Such overrepresentation of rightist political ideology does not fit with the overrepresentation of leftist party preferences of the samples, and this may
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be due to the survey question’s set up of choosing political ideology by dragging a point in the continuous left-right scale, without the option of no choice.

The Survey

The survey proceeds as follows: 1) four sets of questionnaires, 2) two vignette-based experiments, and 3) a concluding questionnaire on socio-demographic characteristics. The two vignette-based experiments are in random order, and to ameliorate any carryover effects, I put several questions including random, distractor question in between the two vignettes.

A. Four Sets of Questionnaires

Questionnaire 1: US-Specific Attitudes

The survey begins with a general question. I ask the respondents to indicate the extent to which they think several key actors are important in ensuring the UK/ROK’s national security. For the UK survey, the actors are British Armed Forces, UN, NATO, and the United States. For the ROK survey, the actors are ROK Armed Forces, UN, relations with DPRK, and the United States. For each of these actors, the respondents could choose from a five-point scale, from very important to very unimportant. The order of these actors is randomized.

I also ask for the respondents’ approval levels of the country’s participation in the US-led Iraq War in 2003. Because this question is very similar to the government approval level questions for the experimental scenarios, I place it at the very end of the survey to avoid any priming effects. The Iraq War question is modified from Tomz and Weeks’s article on “Public Opinion and the Democratic Peace,” to in order to address the question from the US allies’ perspective.1

1 In Tomz and Weeks (2013), the authors ask this question from the US perspective, and so I modify this question from the US allies’ perspective.
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**Questionnaire 2: Verbal Protocol Mock Tasks**

The Verbal Protocol, as developed by Ericsson and Simon (1984, 1993), is modified into a write-aloud task due to the constraints of collecting voice data. I follow the standardized protocol to have subjects practice on the verbal protocol mock tasks before beginning the real task. I arrange three practice tasks. I ask the respondents to first indicate how much they agree or disagree with the following statements on a five-point scale, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree:

1) It is appropriate to celebrate New Year’s Day.  
2) The UK/ROK should increase corporation tax.  
3) Genetic engineering should be advanced.

The first mock task was intended to probe how people talk about their taken-for-granted cognitive processes, as many arguably would take the New Year’s Celebration as natural and inevitable, when it is our choice. The second mock task was intended to probe how people talk about their motivated cognitive processes, and the third one was intended to gauge at either socially constrained or non-motivated cognitive process. The order of the three statements is randomized. Immediately after asking for their levels of agreement, I give the following prompt:

Now we’d like to know more in depth what you were thinking when you chose to piped text the statement. Please write everything that had gone through your mind when you chose to piped text the statement in the box below.

There were no time or space limits in the open-ended text box.

**Questionnaire 3: Foreign Policy Orientations**

I measure the respondents’ foreign policy orientations with six questions. For comparative purposes, I use the wordings of Gravelle, Reifler, and Scotto’s (2017) article on “The structure of foreign policy attitudes in transatlantic perspective: Comparing the United States, United Kingdom, France and Germany,” for consistency in the established cross-national
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I use two statements on militant internationalism, two statements on cooperative internationalism, and two statements on isolationism. I ask the respondents to first indicate how much they agree or disagree with the six statements on a five-point scale, ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Specifically, the two statements on militant internationalism are as follows:

1) The UK/ROK needs a strong military to be effective in international relations.
2) The UK/ROK should take all steps including the use of force to prevent aggression by any expansionist power.

The two statements on cooperative internationalism are as follows:

1) The UK/ROK should be more committed to diplomacy and not so fast to use the military in international crises.
2) The UK/ROK should work more through international organizations, like the UN.

Finally, the two statements on isolationism are as follows:

1) The UK/ROK interests are best protected by avoiding involvement with other nations.
2) The UK/ROK shouldn’t risk its citizens’ happiness and well-being by getting involved with other nations.

Questionnaire 4: Thinking Dispositions

I measure the respondents’ general thinking dispositions in three ways. I use four questions from Need for Cognition questionnaire and four questions from Need for Closure questionnaire in Rathbun, Kertzer, and Paradis’ (2017) article on “Homo Diplomaticus: Mixed-Method Evidence of Variation in Strategic Rationality.” Lastly, I have two standard Cognitive Reflection Tests (CRT), with modified numbers for those non-naïve respondents.

B. Two Vignette-Based Experiments

The vignettes have hypothetical scenarios, where the United States is requesting the UK/ROK government to participate in two different operations abroad. I chose two issues with different levels of salience. The highly salient scenario concerns the US requests for troop
contributions to a US-led operation against chemical weapons facilities in an autocratic country in Africa. The other low-key scenario involves the US requests for troop contributions to help train a multi-national joint task force in West Africa.

I omitted any information on country name or leaders, as specific names can be thought of as compound treatment effects. Nonetheless, one might wonder whether participants reacted strongly to the chemical weapons operation scenario, because Syria’s use of chemical weapons is contemporaneously salient. This is why, without naming the country specifically, I located the country that used chemical weapons to be in Africa, which is a different continent from Syria’s location.² The scenario on US-led operation against chemical weapons facilities reads as follows:

US Intelligence sources revealed that a dictatorship in Africa used chemical weapons as part of its recent attempts to put down a large-scale armed rebellion. This country shows no sign of becoming a democracy and does not have high levels of trade with the United Kingdom. The use of chemical weapons in armed conflict is a violation of international law. The United States requested the [Rightist/Leftist] government to join the US-led military strike against the chemical weapons facilities in this country. The [Rightist/Leftist] government determined that it is necessary to join and deployed troops to the US-led operation.

Both the UK/ROK survey read the exact same scenario, except in the last sentence of the ROK survey, I specified that the [Rightist/Leftist] government deployed non-combat troops to the US-led operation, because it would be politically unimaginable for the government to deploy combat troops given the mandatory draft in the ROK. Non-combat troops could be stationed in nearby contingents carrying out various tasks. The other less salient scenario reads as follows:

Oftentimes, multiple countries contribute troops and form multi-national forces to manage various security crises. One example is the Multinational Joint Task Force (MNJTF) in Chad, where several West African countries contributed troops to fight the violent extremist organization in Nigeria. In order to increase the effectiveness of such multi-national forces, the United States requested the [Rightist/Leftist] government to help provide military training to several West African countries. The [Rightist/Leftist] government determined that the task is necessary and agreed to deploy troops to the region.

² Tomz and Weeks (2013) also specify the continent in their scenarios.
Here, specific country names, such as Chad and Nigeria, are mentioned only as an example to illustrate what a multinational joint task force means. When the United States requests the UK/ROK government to contribute troops to such a multinational joint task force, no country is actually named and only the region is specified as West Africa.

Although the scenarios did not literally state that the UN Security Council authorization to use armed force was lacking, as such statement may prime respondents, it is clear from the background real-time issue that there was no UN Security Council authorization on the allied forces’ military action against the chemical weapons facilities in Syria and it is obvious that the Joint Task Force to degrade the extremist organization is not a UN peace enforcement or peacekeeping operation.

Treatment Conditions

What would non-conflict and conflict detection settings look like for this particular context of decision-making for the citizen samples? Non-conflict conditions would be where there are no conflicting response cues, and conflict conditions would be where there are conflicting response cues. One could question whether non-conflict conditions are realistic or not, given the high salience of the issue of troop deployment overseas. I argue that for some individuals, such as identifiers, members, and leaders of the rightist political parties, where there is non-contestation of strategic beliefs at the party level, this can be the case. While many different policy alternatives may be physically present in the broader social, political, and rhetorical environments, they may not necessarily be registered as a conflict for this group of individuals. Hence, I argue that conflicting response cues need to come from one’s own identifiable group, so as to effectively increase the chances for conflict detection. Below, I explain two different treatments of conflicting response cue conditions. One is more indirect, and
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the other is more direct.

**Preferred Political Party (PPP) and Non-Preferred Political Party (NPP) in Power**

A potential conflicting response cue detection could involve the party ID of the government proposing the plans for military participation at US requests. If one’s preferred political party is in government, then such partisan cue may automatically invoke support for the government’s troop deployment plans. However, if the non-preferred political party is in government, then such partisan cue may invoke opposition against the government’s participation plan. The tendency to unduly accept and reward one’s own preferred political party (PPP) and unfairly dismiss and oppose the non-preferred political party (NPP) appears to be even more powerful among those, who hold the strongest partisan attachments.³ Thus, when the NPP government proposes the participation decision, it may be more likely that there are two conflicting response cues: 1) the participation decision directly prompted by the non-preferred party government in the prompt, and 2) the alternative response of non-participation. When the PPP government proposes the participation decision, then it may be less likely that there are two conflicting response cues. The alternative of non-participation may not be cued.

In the context of the Iraq War in 2003, Berinsky (2007) explains that even though there was not much information coming from Democratic leaders, the Bush administration’s clear stance on war provided a clear partisan guide. Berinsky (2007, 978) writes that, “If I am a Democrat, I need only know that George Bush supports a policy initiative to recognize that I should oppose such a course of action.” A similar argument can be made about the Trump administration’s decisions for this Democrat. Such partisan cues of opposition need not only apply to Republican presidents. It can apply to Democratic presidents. The point is that when it is the non-preferred party government that proposes a plan, the proposed plan and its direct

---
³ This has been noted by Bartels (2002); Lavine, Johnston, and Steenbergen (2012).
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opposite, alternative policy response may be more likely to be cued than when it is the preferred party government.

Legislators, too, seem to heed to such partisan cues. Howell and Pevehouse (2007) offer various reasons why members of the president’s party would likely be supportive of the government’s decision, while the opposition party members would likely oppose the government’s plans. First, legislators have electoral incentives and the opposition party has an incentive to highlight any failures, missteps, or scandals that might arise in the course of the government’s decision. As well, because individuals with shared ideological or partisan affiliations find it easier to communicate with one another, the members of the president’s party will trust the government decision more than the opposition members, who are predisposed to doubt and challenge the government’s decision.

Within each of the two scenarios, I manipulate the party of the government making the decision to meet US requests and deploy troops abroad. The government is either one of the two major political parties. Because the military participation issue takes place in a highly politicized context, I make sure to specify which party government made the decision and there is no pure control. Respondents are randomly assigned to either Leftist or Rightist party government proposes condition. This is the more indirect treatment of conflicting response cue condition.

Unity and Disunity within One Political Party

Following the scenario prompts, I either give no information on the political elite discourse (pure control) or give information on the political elite discursive environment. Each of the two major parties has either unity or disunity in their support for the government decision. Here, intra-party unity travels in one direction: support for the government’s deployment
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decision.\(^4\) There are two major parties [Leftist party/Rightist party] \(\times\) two types of intra-party discursive conditions [Unity/Disunity] = four conditions. Thus, respondents are randomly assigned to one of the five elite discursive environment conditions: 1) pure control; 2) Rightist United, Leftist United; 3) Rightist United, Leftist Divided; 4) Rightist Divided, Leftist United, and 5) Rightist Divided, Leftist Divided. One could raise the issue of believability of the Rightist Divided condition,\(^5\) but I include the Rightist Divided discourse conditions for comparative purposes and have a 2 \(\times\) 5 fully crossed between-subjects experimental design.

I make sure that the only difference in the united versus divided discourse conditions is the division itself. In the divided condition, no qualitatively new dimension is introduced. Rather, supportive dimensions are directly contested, in order to cue two conflicting responses: approve versus disapprove the government’s decision to contribute troops. For the chemical weapons scenario, the dimensions for support are three-fold: tough response to the use of chemical weapons is necessary, operation serves national interest, and importance to support the United States. Direct contestation of these dimensions are: questionable credibility on the use of chemical weapons, diplomatic solution better serves national interest, and non-necessity of supporting the United States. Likewise, for the troop-training scenario, the dimensions for support are three-fold: military coordination is necessary, adequacy of behind-the-scenes non-combat role, and supporting US global priorities. Again, direct contestation of these dimensions are: questionable effectiveness of military coordination, putting troops in harm’s way even in the

\(^4\) Intra-party unity could travel the other way of the political party united in opposing the government’s decision to deploy troops, but this would have increased the number of experimental conditions and I had to make it analytically tractable.

\(^5\) The Rightist parties are not 100% united all the time. There are dissents at the margins during normal times. In the case of terrorist abductions of a ROK citizen in Iraq in 2004, the rightist party was split in support of the government’s motion to extend the deployments in Iraq. There were dissents in the UK Conservative party in the Suez Canal crisis of 1956 (Epstein 1960).
behind-the-scenes role, and disagreement with US global priorities. Exact wordings of each discourse condition are presented in Appendix A.2.

The partisan cues in the public opinion literature usually consist of united information from a political party or leader. If there are divisions in the elite opinion, it usually means that the major political parties have different opinions. In other words, elite division is where Democratic and Republican parties have different opinions, and the ‘polarization’ pattern indicates the increasing differences in opinions between informed Democrats and informed Republicans. The conflict detection setting in my experiment is slightly different from such united versus divided elite environment, because the unity and disunity is coming from within one political party. In fact, such splintering of parties has been empirically documented.

Jacobson (2010) also documents significant effects of breaking down of the Republican consensus on Iraq, especially in the wake of the 2006 midterm elections. Thus, while I set non-conflict condition as either pure control, or non-conflict condition, I set conflicting response cue conditions as the preferred party’s disunity. Such preferred party’s disunity is expected to lead to more successful detection of conflicting response cues.

Addressing the Carryover Effects

When there are multiple experiments embedded in one survey, there could be concerns for carryover effects, meaning that the particular treatment a respondent receives during the first experiment influences the dependent variable of interest in the subsequent experiment. In this instance, those who receive a divided discourse condition in the first experiment may be

---

6 For instance, please see, Zaller (1992); Boudreau and MacKenzie (2014).

7 This is also noted in Lodge and Taber (2013).

8 For instance, please see Rathbun (2004).
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influenced to think harder about the next scenario, regardless of the treatment group they are assigned to in the second experiment.

In order to ameliorate any such carryover effects, I put three types of distractor questions in between the two experiments. First, I situate one of the two standard Cognitive Reflection Tests (CRT) that I use to measure the respondents’ general thinking dispositions in between the two experiments. Second, I place one of Yarhi-Milo’s (2018) three-item version of Snyder and Gangestad’s Self-Monitoring Scale to measure trait self-monitoring. Finally, I ask a random question about what respondents had for dinner last night. Furthermore, I randomize the order of the two experiments to avoid any order effects.

Five Questions

i. Approval Level

I ask respondents for their approval levels on the government decision to deploy troops on a seven-point scale, ranging from strongly approve to strongly disapprove. This is used to measure that substantive choice outcome. As well, responses for this approval question are used to compare patterns of response change across subgroups.

ii. Response Time

I time the above approval responses in seconds and log transform the response time data. Because response time is strongly positively skewed, with most data peaking in the matter of seconds, and residuals having the tendency to reflect random errors, it is standard practice in the cognitive sciences to log transform the response time data.9

To ensure that the difference in response time is not due to reading different text lengths across different elite discursive environments, I ask this approval question on a separate screen,

---

after both the hypothetical scenario and elite discourse prompts. The response time starts from the click onto this approval question screen to the click onto the next screen.

I also control for the respondents’ baseline response time. Some respondents may take longer to respond to the approval level question, not because they have to think through to choose their approval levels, but because they are taking multiple surveys at once or they are simply taking longer to click, due to age, infrequent smartphone usage, concentration levels, etc. Thus, as baseline controls, I measure the response time for two socio-demographical items on the survey—income level and employment status—as these questions respectively have nine and eight choices, closely matching the seven-point scale for the approval questions.\(^\text{10}\) I control for response latency with the shortest response time between the two socio-demographical questions.

### iii. Write-Aloud Task

_Immediately_ after asking for their approval levels, I ask the respondents to write about everything that had gone through their mind as they chose their approval levels. The advantage of such write-aloud reports is that they provide a non-discrete, qualitative account of the cognitive process. I analyze the text data produced by this write-aloud task.

### iv. Decision Certainty

After the write-aloud task, I ask how certain the respondents are of their approval choices. Respondents could choose their decision certainty levels by dragging a point in the continuum ranging from 0-100%.

### v. Manipulation Checks

I ask two manipulation check questions. First, I ask about the party of the government making the deployment decision. Second, I ask which political party was divided on the issue.

\(^{10}\) On response time latency, please see Mulligan et al. (2003).
C. Concluding Questionnaire

I ask the standard battery of socio-demographic questions at the end of the survey. These include age, gender, education, income, employment status, political ideology, closeness to preferred party, level of social conservatism, and level of interest in politics and in foreign policy. I control for these variables.

II. Measurement and Operationalization

Capturing the Independent Variable: The Degree of Two-Level Contestation in Action Knowledge

The Institutional Level

To begin with the institutional level for the survey respondents, I posit that the aggregate group that provides the baseline reality on foreign security policy, as well as a host of other government policies, is the political party preferred by the individual survey respondent. The past six decades of research has provided insights into the degree to which partisan identification acts as a perceptual screen.\(^\text{11}\) Hence, in my operationalization of the main independent variable—the degree of two-level contestation in action knowledge—I focus on the preferred political party (PPP) as the aggregate group that provides the baseline reality of foreign security policy for the survey participants. The PPP may be different across individual survey respondents. In this survey, however, I only focus on those whose PPP are the two major, Leftist and Rightist political parties.

The nine boxes in Figure 3.1 below illustrate the variation in my key explanatory factor. I do not consider the third row, where the degree of institutional level contestation in action

\(^{11}\) Please see Bartels (2002).
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knowledge is non-contested towards staying out of US-led operations lacking any international institutional authorization to use armed force. This is because the two major political parties in the UK and the ROK are, at most, contested in the action knowledge. This does not mean that there are no political parties with non-contested action knowledge towards non-participation. In the UK, the Scottish National Party (SNP) has non-contested action knowledge towards non-participation in operations that lack any international institutional authorization to use armed force, and in the ROK, the Democratic Labor Party has non-contested action knowledge towards non-participation in US-led operations in such specific contexts. Nonetheless, they are minor parties that do not have the histories of being in the government, and the two major political parties of the UK and the ROK do not yet have non-contested action knowledge towards non-participation.

Based on previous studies on the UK and ROK partisan foreign policy preferences, I find the UK and ROK rightist parties to have non-contested action knowledge towards participation in the US-led operations. Specifically, the rightist parties have strong belief in the efficacy of the traditional alliance relations with the United States and in the use of military force in achieving national security objectives as well as other foreign policy goals, while there is weaker belief in the effectiveness of international rules and institutions in ensuring national security objectives. On the other hand, the UK and ROK leftist parties have contested action knowledge. While some believe in the efficacy of bilateralism with the United States, others insist on military actions authorized by the United Nations, and while some believe in the efficacy of the use of force, others are pacifists. This is why the major Rightist party is in the first row of Figure 3.1. Both the UK and ROK Rightist parties have non-contested action knowledge towards

---

12 For UK parties, I look at the history of parliamentary votes and use studies by Epstein (1960) and Rathbun (2004). For ROK parties, I also check the history of parliamentary votes and use studies by Steinberg and Shin (2006); Chae and Kim (2010).
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participation in the US-led operations even if there is a lack of any international institutional authorization to use armed force. The Leftist parties that hold contested action knowledge are in the second row of Figure 3.1.

Figure 3.1. Six Theoretical Subgroups in the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Individual Level Non-Contestation (Participation)</th>
<th>Individual Level Contestation</th>
<th>Individual Level Non-Contestation (Non-Participation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Level Non-Contestation (Participation)</td>
<td>(1) Rightist pro-US hawks</td>
<td>(2) Rightist subgroup with individual level contestation in action knowledge</td>
<td>(3) Rightist pro-UN doves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Level Contestation</td>
<td>(4) Leftist pro-US hawks</td>
<td>(5) Leftist subgroup with individual level contestation in action knowledge</td>
<td>(6) Leftist pro-UN doves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Level Non-Contestation (Non-Participation)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Individual Level

Now I move onto how I measure the degree of individual level contestation in the action knowledge, as represented by the three conceptual columns. I use the respondents’ answers to six questions on the survey. Two responses were to the initial questions that tried to capture the respondent’s understandings of the importance of the United States and the United Nations in achieving and ensuring national security. Two responses were to two questions on militant
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internationalism (MI). Two responses were to two questions on cooperative internationalism (CI).

To start with the first column, there is individual level non-contestation in action knowledge towards participation in US-led operations, even when there is a lack of international institutional authorization to use armed force. This is when the belief in the effectiveness of bilateral relations with the United States in achieving and ensuring national security is stronger than that of multilateralism, and there is strong belief in military effectiveness. I operationalize such combination of pre-existing beliefs as follows. First, to capture the relative strengths of beliefs in the effectiveness of bilateralism and multilateralism, I subtract the participant response to the question on the importance of the United Nations in ensuring national security from the same participant’s response to the question on the importance of the United States in ensuring national security. The questions are from the first set of questionnaire in the survey, and the responses are on a five-point scale. If the belief on the effectiveness of bilateralism is stronger, then this value should be positive. If the belief on the effectiveness of multilateralism is stronger, then this value should be negative. If the beliefs on the effectiveness of bilateralism and multilateralism are similarly strong or similarly weak, then this value should be zero.

Given that this subtracted value is positive, I also look at the same participant’s responses to the militant internationalism (MI) and cooperative internationalism (CI) questions. If the average of the two MI question responses is 4 and above, while the average of the two CI question responses is below 4, I operationalize this as strong belief in the efficaciousness in the use of military force in achieving national security objectives. Any survey participant who satisfy these conditions jointly are grouped as those with individual level non-contestation in action knowledge towards participation in US-led operations that lack any international institutional
authorization to use armed force. These individuals have relatively stronger beliefs in bilateralism than in multilateralism and have strong beliefs in the efficaciousness of the use of force. In Figure 3.1, this group of individuals with both positive subtracted value (stronger belief in bilateralism than multilateralism) and strong belief in military effectiveness are in column 1.

Given that the value from subtracting participant responses to the UN question from the US question is negative (stronger belief in multilateralism than bilateralism), I look at the same participant’s responses to the MI and CI questions. If the average of the two CI question responses is 4 and above, while the average of the two MI question responses is below 4, I operationalize this as weak belief in the efficaciousness in the use of military force in achieving national security objectives. This group of respondents prefers diplomatic solutions and peaceful multilateral efforts to achieving national security objectives. Any survey participant who satisfy these conditions jointly are grouped as those with individual level non-contestation in action knowledge towards non-participation in these US-led operations. These individuals have relatively stronger beliefs in multilateralism than in traditional bilateralism and have weak beliefs in the effectiveness of the use of force. In Figure 3.1, this group of individuals with both negative subtracted value and weak belief in military effectiveness are in column 3.

All other survey respondents are in column 2, where there is individual level contestation in action knowledge. This is a big group composed of, at least, three different subgroups. First subgroup is those participants with a positive subtracted value (stronger belief in bilateralism than multilateralism) but with either a weak belief in military effectiveness or a similarly strong CI orientation. Second subgroup is those participants with a subtracted value of zero. These individuals hold similarly strong or weak beliefs in bilateralism and multilateralism. Third subgroup is those participants with a negative subtracted value (stronger belief in multilateralism
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than bilateralism) but with either a strong belief in military effectiveness or a similarly strong MI orientation. These three subgroups in column 2 are theoretically conceptualized to hold individual level contestation in action knowledge.

The survey questions allow me to literally capture the degree of individual level contestation in action knowledge with relatively high precision. With these responses, I can translate the theory and its key independent variable in a straightforward way that would not otherwise be so readily available. For instance, the first column is the group of individuals who are pro-US hawks. The third column is the group of individuals who are pro-UN doves. All others, such as pro-US doves and pro-UN hawks, are in the middle column. Now, I further divide these columns and study them in two different rows, or according to the respondents’ preferred political parties. In total, there are six theoretical subgroups of interest.

**Dependent Variables**

I have two dependent variables of interest. First is the substance of the final choice outcome, and second is the type of cognitive process that generated the final choice. In the survey experiments on adult citizens, the choice outcomes are approval levels on a seven-point scale. The government decides to meet US requests and deploy troops abroad, and after each scenario the survey asks for the participants’ approval levels on such government decisions. If the survey respondent approves of the government’s troop contribution decision, this would be similar to the participation decision of the government leaders. If the survey respondent disapproves of the governments’ troop contribution decision, this would be similar to the non-participation decision of the government leaders. Thus, to measure the first dependent variable of choice outcomes, I look at the survey participants’ responses to the approval level questions.
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For the second dependent variable of the types of cognitive process generating the choice outcomes, the measurement and operationalization are less straightforward. As I have explained in the introductory chapter, no one measure is indicative of a type of cognitive process, as of yet. I use three standard measures from the conflict detection setting of the thinking and reasoning field of the cognitive sciences and an inductively uncovered text-based measure to operationalize the different types of cognitive process generating the approval levels.

To begin with the taken-for-granted process, the conflicting response cue treatment conditions are not likely to increase response time, induce response change, or decrease decision certainty. This is precisely because the conflicting response cues will not likely be registered and seriously conceived in the first place. The open-ended texts can be lengthy and elaborate, but they will likely be one-sided, highlighting all the positive aspects about the preferred action. The convergence across these measures would be vital to argue that the unobservable type of cognitive process is the non-deliberative and non-utilitarian logic of habit.

Next, I measure the socially constrained process as follows. The conflicting response cue treatment conditions are may increase response time, induce response change, and decrease decision certainty. There will be a successful conflict detection. The open-ended texts may be more balanced towards the preferred action; there will be both positive and negative aspects about the preferred action. Again, if there is consistency across these four measures, such convergence will increase the confidence that these measures are capturing the socially constrained process.

Third, I measure the motivated process in the following way. The conflicting response cue treatment conditions may increase response time, may induce response change (but of the logics of non-habit, I expect this motivated process, or rationalization, to show the least amount
of response change), and may not decrease decision certainty. Because there is subjective certainty from individual level non-contestation in the action knowledge towards either participation or non-participation, the conflicting response cue treatment conditions are unlikely to causally decrease such pre-existing subjective certainty. The text-based measure will also be more complex in that both the preferred and non-preferred actions may likely be discussed. However, there will likely be an imbalance or reasons and aspects. The non-preferred action is almost always more negative than the preferred action.

Finally, I measure the non-motivated process as follows. The conflicting response cue treatment conditions may increase response time, induce response change, and may decrease decision certainty. Successful conflict detection will likely trigger these causal changes in the survey experimental setting. The text-based measure will also be complex, in that both the preferred and non-preferred actions will likely be discussed in an indeterminate way. Respondents will likely verbalize that they cannot decide or are unsure, or that they need more information to decide. Positive aspects of the non-preferred action will be acknowledged and thoroughly discussed. This text-based measure provides the key difference between the socially constrained process and the non-motivated process in isolated, survey experimental settings.

Although the three standards measures in the conflict detection set-up may be similar, the text-based measure for the non-motivated process will more likely reflect the indeterminacy.

**III. Critical Tests: The Findings**

**Critical Test 1—The Choice Outcomes**

I first test if the expectations of the competing theoretical explanations hold up in terms of the final choice outcomes. For the objective holist, or mainly neorealist, explanations to pass
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the first critical test, it needs to explain the respondents’ actual choice outcomes. Given the frequent Anglo-American deployments in the region geographically close to the UK, the UK’s threat perceptions from the use of chemical weapons and from the extremist organization in Africa should be similar to the US threat perceptions implied in the hypothetical scenarios. According to the balance-of-threat explanation, threat is more or less self-evident and alignment behavior to address the threat is expected from leaders and citizens alike. Therefore, the UK citizen sample should be supportive of the government’s decision to meet US requests and deploy troops on various operations abroad. For both the chemical weapons and training troops scenarios, the UK sample’s average approval levels are above 4, or “slightly approve.” For the ROK case, there is a clear regional threat (i.e. North Korea). Thus, the ROK citizen sample should be supportive of the government’s decision to meet US requests and deploy troops abroad. For both scenarios, the ROK sample’s average approval levels are also above 4, or “slightly approve.”

The other objective holist, side-deal explanation cannot be tested using the survey experimental data, because the hypothetical scenarios did not embed and manipulate these side-payments and deals. I test and report the findings of this other objective holist, side-deal explanation in the next chapter where I focus on the target populations of government decision-makers. Likewise, the objective individualist explanation cannot be tested on citizens, as they do not have similar levels of electoral or policy incentives as national leaders. I test and report the findings of this objective individualist explanation in the next chapter too.

The subjective holist, or intersubjectivist, explanation focused on the national identity understandings of the United States, from the perspective of US allies, similarly expect both leaders and citizens to support US military operations. Whether the United States is understood
as a family of nations or an indispensable security partner, such shared understandings should expect the UK and ROK samples to support the government decisions to meet US requests and deploy troops abroad. As I have noted above, the UK and ROK samples’ average approval levels are above 4, or “slightly approve,” for both the chemical weapons and training troops scenarios. Such shared understandings are a bit more contested in the Leftist parties. For instance, then Labour leader, Jeremy Corbyn, specifically criticized Prime Minister Theresa May’s decision to join the US-led military action against the Syrian regime’s chemical weapons facilities, as “trailing after Trump.” These anti-US rhetoric, or the rhetoric of more autonomy in ROK’s foreign policy, are continuously employed by the ROK Leftist parties too.

As such, respondents who prefer the Rightist party should, on average, have higher approval levels than respondents who prefer the Leftist party. In the UK sample, such expectation is supported in both scenarios. In the chemical weapons scenario, the average approval level on a seven-point scale for the Rightist respondents is 4.750907 (SD: 1.501689), while it is 4.194615 (SD: 1.482192) for the Leftist respondents. In the training troops scenario, the average approval level for the Rightist respondents is 4.789601 (SD: 1.474312), while it is 4.355385 (SD: 1.446456) for the Leftist respondents. These average approval levels pass the two-sample t tests. These findings are replicated in the ROK sample. In the chemical weapons scenario, the average approval level for the Rightist respondents is 4.654959 (SD: 1.375155), while it is 3.891851 (SD: 1.361111) for the Leftist respondents. In the training troops scenario, the average approval level for the Rightist respondents is 4.716942 (SD: 1.314217), while it is 4.152323 (SD: 1.2246) for the Leftist respondents. Again, these average approval levels pass the two-sample t tests.

The subjective individualist, or subjectivist, explanation focused on the individual level beliefs would expect those leaders and citizens with certain beliefs to support participation in US-led operations that lack any international institutional authorization to use armed force. These beliefs may be about image understandings of the United States or general foreign policy orientations. For instance, those individuals in Figure 3.1 column 1 would have highest average approval levels, while those individuals in column 3 would have lowest average approval levels. This expectation is supported in both UK and ROK samples, across both scenarios.

According to my mid-level argument on US allies’ joining behaviors, I expected those in the first row, where there is institutional level non-contestation in action knowledge towards participation in US-led operations lacking international institutional authorization to use armed force, to support participation. However, if there are no social or role constraints affecting the individuals in boxes (2) and (3), I expected these individuals in boxes (2) and (3) to choose non-participation, when in isolation. The survey participants are in isolation from one another and they are not in any national governmental roles, and so I expect those individuals in box (3) to disapprove of the government decisions to meet US requests and deploy troops abroad. Those in box (6) will likely disapprove of the participation decision, regardless of the social or role contexts. The approval choice is most indeterminate for those with complete two-level contestation in action knowledge, as represented in box (5). These differences in approval levels across theoretical subgroups are supported cross-nationally, as shown in Figures 3.2-3.3 below.

In the rest of this chapter, I call those in each of the six boxes of interest as subgroup 1 through subgroup 6. Those individuals in box (1) are subgroup 1, and those individuals in box (6) are subgroup 6.
In addition, my theoretical argument expects similar differences in certainty levels across the subgroups. Specifically, I expect the subgroup 1 to hold the highest level of certainty, as it would be akin to naturalistic certainty. As well, I expect the subgroup 5 to hold the lowest levels of certainty. As shown in Figures 3.4-3.5 below, in both UK and ROK samples, the theoretical
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subgroup 1 does have the highest average certainty levels among the six subgroups in both scenarios. Such cross-national statics are supportive of the theoretical notion of naturalistic certainty, which is distinct from the subjective certainty. In both the UK and ROK samples, the average certainty levels are higher for the theoretical subgroup 1 than those for the theoretical subgroup 4 in both scenarios. As well, in both the UK and ROK samples, the average certainty levels for the theoretical subgroup 2 was lower than those for subgroup 1. This illustrates that not all Rightist respondents have high certainty levels.

In the UK sample, the theoretical subgroup 5 barely shows the lowest levels of certainty across both scenarios, as the differences from those average certainty levels of other subgroups are not great. In the ROK sample, the theoretical subgroup 6 has the lowest levels of certainty in both scenarios.

Figure 3.4. The UK Sample: average certainty levels across six subgroups
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**Figure 3.5. The ROK Sample: Average Certainty Levels Across Six Subgroups**

![](image)

In sum, although I could not test the objective holist explanation based on side-deals and side-payments and I could not test the objective individualist explanations based on electoral and policy incentives of national leaders, all other existing explanations as well as my two-level ideational argument on US allies’ joining behaviors were tested using the cross-national survey experimental data on approval levels. In terms of the final choice outcomes, all the competing explanations were similarly supported, and so I move onto the second critical test.

**Critical Test 2—Different Logics of Action**

In the second round of critical tests, I spin out the types of cognitive process expected by the competing theoretical explanations. A priori, only the intersubjectivist explanations would expect to observe the logic of habit, as it is a uniquely social constructivist cognitive process concept. If I observe the logic of habit, specifically for the Rightist pro-US hawks across both the UK and ROK samples, then this would be the strongest possible evidence that simultaneously confirms the expectations of my two-level ideational argument and disconfirms the expectations of the competing explanations of US allies’ joining behaviors. Moreover, if I observe the
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described expected types of cognitive process for each of the six theoretical subgroups of interest, then given how elaborate the two-level ideational argument is, the empirical evidence would lend strong support for the mid-level theoretical argument specified from the general level sociological theory of choice. I report the observed types of cognitive process for each of the six subgroups of interest below.

I begin with the subgroup 1, or Rightist pro-US hawks. In the UK sample, I report two different sets of results for two different operationalization of the Rightist pro-US hawks. The first result is based on the theoretical operationalization of the first column of individuals. If the belief on the effectiveness of bilateralism is stronger than that of multilateralism, then the subtracted value should be positive. In addition to such relative strength in bilateralism over multilateralism, I look at the same participant’s responses to the militant internationalism (MI) and cooperative internationalism (CI) questions. The responses were on a five-point scale. If the average of the two MI question responses is 4 and above, while the average of the two CI question responses is below 4, I operationalize this as strong belief in the efficaciousness in the use of military force in achieving national security objectives. Any survey participant who satisfy these conditions are grouped as those with individual level non-contestation in action knowledge towards participation in US-led operations that lack any international institutional authorization to use armed force. The subgroup size is 91.

In the UK sample, however, the average MI score is high. The mean is 3.756465 (SD: .7799669) with more than half of the survey respondents having an average MI score of 4 and above. The average CI score is also high. The mean is 3.731547 (SD: .7468067) with more than half of the survey respondents having an average CI score of 4 and above. Thus, to narrow in on the hawks, who do not find diplomacy and multilateral efforts as appealing foreign policy
strategy, I focus on those with an average MI score of 4.5 and above, with average CI score of below 3.5. This narrower subgroup of Rightist pro-US hawks is based on the sample statistics. The subgroup size is 47.

Table 3.1 below reports the findings for the first subgroup, based on the first operationalization. There are six columns: the first three columns are the findings for the chemical weapons scenario (Scenario A) and the next three columns are the findings for the training troops scenario (Scenario B). The dependent variables are logged response time in seconds, approval levels, and certainty levels of previously chosen approval levels. Control variables include male, age, education, income, political ideology, closeness to party, average militant internationalism (MI), average cooperative internationalism (CI), average isolationism, importance of US, importance of UN, support for participation in 2003 Iraq War, average need for cognition (NFC), average need for cognitive openness, average social conservatism, widget CRT correct, lily CRT correct, and interest in foreign policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Log RT</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>Certainty</td>
<td>Log RT</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>Certainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP Divided</td>
<td>0.578**</td>
<td>-0.840*</td>
<td>19.98*</td>
<td>0.0140</td>
<td>-0.885*</td>
<td>-6.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.254]</td>
<td>[0.499]</td>
<td>[10.20]</td>
<td>[0.197]</td>
<td>[0.455]</td>
<td>[5.832]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Divided</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>-0.776</td>
<td>15.09</td>
<td>0.0406</td>
<td>-0.675</td>
<td>-5.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.297]</td>
<td>[0.511]</td>
<td>[12.53]</td>
<td>[0.228]</td>
<td>[0.487]</td>
<td>[7.069]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Divided</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>-0.530</td>
<td>17.63*</td>
<td>-0.0753</td>
<td>-0.588</td>
<td>-8.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.312]</td>
<td>[0.559]</td>
<td>[10.44]</td>
<td>[0.212]</td>
<td>[0.421]</td>
<td>[6.352]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Proposed</td>
<td>0.368*</td>
<td>-0.721**</td>
<td>1.812</td>
<td>0.0168</td>
<td>-0.175</td>
<td>-1.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.210]</td>
<td>[0.322]</td>
<td>[5.692]</td>
<td>[0.153]</td>
<td>[0.282]</td>
<td>[4.811]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Latent RT</td>
<td>0.335***</td>
<td>0.636***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.123]</td>
<td>[0.0960]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-pt Scale</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>0.578</td>
<td>0.459</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in brackets (*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10).
As shown in Table 3.1, I fail to find the logic of habit for this subgroup, due to two findings. For the chemical weapons scenario (Scenario A), this subgroup shows a statistically significant causal increase in response time when there are conflicting response cues, as shown in column (1). When the respondent’s preferred political party (PPP) is divided, there is a significant causal increase in response time when compared to the average response time in All United baseline condition. When the non-preferred political party (NPP) government proposes the troop contribution, there is also a significant causal increase in response time when compared to the average response time in PPP government proposed condition. Although the approval levels on the government decision to contribute troops decreased, if I look at the approval levels on a more substantial three-point scale (1=Disapprove, 2=Neither, 3=Approve), then there are no statistically significant response changes.

The second finding that negates the workings of the logic of habit is shown in column (5). The approval level on the government decision to contribute troops for the training troops scenario (Scenario B) goes down when the respondent’s PPP is divided, and this result remains for the more substantial three-point approval scale. To say that the logic of habit is in operation, there should be neither a causal increase in response time nor a causal change in the responses across non-conflict to conflicting response cue conditions. Thus, I fail to find the logic of habit, for this subgroup, based on the first operationalization.

Yet, if I narrow this group down from 91 to 47 respondents, who are extremely hawkish, based on the sample statistics, I do indeed find the workings of the logic of habit. Table 3.2 below reports the findings for this narrower subgroup of Rightist pro-US hawks. I find neither a statistically significant causal increase in response time nor a significant causal decrease in approval level, across both scenarios. In the chemical weapons scenario, I find a significant
causal increase in certainty levels when there are conflicting response cues. Such motivated process can also play out for taken-for-granted cognitive process. Thus, based on this second, narrower operationalization of the Rightist pro-US hawks, I do find the logic of habit. If I had found even more results that negated the workings of the logic of habit, by excluding those with median values of MI and CI orientations, then such findings even in this narrower direction would have greatly disconfirmed my theory for the UK sample. However, because I do find the results that are convergent and supportive of the workings of the logic of habit for this particular subgroup based on the second operationalization, I find support for one part of my theoretical expectations.

Table 3.2. UK Subgroup 1 (Second operationalization)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) Log RT</th>
<th>(2) A Approval</th>
<th>(3) A Certainty</th>
<th>(4) Log RT</th>
<th>(5) B Approval</th>
<th>(6) B Certainty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPP Divided</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td>-1.556</td>
<td>31.73**</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>-0.226</td>
<td>-13.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.487]</td>
<td>[0.981]</td>
<td>[13.03]</td>
<td>[0.353]</td>
<td>[0.893]</td>
<td>[12.25]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Divided</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>-1.453</td>
<td>26.06*</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>-5.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.627]</td>
<td>[0.937]</td>
<td>[12.76]</td>
<td>[0.382]</td>
<td>[0.818]</td>
<td>[11.34]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Divided</td>
<td>-0.146</td>
<td>-0.261</td>
<td>13.89</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>-0.477</td>
<td>-1.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.507]</td>
<td>[0.857]</td>
<td>[11.18]</td>
<td>[0.283]</td>
<td>[0.626]</td>
<td>[7.438]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Proposed</td>
<td>-0.253</td>
<td>-1.074</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>-0.181</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>-1.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.396]</td>
<td>[0.775]</td>
<td>[10.14]</td>
<td>[0.220]</td>
<td>[0.497]</td>
<td>[5.221]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Latent RT</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>-1.074</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>-0.181</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>-1.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-pt Scale</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.616</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>0.711</td>
<td>0.710</td>
<td>0.677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in brackets (*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10).

For the ROK subgroup 1, I not only cannot work with a narrower subgroup of Rightist pro-US hawks, chiefly due to the sample size, but the theoretical need is not as high as was the case with the UK sample. The first operationalization results in 64 respondents to begin with,
and if I narrow this group down as I did for the UK subgroup, then I am left with 22 respondents. This subgroup size does not allow me to run statistical analyses and examine the dependent variables that could inform the types of cognitive process. Moreover, while in the UK case, one standard deviation away from the mean average MI and CI scores were 4.52 and 2.99, respectively, and so it made sense to narrow in on the subgroup with average MI scores of 4.5 and 5, and average CI scores or 3 and below, in the ROK sample, one standard deviation away from the mean average MI and CI scores are 4.13 and 3.21, respectively. The ROK sample’s average MI score was 3.380356 (SD: .7566618) and the average CI score was 3.823595 (SD: .6103595). Compared to the UK sample statistics, the ROK sample’s average MI score is lower and average CI score is higher. What this means is that the first operationalization of average MI score of 4 and above, and average CI score of 3.5 and below, better captures those with hawkish foreign policy orientations than was the case for the UK sample.

Table 3.3 below reports the findings for the ROK subgroup of Rightist pro-US hawks, based on the first operationalization. I do find the workings of the logic of habit across both scenarios. As shown in column (5), I find a causal decrease in approval levels for the government decision to contribute troops to train local forces in West Africa, when comparing across the PPP government proposed and the NPP government proposed conditions. However, when I look at the more substantial three-point scale approval levels, there is no statistically significant difference in the approval levels across the conditions. As was the case in Table 3.2 there are no significant treatment effects across both scenarios. There are no significant increases in response time in seconds, no significant changes in the approval levels, and no significant decreases in certainty levels across treatment conditions of conflicting response cues in both Scenarios A and
B. Thus, I do observe the workings of the logic of habit for this first theoretical subgroup of Rightist pro-US hawks in the ROK sample as well.

Table 3.3. ROK Subgroup 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) A Log RT</th>
<th>(2) A Approval</th>
<th>(3) A Certainty</th>
<th>(4) B Log RT</th>
<th>(5) B Approval</th>
<th>(6) B Certainty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPP Divided</td>
<td>-0.0258</td>
<td>0.425</td>
<td>-11.49</td>
<td>-0.0330</td>
<td>-0.708</td>
<td>-17.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.447]</td>
<td>[0.840]</td>
<td>[9.056]</td>
<td>[0.341]</td>
<td>[0.684]</td>
<td>[12.45]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Divided</td>
<td>0.0321</td>
<td>-0.158</td>
<td>-7.690</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>-0.150</td>
<td>-7.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.298]</td>
<td>[0.674]</td>
<td>[7.011]</td>
<td>[0.318]</td>
<td>[0.663]</td>
<td>[11.76]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Divided</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>1.383</td>
<td>-0.481</td>
<td>-0.0508</td>
<td>-7.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.381]</td>
<td>[0.679]</td>
<td>[6.790]</td>
<td>[0.401]</td>
<td>[0.710]</td>
<td>[11.75]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Proposed</td>
<td>-0.0810</td>
<td>-0.829</td>
<td>-1.294</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>-1.019**</td>
<td>-2.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.230]</td>
<td>[0.526]</td>
<td>[5.620]</td>
<td>[0.247]</td>
<td>[0.446]</td>
<td>[7.818]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Latent RT</td>
<td>0.0941</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.217]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.270]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-pt Scale</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td>0.479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in brackets (** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10).

I now move onto the theoretical subgroup 2. These are Rightist respondents who hold individual level contestation in relevant action knowledge. Table 3.4 reports the findings of the UK subgroup 2. In both scenarios A and B, this subgroup shows a statistically significant causal decrease in approval levels of the government decision to contribute troops. Specifically, if the respondent’s PPP is divided or if all of the two major parties are divided over the issue of participation, then the average approval levels are significantly lower in these treatment conditions than the average approval levels in the All United baseline condition. This is true even when the approval level is on a more substantial three-point scale. As shown in column (6), in the training troops scenario, I also find a significant causal decrease in certainty levels across PPP government proposed and NPP government proposed condition. I do not find any significant
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causal increase in response time in both scenarios; this may be due to the fact that this particular subgroup takes a long time to respond in the baseline conditions in the first place. Even though I do not find a significant causal increase in response time across non-conflict to conflicting response cue conditions, because I find a statistically significant causal decrease in approval levels, this subgroup demonstrates response change. Such clear observation of response change in both scenarios means that I can cross off taken-for-granted and motivated processes. Despite the institutional level non-contestation in action knowledge towards participation in US-led operations abroad, such response change is expected to be possible, because respondents are not in social or role environments.

Table 3.4. UK Subgroup 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log RT</td>
<td>-0.0709</td>
<td>-0.435***</td>
<td>-1.668</td>
<td>0.0767</td>
<td>-0.459***</td>
<td>-1.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.100]</td>
<td>[0.150]</td>
<td>[2.272]</td>
<td>[0.0943]</td>
<td>[0.151]</td>
<td>[2.392]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Divided</td>
<td>0.00571</td>
<td>-0.341***</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>-0.0141</td>
<td>-0.358**</td>
<td>1.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.108]</td>
<td>[0.142]</td>
<td>[2.284]</td>
<td>[0.0982]</td>
<td>[0.146]</td>
<td>[2.228]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Divided</td>
<td>0.0664</td>
<td>-0.190</td>
<td>-1.545</td>
<td>-0.0443</td>
<td>-0.253*</td>
<td>-1.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.115]</td>
<td>[0.137]</td>
<td>[2.205]</td>
<td>[0.0959]</td>
<td>[0.139]</td>
<td>[2.161]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Proposed</td>
<td>0.0454</td>
<td>-0.149</td>
<td>1.381</td>
<td>-0.0406</td>
<td>0.0195</td>
<td>-3.755**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0773]</td>
<td>[0.103]</td>
<td>[1.587]</td>
<td>[0.0641]</td>
<td>[0.105]</td>
<td>[1.549]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Latent RT</td>
<td>0.316***</td>
<td>0.387***</td>
<td>[0.0803]</td>
<td>[0.0494]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-pt Scale</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>0.152</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in brackets (*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10).

The counterpart ROK subgroup 2 also shows similar results. The approval levels significantly decrease in conflicting response cue conditions across both scenarios. As Table 3.5 columns (2) and (5) show, the average approval levels in PPP and All Divided conditions are
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significantly lower than the average approval levels in All United baseline condition in both scenarios. This is true, even when the approval level is measured in three-point scale, and so I observe significant response changes in this subgroup. There is also a significant drop in certainty levels in the PPP condition across both scenarios. Unlike the UK subgroup 2, the ROK subgroup 2 show significant causal increase in response time in the conflicting response cue conditions for the training troops scenario. As column (4) shows, the average response time significantly increase in PPP Divided, All Divided, and NPP Divided conditions, when compared to the average response time in the All United baseline condition. As the ROK subgroup 2 exhibit significant causal increases in response time, decreases in approval levels, and decreases in decision certainty levels, I can cross off the possibilities of the taken-for-granted and motivated processes. Again, I do not observe the workings of social constraints, because survey participants are not in social or role environments.

Table 3.5. ROK Subgroup 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Log RT A</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>Certainty</td>
<td>Log RT B</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>Certainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP Divided</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>-0.640***</td>
<td>-4.322*</td>
<td>0.282***</td>
<td>-0.565***</td>
<td>-6.584***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.116]</td>
<td>[0.175]</td>
<td>[2.621]</td>
<td>[0.0788]</td>
<td>[0.162]</td>
<td>[2.511]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Divided</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>-0.531***</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.166***</td>
<td>-0.416***</td>
<td>-1.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0714]</td>
<td>[0.155]</td>
<td>[2.368]</td>
<td>[0.0614]</td>
<td>[0.152]</td>
<td>[2.377]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Divided</td>
<td>0.0847</td>
<td>-0.585***</td>
<td>-0.795</td>
<td>0.306***</td>
<td>-0.188</td>
<td>-1.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0873]</td>
<td>[0.172]</td>
<td>[2.486]</td>
<td>[0.0651]</td>
<td>[0.165]</td>
<td>[2.439]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Proposed</td>
<td>0.0260</td>
<td>-0.254**</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td>-0.0510</td>
<td>-0.122</td>
<td>1.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0667]</td>
<td>[0.120]</td>
<td>[1.973]</td>
<td>[0.0479]</td>
<td>[0.113]</td>
<td>[1.727]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Latent RT</td>
<td>0.301***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.231***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0558]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0455]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-pt Scale</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R^2</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in brackets (** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10).
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Now I move onto the theoretical subgroup 3, where there is a cross-level contestation. As was the case for the UK subgroup 1, I wanted to have two different operationalization for this theoretical subgroup to really narrow in on those Rightist pro-UN doves, who absolutely prefer diplomacy and peaceful approaches. However, if I narrow in on those with average CI scores of 4.5 and above, and average MI scores of below 3.5, then from a subgroup size of 43, I am only left with 9. And so, for this UK subgroup 3, I study the results from the first operationalization only. For the ROK subgroup 3, I cannot conduct any statistical analyses, as the subgroup size is 12 to begin with.

Table 3.6 reports the findings for the UK subgroup 3. I find significant response time differences and significant response changes. In the chemical weapons scenario, the UK subgroup 3 spent less response time for the NPP government proposed condition, when compared to the average response time for the PPP government proposed condition. When either the PPP or the NPP was divided over the issue of participation, the approval level also causally decreased from the baseline condition of All United. This is true, even when the approval level is reduced to a more substantial three-point scale. It is interesting to note that their certainty levels significantly increased in the NPP (Labour Party) Divided condition in the chemical weapons scenario. In the training troops scenario, this UK subgroup 3 shows a significant increase in response time in the PPP divided condition. At the seven-point scale, there are significant decreases in the approval level across treatment conditions, but the decreased approval levels do not remain with the three-point scale. There is no significant change in certainty levels in the training troops scenario. Across both scenarios, there is no causal decrease in certainty levels, because these individuals are subjectively certain with non-contested action knowledge at the individual level.
Table 3.6. UK Subgroup 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Log RT</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>Certainty</td>
<td>Log RT</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>Certainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP Divided</td>
<td>-0.528</td>
<td>-2.396*</td>
<td>-7.408</td>
<td>0.605**</td>
<td>-1.159*</td>
<td>-8.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.404]</td>
<td>[1.215]</td>
<td>[6.098]</td>
<td>[0.257]</td>
<td>[0.570]</td>
<td>[10.65]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Divided</td>
<td>-0.850</td>
<td>-1.863</td>
<td>-2.430</td>
<td>-0.164</td>
<td>-2.435*</td>
<td>-18.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.468]</td>
<td>[1.020]</td>
<td>[5.301]</td>
<td>[0.334]</td>
<td>[1.124]</td>
<td>[16.87]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Divided</td>
<td>-0.477</td>
<td>-2.900*</td>
<td>16.00*</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>-1.100</td>
<td>-22.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.717]</td>
<td>[1.569]</td>
<td>[8.178]</td>
<td>[0.404]</td>
<td>[1.149]</td>
<td>[16.66]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Proposed</td>
<td>-0.731*</td>
<td>-0.795</td>
<td>-0.209</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.967</td>
<td>4.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.324]</td>
<td>[0.897]</td>
<td>[4.380]</td>
<td>[0.258]</td>
<td>[0.735]</td>
<td>[10.75]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Latent RT</td>
<td>0.619**</td>
<td>[0.227]</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.430**</td>
<td>[0.149]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-pt Scale</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.864</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.777</td>
<td>0.610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in brackets (*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10).

I now move onto the theoretical subgroup 4. These are Leftist, pro-US, hawkish respondents with institutional level contestation in action knowledge. For the UK subgroup of Leftist pro-US hawks, I wanted to have two different operationalization for this subgroup to really narrow in on the hawkishness of the respondents. However, because I start with the subgroup size of 34, I am left with 13 if I use the second operationalization of this subgroup. Even if I were to get a sizable group of UK Leftist pro-US hawks, though, I would not expect to observe the workings of the logic of habit. My two-level ideational argument would expect to see either significant increase in response time or significant decrease in approval level, across the conflicting response cue conditions.

Table 3.7 reports the findings for the UK subgroup 4. There is an intra-group difference across scenarios. For the chemical weapons scenario, there is a significant increase in response time in PPP Divided condition. The approval level is also significantly lower when the NPP
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government proposes than when the PPP government proposes. Such approval level difference remains significant even when the approval level is reduced to the more substantial three-point level. The decision certainty levels show causal increase in the NPP (Conservative Party) Divided condition. There are no significant decreases in decision certainty levels. For the training troops scenario, the findings look like the logic of habit. There are no significant increases in response time or decreases in approval levels. The decision certainty levels only show causal increases in All Divided and NPP Divided conditions, and the decision certainty levels are higher when the PPP government proposes.

Table 3.7. UK Subgroup 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Log RT</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>Certainty</td>
<td>Log RT</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>Certainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP Divided</td>
<td>1.898*</td>
<td>-0.178</td>
<td>18.54</td>
<td>2.728</td>
<td>0.666</td>
<td>12.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.811]</td>
<td>[1.473]</td>
<td>[14.35]</td>
<td>[0.833]</td>
<td>[1.143]</td>
<td>[8.563]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Divided</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>-11.83</td>
<td>-2.008</td>
<td>-1.541</td>
<td>14.79*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.495]</td>
<td>[0.745]</td>
<td>[17.44]</td>
<td>[0.742]</td>
<td>[0.545]</td>
<td>[4.580]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Divided</td>
<td>-1.446**</td>
<td>-0.934</td>
<td>29.42**</td>
<td>2.217</td>
<td>-0.329</td>
<td>35.45**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.364]</td>
<td>[1.180]</td>
<td>[10.38]</td>
<td>[0.568]</td>
<td>[0.720]</td>
<td>[5.612]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Proposed</td>
<td>-0.0407</td>
<td>-1.685*</td>
<td>5.932</td>
<td>1.075</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>-30.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.486]</td>
<td>[0.702]</td>
<td>[10.06]</td>
<td>[0.518]</td>
<td>[0.875]</td>
<td>[6.459]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Latent RT</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.391]</td>
<td>[0.540]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-pt Scale</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.953</td>
<td>0.894</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>0.995</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>0.991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in brackets (** p<0.01, * p<0.05, * p<0.10).

Such intra-group difference across scenarios is the flip side for the ROK subgroup 4.

Table 3.8 reports the findings for the ROK Leftist pro-US hawks. It is in the chemical weapons scenario where I observe the measures that are similar to the logic of habit. There are no significant increases in response time or decreases in approval levels. Yet, in the second training
troops scenario, there is significant decrease in approval level in the All Divided condition, when compared to the All United condition. This is true even when the approval level is in the three-point scale. Decision certainty levels also significantly increase for conflicting response cue conditions in the training troops scenario.

Table 3.8. ROK Subgroup 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Log RT</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>Certainty</td>
<td>Log RT</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>Certainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP Divided</td>
<td>-0.0527</td>
<td>-0.854</td>
<td>6.699</td>
<td>-0.155</td>
<td>-0.742</td>
<td>3.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.334]</td>
<td>[0.943]</td>
<td>[16.99]</td>
<td>[0.260]</td>
<td>[0.573]</td>
<td>[7.305]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Divided</td>
<td>0.0887</td>
<td>-1.580</td>
<td>-5.485</td>
<td>0.0309</td>
<td>-1.147**</td>
<td>19.50***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.385]</td>
<td>[1.055]</td>
<td>[18.22]</td>
<td>[0.210]</td>
<td>[0.462]</td>
<td>[6.590]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Divided</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>-0.814</td>
<td>1.059</td>
<td>-0.0286</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>15.90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.338]</td>
<td>[1.131]</td>
<td>[19.25]</td>
<td>[0.215]</td>
<td>[0.818]</td>
<td>[7.804]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Proposed</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>16.04</td>
<td>-0.259</td>
<td>-0.0132</td>
<td>9.714**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.211]</td>
<td>[0.695]</td>
<td>[13.05]</td>
<td>[0.182]</td>
<td>[0.476]</td>
<td>[4.155]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Latent RT</td>
<td>0.308**</td>
<td>0.258*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.133]</td>
<td>[0.137]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-pt Scale</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>0.759</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in brackets (** p<0.01, * p<0.05, * p<0.10).

Perhaps the ROK subgroup 4 is more directly comparable to the ROK subgroup 1, as both subgroups are operationalized in the same way. While the ROK Rightist pro-US hawks show a fast, taken-for-granted cognitive process across both scenarios, the ROK Leftist pro-US hawks only show the fast, taken-for-granted process in the chemical weapons scenario. In the training troops scenario, there is a significant causal decrease in approval levels, especially in the All Divided condition.

I move onto the theoretical subgroup 5. These individuals have complete two-level contestation in relevant action knowledge. They do not know whether or not to contribute troops
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to US-led operations that lack international institutional authorization to use armed force. To start with the UK subgroup, Table 3.9 reports the findings. In the chemical weapons scenario, this subgroup shows causal increase in response time in the PPP divided condition. In both scenarios, there is a causal decrease in approval levels on the government decision to contribute troops. This decrease in approval levels remains even in the three-point scale. I do not observe any causal increases in decision certainty levels across the two scenarios. Because there are significant decreases in approval levels in both scenarios, and any increases in decision certainty levels are absent, I cross out the possibilities of the taken-for-granted and motivated processes.

Table 3.9. UK Subgroup 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log RT</td>
<td>0.147**</td>
<td>-0.0645</td>
<td>2.612</td>
<td>0.0807</td>
<td>-0.357***</td>
<td>0.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0706]</td>
<td>[0.118]</td>
<td>[2.116]</td>
<td>[0.0727]</td>
<td>[0.114]</td>
<td>[1.953]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP Divided</td>
<td>0.0717</td>
<td>-0.324***</td>
<td>1.434</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>-0.309***</td>
<td>0.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0744]</td>
<td>[0.123]</td>
<td>[2.186]</td>
<td>[0.0732]</td>
<td>[0.120]</td>
<td>[2.013]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Divided</td>
<td>0.0201</td>
<td>0.0880</td>
<td>-0.407</td>
<td>0.0194</td>
<td>-0.131</td>
<td>-0.0237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0756]</td>
<td>[0.121]</td>
<td>[2.054]</td>
<td>[0.0782]</td>
<td>[0.115]</td>
<td>[1.835]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Divided</td>
<td>0.0520</td>
<td>-0.128</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>-0.0408</td>
<td>-0.0907</td>
<td>1.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0522]</td>
<td>[0.0827]</td>
<td>[1.438]</td>
<td>[0.0534]</td>
<td>[0.0823]</td>
<td>[1.357]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Proposed</td>
<td>0.452***</td>
<td>0.348***</td>
<td>0.348***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0446]</td>
<td>[0.0460]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-pt Scale</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>0.137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in brackets (*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10).

Table 3.10 reports similar findings for the ROK subgroup 5. In both scenarios, there is a significant causal decrease in approval levels on the government decision to contribute troops. This decrease in approval levels remains even in the three-point scale. For the training troops scenario, I see that there is a significant causal decrease in certainty level in the PPP Divided
condition. I do not observe any other causal increases in decision certainty levels across the two scenarios.

### Table 3.10. ROK Subgroup 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Log RT</td>
<td>A Approval</td>
<td>A Certainty</td>
<td>B Log RT</td>
<td>B Approval</td>
<td>B Certainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP Divided</td>
<td>0.0288</td>
<td>-0.215**</td>
<td>-0.614</td>
<td>-0.0359</td>
<td>-0.358***</td>
<td>-2.550*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0587]</td>
<td>[0.110]</td>
<td>[1.625]</td>
<td>[0.0556]</td>
<td>[0.101]</td>
<td>[1.458]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Divided</td>
<td>0.0279</td>
<td>-0.153</td>
<td>-0.758</td>
<td>-0.0389</td>
<td>-0.228**</td>
<td>-1.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0604]</td>
<td>[0.107]</td>
<td>[1.604]</td>
<td>[0.0670]</td>
<td>[0.104]</td>
<td>[1.538]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Divided</td>
<td>0.00189</td>
<td>-0.110</td>
<td>-2.396</td>
<td>0.0226</td>
<td>-0.130</td>
<td>-0.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0571]</td>
<td>[0.109]</td>
<td>[1.678]</td>
<td>[0.0658]</td>
<td>[0.101]</td>
<td>[1.430]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Proposed</td>
<td>0.0824**</td>
<td>-0.404***</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td>0.0618</td>
<td>-0.197***</td>
<td>1.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0383]</td>
<td>[0.0772]</td>
<td>[1.159]</td>
<td>[0.0445]</td>
<td>[0.0697]</td>
<td>[1.062]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Latent RT</td>
<td>0.289***</td>
<td>0.296***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0379]</td>
<td>[0.0485]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-pt Scale</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R^2</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in brackets (** p<0.05, * p<0.10).

Here, it is interesting to note that for this particular ROK subgroup, the All United condition may not be the maximal baseline; in fact, if I look at control condition as the baseline, All United condition significantly increases response time, and so the control condition would make the maximal baseline for this subgroup. If I use the control condition as the baseline, the conflicting response cue conditions significantly increases response time in both scenarios. Because I find significant causal increases in response time (especially when control is the baseline), significant causal decreases in substantial approval levels, and significant decreases in decision certainty levels, I can cross out the taken-for-granted and motivated processes for this ROK subgroup 5 as well.
Lastly, I move onto the theoretical subgroup 6. For the UK subgroup, I am able to operationalize the Leftist pro-UN doves in two different ways. I am able to get a narrower group as the subgroup sample size permits me to do so. As I am narrowing in, the second version of this subgroup becomes really dovish and pacific. These individuals hold individual level non-contestation in action knowledge towards non-participation in US-led military operations that lack any international institutional authorization to use armed force.

Table 3.11 shows the findings for the subgroup 6, obtained through the first operationalization. In the chemical weapons scenario, there is a significant decrease in approval levels in PPP Divided and NPP Divided conditions, when compared to the All United baseline condition. These decreases in the approval level remain with the more substantial three-point scale. In the training troops scenario, there is a significant increase in response time in the PPP Divided condition. These findings negate the possibility of the logic of habit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.11. UK Subgroup 6 (First operationalization)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log RT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP Divided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Divided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Divided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Latent RT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-pt Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in brackets (*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10).
Next, Table 3.12 reports the findings for the narrower subgroup 6, obtained through the second operationalization. I did not expect this operationalization of the narrower subgroup of doves to show even more fast, taken-for-grantedness in non-participation. This is because there is institutional level contestation in the action knowledge for the UK Leftist pro-UN doves. Indeed, the two key findings from the above Table 3.11 for the same subgroup 6, obtained through the first operationalization, still hold up. There are significant approval level decreases in the chemical weapons scenario, while there are significant response time increases in the training troops scenario. In addition, I find a significant difference in response time in Scenario A, depending on which party government is proposing the troop contribution.

Table 3.12. UK Subgroup 6 (Second operationalization)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) Log RT</th>
<th>(2) Approval</th>
<th>(3) Certainty</th>
<th>(4) Log RT</th>
<th>(5) Approval</th>
<th>(6) Certainty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPP Divided</td>
<td>-0.325</td>
<td>-1.058*</td>
<td>2.900</td>
<td>0.598**</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>-7.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.245]</td>
<td>[0.586]</td>
<td>[12.86]</td>
<td>[0.269]</td>
<td>[0.503]</td>
<td>[10.20]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Divided</td>
<td>-0.373*</td>
<td>-0.867*</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>-0.384</td>
<td>-9.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.197]</td>
<td>[0.475]</td>
<td>[9.350]</td>
<td>[0.258]</td>
<td>[0.569]</td>
<td>[14.91]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Divided</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>-0.558</td>
<td>5.385</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>-9.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.215]</td>
<td>[0.611]</td>
<td>[11.36]</td>
<td>[0.235]</td>
<td>[0.494]</td>
<td>[14.11]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Proposed</td>
<td>0.384**</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>-8.513</td>
<td>-0.173</td>
<td>-0.562</td>
<td>-3.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.182]</td>
<td>[0.356]</td>
<td>[8.172]</td>
<td>[0.232]</td>
<td>[0.381]</td>
<td>[8.637]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Latent RT</td>
<td>0.380**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.143]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.118]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-pt Scale</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in brackets (*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10).

Table 3.13 shows the findings for the counterpart ROK subgroup 6. I do not find any significant increases in response time or significant decreases in approval levels. There are no significant changes in decision certainty levels in both scenarios too. These measures indicate the workings of the logic of habit, and so I further checked the baseline condition. Indeed, the All
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United condition is not the maximal baseline condition; the PPP divided condition significantly increases response time in the training troops scenario, when compared to the average response time in the pure control condition. In order words, while the All United conditions make it easy for the other subgroups to make their approval decisions, the All United condition actually increases response time for this theoretical subgroup as well as the subgroup in box (5) for the ROK sample. Hence, I do find significant increases in response time for the PPP Divided condition in Scenario B.

Table 3.13. ROK Subgroup 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) A Log RT</th>
<th>(2) A Approval</th>
<th>(3) A Certainty</th>
<th>(4) B Log RT</th>
<th>(5) B Approval</th>
<th>(6) B Certainty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPP Divided</td>
<td>0.0145</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
<td>-6.709</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>-0.729*</td>
<td>2.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.159]</td>
<td>[0.600]</td>
<td>[7.969]</td>
<td>[0.326]</td>
<td>[0.421]</td>
<td>[9.026]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Divided</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
<td>0.0547</td>
<td>14.07</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>-0.0111</td>
<td>5.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.216]</td>
<td>[0.621]</td>
<td>[8.925]</td>
<td>[0.258]</td>
<td>[0.381]</td>
<td>[9.671]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Divided</td>
<td>-0.114</td>
<td>-0.219</td>
<td>-2.575</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>-0.0988</td>
<td>0.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.168]</td>
<td>[0.616]</td>
<td>[8.806]</td>
<td>[0.205]</td>
<td>[0.308]</td>
<td>[8.219]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Proposed</td>
<td>-0.172</td>
<td>0.00912</td>
<td>-0.572</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>-0.0366</td>
<td>-0.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.109]</td>
<td>[0.334]</td>
<td>[5.885]</td>
<td>[0.194]</td>
<td>[0.247]</td>
<td>[5.414]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Latent RT</td>
<td>0.223***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0744]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.185]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-pt Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td>0.272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in brackets (*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10).

Again, ROK subgroups 1, 4, and 6 are most directly comparable in that there are individual level non-contestation in action knowledge, and they are operationalized in the same way. While the subgroup 1 indicates the workings of the fast, taken-for-granted process in both scenarios, the two other subgroups 4 and 6 show a similarly fast process in the chemical weapons scenario, but in the training troops scenario, there are either significant increases in response time
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(Table 3.13, ROK subgroup 6) or significant decreases in approval level (Table 3.8, ROK subgroup 4).

Still, one could argue that the difference between ROK subgroup 1 and subgroups 4 and 6 is not only in the degree of institutional level contestation in action knowledge. Rightist respondents may also just be more dogmatic. If this is so, then the directly comparable ROK subgroup 2 and subgroup 5 should also be different. Yet, I do not find any differences across the two subgroups. This is because subgroup 2 is in isolation from one another and there are no role constraints. If there is some other dimension, such as social conservatism or dogmatism, that the Rightist respondents should carry, and that dimension impacts the underlying logics of action or cognitive processes, then I should observe this difference in the subgroups 2 and 5. Yet, I do not observe any differences across these two subgroups. Differences only remain for ROK subgroup 1 on the one hand and subgroups 4 and 6 on the other hand. Thus, I maintain that the difference across the ROK subgroup 1 and the ROK subgroups 4 and 6 is from the difference in the degree of institutional level contestation in action knowledge.

In the UK case, too, the narrower operationalization that was possible for the subgroups 1 and 6 make them more directly comparable. There is individual level non-contestation in action knowledge, while the degree of institutional level contestation in action knowledge is different. While I find that the logic of habit operates for the Rightist pro-US hawks, or the subgroup 1, it does not operate for the Leftist pro-UN doves, or the subgroup 6. For the latter group, there is significant causal increase in response time in both scenarios, and there is significant decrease in approval level, even in the three-point scale, for the chemical weapons scenario.

Again, one could argue that the difference between the narrower UK subgroup 1 and subgroup 6 is not only in the degree of institutional level contestation in action knowledge.
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Rightist respondents may also just be more dogmatic. If this is so, then the directly comparable UK subgroup 2 and subgroup 5 should also be different. Yet, as was the case in the ROK sample, I do not find any differences across the two subgroups 2 and 5. This is because subgroup 2 is in isolation from one another and there are no role constraints. If there is some other dimension, such as social conservatism or dogmatism, that the Rightist respondents should carry, and that dimension impacts the underlying logics of action or cognitive processes, then I should observe this difference in the subgroups 2 and 5. Yet, I do not observe any differences across these two subgroups in the UK sample.

Lastly, I look at the text-based measures across the six theoretical subgroups. I expect the subgroup 1 to show the highest percentage of one-sided reasoning. Figure 3.6 below shows the percentage of text score of 1 (one-sided reasoning for the preferred policy or no justification) across the six UK subgroups. Similarly, Figure 3.7 shows the percentage of text score of 1 across the six ROK subgroups. I confirm my expectations that those who engage in the logic of habit would verbalize their thought processes in a way that is one-sided and would not discuss the non-preferred policy. This text category also contains those texts without any justification too. In both the UK and ROK samples, other subgroups also have high percentages of one-sided reasoning for the preferred policy. I think this is due to the survey experimental setting. Given the low incentives to write long sentences in the first place, I still find that the subgroup 1 to have the highest percentages of these one-sided reasoning or texts without any justifications.

---

14 These measures are hand-coded by myself and so I cannot say that they are perfectly replicable. The intra-coder consistency is at 80% level. Still, the rough estimates do confirm my expectations. I cannot statistically test the differences in the text-based scores, as they are not one-dimensional continuous scores.
In contrast, I expect the theoretical subgroup 1 to have the least proportions of the most indeterminate, double-sided reasoning for the preferred and non-preferred policies, which is how I classified the texts and assigned a score of 4. Figure 3.8 shows the percentage of text score of 4 across the six UK subgroups, while Figure 3.9 shows the percentage of text score of 4 across the
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six ROK subgroups. In the UK sample, subgroup 1 has second to lowest percentage of text score of 4 in the chemical weapons scenario, but it has the least percentage of text score of 4 in the training troops scenario. For the ROK sample, the subgroup 1 shows the least percentages of text score of 4 in both scenarios.

Figure 3.8. The UK Sample: Average Proportions of Text Score of 4 Across Six Subgroups

![Figure 3.8](image_url)

Figure 3.9. The ROK Sample: Average Proportions of Text Score of 4 Across Six Subgroups

![Figure 3.9](image_url)
Addressing the Alternative Explanations of the Logic of Habit

In this section, I derive out how the competing theoretical arguments on the US allies’ joining behaviors would explain the logic of habit, if one were to empirically observe it. As shown above, I observe the workings of the logic of habit for both the UK and ROK subgroups 1, or for the Rightist pro-US hawks.

To begin with the objective holist, namely neorealist, explanations of US allies’ joining behaviors, some participation or non-participation decisions may just be self-evident and actual, precisely because of the high levels of need for US capabilities, or clear existential regional threats. In the case of the UK, where there is no clear consensus on alliance “dependence” or material need for US capabilities to ensure national security, the complete information game may nonetheless play out in the following way. Those who are highly informed about the threat levels of the target of the operation would obviously want to balance against the threat and join the US-led operation, even when there is a lack of international institutional authorization to use armed force. In the UK case, I would expect those with high levels of information to potentially exhibit the non-deliberative and non-utilitarian logic of habit. High levels of information on the development of nuclear weapons, uses of chemical weapons, and violent extremist plots may prompt individual actors to take alignment with the United States as apparent and natural. Again, in a complete information game, the strategy to be taken is obvious and it may not require deliberation and further rationales at the split-second.

Table 3.14 reports the findings for those UK respondents with high interest in foreign policy. I focus on those who gave that they have the highest interest (level of 5) in foreign policy. In the chemical weapons scenario, the average response time spent in the NPP government proposes condition is significantly higher than the average response time spent in the PPP
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government proposes condition. In addition, as shown in column (2), the approval level is significantly lower in the NPP government proposes condition than that in the PPP government proposes condition. This is true even in the three-point scale. In the training troops scenario, I do not find any significant increases in response time and significant decreases in the approval level in conflicting response cue conditions, but I do find a significant decrease in the decision certainty level in the PPP Divided condition. For the logic of habit, I do not expect any significant decreases in decision certainty. Hence, across both scenarios, I fail to find support for the objective holist expectations on the logic of habit operating in the high information context.

Table 3.14. UK High Interest in Foreign Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Log RT</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>Certainty</td>
<td>Log RT</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>Certainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP Divided</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>-0.544</td>
<td>1.282</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>-0.157</td>
<td>-7.827*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.189]</td>
<td>[0.377]</td>
<td>[4.825]</td>
<td>[0.157]</td>
<td>[0.272]</td>
<td>[4.308]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Divided</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>-0.220</td>
<td>-1.468</td>
<td>-0.0971</td>
<td>-0.153</td>
<td>-4.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.195]</td>
<td>[0.371]</td>
<td>[4.615]</td>
<td>[0.160]</td>
<td>[0.330]</td>
<td>[4.629]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Divided</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>-0.387</td>
<td>-6.575</td>
<td>-0.0350</td>
<td>-0.0959</td>
<td>-7.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.207]</td>
<td>[0.366]</td>
<td>[4.710]</td>
<td>[0.188]</td>
<td>[0.347]</td>
<td>[4.718]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Proposed</td>
<td>0.246*</td>
<td>-0.542**</td>
<td>-0.734</td>
<td>-0.00985</td>
<td>-0.0447</td>
<td>-4.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.139]</td>
<td>[0.234]</td>
<td>[3.474]</td>
<td>[0.128]</td>
<td>[0.280]</td>
<td>[3.381]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Latent RT</td>
<td>0.492***</td>
<td>0.297***</td>
<td>0.297***</td>
<td>0.297***</td>
<td>0.297***</td>
<td>0.297***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.113]</td>
<td>[0.0885]</td>
<td>[0.0885]</td>
<td>[0.0885]</td>
<td>[0.0885]</td>
<td>[0.0885]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-pt Scale</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.553</td>
<td>0.321</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in brackets (*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10).

In a complete information game, the strategy to be taken is so obvious and certain, and it may not require deliberation or further rationales at the split-second. For these reasons, the neorealist explanations would expect that it is more likely to find the logic of habit in the South Korean government’s decision-making on the participation issue. South Korea has high levels of
alliance dependence and high levels of material need for US capabilities, as there is a clear existential threat from North Korea. Yet, as shown above, I do not find the logic of habit for all ROK subgroups. I also check if those respondents with high levels of interest in foreign policy are in this complete information game. Table 3.15 reports the findings for those ROK respondents with high interest in foreign policy. I focus on those who gave that they have the highest interest (level of 5) in foreign policy. As was the case with the UK sample of respondents with high interest in foreign policy, even when there is high information, there are increases in response time, decreases in approval level, and decreases in decision certainty across non-conflict and conflicting response cue conditions in both scenarios. I fail to find the logic of habit in the high information condition for the ROK sample too.

**Table 3.15. ROK High Interest in Foreign Policy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Log RT</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>Certainty</td>
<td>Log RT</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>Certainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP Divided</td>
<td>0.0124</td>
<td>-1.079***</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>0.0308</td>
<td>-0.562*</td>
<td>-8.903**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.102]</td>
<td>[0.393]</td>
<td>[4.879]</td>
<td>[0.132]</td>
<td>[0.316]</td>
<td>[4.107]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Divided</td>
<td>-0.0279</td>
<td>-0.449</td>
<td>1.043</td>
<td>0.270**</td>
<td>-0.565*</td>
<td>-3.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.120]</td>
<td>[0.362]</td>
<td>[4.724]</td>
<td>[0.115]</td>
<td>[0.328]</td>
<td>[3.785]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Divided</td>
<td>-0.0695</td>
<td>-0.186</td>
<td>10.99**</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>-0.447</td>
<td>-1.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.122]</td>
<td>[0.408]</td>
<td>[4.918]</td>
<td>[0.134]</td>
<td>[0.313]</td>
<td>[4.191]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Proposed</td>
<td>-0.0132</td>
<td>-0.200</td>
<td>-0.316</td>
<td>-0.0495</td>
<td>-0.0181</td>
<td>2.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0788]</td>
<td>[0.260]</td>
<td>[3.125]</td>
<td>[0.0887]</td>
<td>[0.190]</td>
<td>[2.751]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Latent RT</td>
<td>0.333***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.250***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0701]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0885]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-pt Scale</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.395</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td>0.290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in brackets (*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10).

I cannot test the other, objective holist explanation based on side-payments and inter-state bargaining. I also cannot test the objective individualist explanations based on electoral and
policy incentives of the government decision-makers on adult citizens. I will test these other alternative explanations and their expectations on the logic of habit in the next chapter.

I move onto the subjective holist, or intersubjectivist, explanation. The above results and discussions already disconfirm the expectations of this intersubjectivist explanation. Individuals with the same citizenship and individuals with the same preferred political party show different types of cognitive process. Those who prefer the Rightist major party show the logic of habit, while other Rightist respondents show non-motivated processes. Similarly, among those who prefer the Leftist major party show both motivated and non-motivated processes. The critical distinction across the Leftist subgroups lies in the differential changes in decision certainty levels. While those with individual level non-contestation in action knowledge show a significant causal increase in certainty levels, even in conflicting response cue conditions, those individuals with contestation in action knowledge do not show such significant causal increase in certainty levels in conflicting response cue conditions. As well, only those with individual level contestation in action knowledge show significant decreases in approval levels, even on a three-point scale, in conflicting response cue conditions in both scenarios. Thus, I fail to find support for the intersubjectivist expectation on the logic of habit.

Next, I consider how the subjective individualist, or subjectivist, explanation would explain the logic of habit, if one were to empirically observe the fast, taken-for-granted cognitive process. If respondents have strong attitudes and beliefs, then such prior strength in attitudes and beliefs might explain the obviousness in final choice. If respondents have strong and consistent attitudes, then the institutional level of analysis should not make a difference in the expected logic of action. Whether one is Rightist or Leftist pro-US hawk, or one is Rightist or Leftist pro-UN dove, if one is theory-driven, with strong and consistent attitudes, then the institutional level

---

15 Please see Howe and Krosnick (2017).
of analysis should not make a difference in the type of cognitive process. However, I only find the logic of habit for the Rightist pro-US hawk and not for other such similar subgroups. This finding is similar across the UK and ROK samples. I maintain such finding for the Rightist pro-US hawks is due to the complete two-level non-contestation in relevant action knowledge.

Finally, I consider other subjectivist explanations based on thinking dispositions and dogmatism. First I look at those respondents who gave intuitive, but incorrect, answers to the two Cognitive Reflection Tests (CRTs). Giving incorrect answers to the two CRTs embedded in the survey are simple binary measures. Tables 3.16-3.17 below report the findings on those UK and ROK respondents who gave the intuitive, but inaccurate, answers to the widget CRT. In the UK case, I find that there are significant decreases in approval levels, which remain at the substantial three-point scales, in both scenarios. In the training troops scenario, there is also a significant increase in response time. I fail to find the logic of habit for this particular group.

### Table 3.16. UK Widget CRT (Cognitive Reflection Test) Incorrect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Log RT</td>
<td>A Approval</td>
<td>A Certainty</td>
<td>B Log RT</td>
<td>B Approval</td>
<td>B Certainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP Divided</td>
<td>0.0608</td>
<td>-0.235**</td>
<td>2.892*</td>
<td>0.155**</td>
<td>-0.295***</td>
<td>-2.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0647]</td>
<td>[0.100]</td>
<td>[1.635]</td>
<td>[0.0610]</td>
<td>[0.0975]</td>
<td>[1.585]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Divided</td>
<td>0.0453</td>
<td>-0.288***</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>0.0602</td>
<td>-0.258**</td>
<td>0.0821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0667]</td>
<td>[0.0990]</td>
<td>[1.678]</td>
<td>[0.0622]</td>
<td>[0.102]</td>
<td>[1.597]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Divided</td>
<td>0.0709</td>
<td>-0.0862</td>
<td>-1.151</td>
<td>0.0324</td>
<td>-0.148</td>
<td>-2.715*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0725]</td>
<td>[0.100]</td>
<td>[1.700]</td>
<td>[0.0659]</td>
<td>[0.0992]</td>
<td>[1.503]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Proposed</td>
<td>0.00985</td>
<td>-0.118*</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td>-0.0284</td>
<td>-0.0201</td>
<td>-0.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0478]</td>
<td>[0.0691]</td>
<td>[1.172]</td>
<td>[0.0441]</td>
<td>[0.0703]</td>
<td>[1.104]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Latent RT</td>
<td>0.386***</td>
<td>0.379***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0480]</td>
<td>[0.0353]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-pt Scale</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| N             | 1,198     | 1,198     | 1,198     | 1,210     | 1,210     | 1,210     |
| R²            | 0.188     | 0.357     | 0.118     | 0.190     | 0.299     | 0.121     |

Robust standard errors in brackets (*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10).
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As shown in Table 3.17 below, I also find that the approval levels significantly decrease in treatment conditions in both scenarios for the ROK group that gave intuitive, but inaccurate answers to the modified widget CRT question. These findings remain, even with the substantial three-point scales.

Table 3.17. ROK Widget CRT (Cognitive Reflection Test) Incorrect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>log RT</td>
<td>0.0294</td>
<td>0.0219</td>
<td>0.0150</td>
<td>0.0732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0740]</td>
<td>[0.0632]</td>
<td>[0.0636]</td>
<td>[0.0452]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>-0.377***</td>
<td>-0.212*</td>
<td>-0.307**</td>
<td>-0.202**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.130]</td>
<td>[-0.126]</td>
<td>[-0.136]</td>
<td>[-0.0910]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certainty</td>
<td>-2.300</td>
<td>-1.179</td>
<td>-0.644</td>
<td>-0.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log RT</td>
<td>-0.00375</td>
<td>0.0533</td>
<td>0.00591</td>
<td>-0.0880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.0649]</td>
<td>[0.0781]</td>
<td>[0.0494]</td>
<td>[-0.00880]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>-0.285**</td>
<td>0.00591</td>
<td>1.903</td>
<td>-0.0829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.115]</td>
<td>[0.115]</td>
<td>[1.013]</td>
<td>[-0.123]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certainty</td>
<td>-2.044</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>1.990</td>
<td>0.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-1.750]</td>
<td>[-1.738]</td>
<td>[1.929]</td>
<td>[1.738]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP Divided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R^2</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in brackets (*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10).

Likewise, I examine those who gave intuitive, but inaccurate, answers to the modified lily patches CRT question. Tables 3.18-3.19 report the findings for those UK and ROK respondents of interest. I find that the approval levels significantly decrease across treatment conditions in both scenarios. These findings remain, even with the substantial three-point scales. In addition, as was the case for those UK respondents who gave incorrect answers to the widget CRT question, I find a significant increase in response time in the training troops scenario. Because there are significant response changes and significant increases in response time, I fail to find
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support for the alternative argument that those intuitive thinkers tend to engage in the fast, taken-for-granted cognitive process.

Table 3.18. UK Lily CRT (Cognitive Reflection Test) Incorrect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log RT</td>
<td>0.0227</td>
<td>-0.267***</td>
<td>3.280**</td>
<td>0.191***</td>
<td>-0.311***</td>
<td>-1.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>[0.0634]</td>
<td>[0.0966]</td>
<td>[1.592]</td>
<td>[0.0596]</td>
<td>[0.0975]</td>
<td>[1.565]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certainty</td>
<td>2.128</td>
<td>0.120**</td>
<td>-0.245**</td>
<td>-0.651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log RT</td>
<td>0.0387</td>
<td>-0.164*</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.0887</td>
<td>-0.144</td>
<td>-2.563*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>[0.0675]</td>
<td>[0.0966]</td>
<td>[1.674]</td>
<td>[0.0604]</td>
<td>[0.101]</td>
<td>[1.604]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certainty</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.0274</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Latent RT</td>
<td>0.408***</td>
<td>0.414***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0436]</td>
<td>[0.0341]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-pt Scale</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1,267</td>
<td>1,267</td>
<td>1,267</td>
<td>1,267</td>
<td>1,267</td>
<td>1,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.369</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0.123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in brackets (*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10).

Table 3.19. ROK Lily CRT (Cognitive Reflection Test) Incorrect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log RT</td>
<td>0.0615</td>
<td>-0.368***</td>
<td>-2.112</td>
<td>-0.0237</td>
<td>-0.342***</td>
<td>-2.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>[0.0610]</td>
<td>[0.111]</td>
<td>[1.663]</td>
<td>[0.0604]</td>
<td>[0.101]</td>
<td>[1.522]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certainty</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>-0.0458</td>
<td>-0.324***</td>
<td>-0.207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log RT</td>
<td>0.0417</td>
<td>-0.278***</td>
<td>-1.599</td>
<td>0.0499</td>
<td>-0.145</td>
<td>0.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>[0.0534]</td>
<td>[0.104]</td>
<td>[1.574]</td>
<td>[0.0634]</td>
<td>[0.105]</td>
<td>[1.646]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certainty</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.00999</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Latent RT</td>
<td>0.308***</td>
<td>0.261***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0348]</td>
<td>[0.0462]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-pt Scale</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.283</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>0.306</td>
<td>0.145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in brackets (*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10).
Next, I examine those respondents who have low levels of need for cognition (NFC) and low levels of need for cognitive openness. I focus on those respondents who are below one standard deviation from the mean NFC scores and mean Need for openness scores. Tables 3.20-3.21 report the findings for those UK and ROK respondents with low levels of need for cognition, and Tables 3.22-3.23 report the findings for those UK and ROK respondents with low levels of need for cognitive openness.

I start with those with low levels of need for cognition. Table 3.20 below reports the findings for those UK respondents of interest. There is intra-group difference across scenarios. While the findings in scenario A indicate the workings of the logic of habit, the findings in scenario B do not indicate the workings of the logic of habit. As shown in column (5), there are significant decreases in approval levels across treatment conditions, and these findings remain with the substantial three-point scale.

**Table 3.20. UK Low Need for Cognition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log RT</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.0848</td>
<td>2.933</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>-0.574**</td>
<td>3.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>4.031</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>4.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certainty</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>4.388</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>4.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log RT</td>
<td>-0.0507</td>
<td>0.0327</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>-0.00293</td>
<td>-0.454*</td>
<td>1.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>[0.170]</td>
<td>[0.273]</td>
<td>4.541</td>
<td>[0.157]</td>
<td>[0.273]</td>
<td>4.453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certainty</td>
<td>[0.127]</td>
<td>[0.201]</td>
<td>3.063</td>
<td>[0.0985]</td>
<td>[0.167]</td>
<td>2.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP Divided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Divided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Divided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Proposed</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>-0.126</td>
<td>7.733**</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>-0.320*</td>
<td>1.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Latent RT</td>
<td>0.370***</td>
<td>0.428***</td>
<td>[0.0955]</td>
<td>0.428***</td>
<td>[0.0827]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-pt Scale</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R^2</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>0.239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in brackets (*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10).
Survey Experiments

Interestingly, I find the intra-group difference across scenarios for the ROK respondents of interest. As shown in Table 3.21 column (2), there is a significant decrease in approval level when the PPP is divided, and this finding remains even with the more substantial three-point scale. Yet, for the other training troops scenario, the findings indicate the possible workings of the logic of habit.

Table 3.21. ROK Low Need for Cognition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log RT</td>
<td>0.0221</td>
<td>-0.384*</td>
<td>3.831</td>
<td>0.00108</td>
<td>-0.240</td>
<td>-3.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.142]</td>
<td>[0.216]</td>
<td>[3.154]</td>
<td>[0.0909]</td>
<td>[0.213]</td>
<td>[2.844]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Divided</td>
<td>-0.0255</td>
<td>-0.0390</td>
<td>4.952</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>-0.238</td>
<td>2.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.117]</td>
<td>[0.219]</td>
<td>[3.263]</td>
<td>[0.146]</td>
<td>[0.230]</td>
<td>[3.400]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Divided</td>
<td>0.0615</td>
<td>-0.279</td>
<td>2.953</td>
<td>0.0759</td>
<td>-0.119</td>
<td>1.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.123]</td>
<td>[0.213]</td>
<td>[3.249]</td>
<td>[0.0860]</td>
<td>[0.224]</td>
<td>[3.151]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Proposed</td>
<td>0.0703</td>
<td>-0.0314</td>
<td>2.612</td>
<td>0.0569</td>
<td>-0.171</td>
<td>-1.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0842]</td>
<td>[0.160]</td>
<td>[2.353]</td>
<td>[0.0820]</td>
<td>[0.144]</td>
<td>[2.075]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Latent RT</td>
<td>0.252***</td>
<td>0.260***</td>
<td>0.252***</td>
<td>0.0733</td>
<td>[0.0722]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-pt Scale</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in brackets (*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10).

While I find intra-group differences across the two scenarios for the UK and ROK respondents with low levels of need for cognition, the findings for the UK and ROK respondents with low levels of need for cognitive openness more clearly disconfirm the expectations that those with lower needs of epistemic motivation engage in the fast, taken-for-granted cognitive process. Tables 3.22-3.23 below show that those UK and ROK respondents with low levels of need for cognitive openness show significant decreases in approval levels in both scenarios, and these findings remain significant even with the more substantial three-point scale measure. There are effective response changes in both scenarios across the two national subsamples.
Lastly, I examine those respondents with high levels of social conservatism or high levels of dogmatism. I focus on those respondents who are one standard deviation above the average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log RT</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>Certainty</td>
<td>Log RT</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>Certainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP Divided</td>
<td>-0.0757</td>
<td>0.0150</td>
<td>-1.516</td>
<td>0.0996</td>
<td>-0.389**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.162]</td>
<td>[0.204]</td>
<td>[2.862]</td>
<td>[0.121]</td>
<td>[0.173]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Divided</td>
<td>-0.0698</td>
<td>-0.0512</td>
<td>1.116</td>
<td>-0.0389</td>
<td>-0.431**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.181]</td>
<td>[0.207]</td>
<td>[3.180]</td>
<td>[0.118]</td>
<td>[0.190]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Divided</td>
<td>-0.236</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>-0.555</td>
<td>-0.0410</td>
<td>-0.292*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.157]</td>
<td>[0.205]</td>
<td>[3.213]</td>
<td>[0.133]</td>
<td>[0.172]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Proposed</td>
<td>0.0109</td>
<td>-0.278**</td>
<td>-1.390</td>
<td>-0.144*</td>
<td>-0.0458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0988]</td>
<td>[0.135]</td>
<td>[2.104]</td>
<td>[0.0855]</td>
<td>[0.131]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Latent RT</td>
<td>0.286***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.468***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0757]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0615]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-pt Scale</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in brackets (*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10).
social conservatism score. Table 3.24 reports the findings for the UK of interest. There is intra-group difference across scenarios. While in the chemical weapons scenario, I find the possible workings of the logic of habit, I find significant decreases in the approval levels for the training troops scenario. This finding remains even with the three-point scale measure. Thus, I find effective response changes for the more dogmatic group in the UK sample.

Table 3.24. UK High Social Conservatism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Log RT</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Certainty</td>
<td>Log RT</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP Divided</td>
<td>0.0173</td>
<td>-0.379</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>-0.172</td>
<td>-0.516**</td>
<td>1.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.166]</td>
<td>[0.299]</td>
<td>[4.681]</td>
<td>[0.124]</td>
<td>[0.234]</td>
<td>[4.153]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Divided</td>
<td>0.0502</td>
<td>-0.330</td>
<td>-5.916</td>
<td>-0.230**</td>
<td>-0.773***</td>
<td>2.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.182]</td>
<td>[0.253]</td>
<td>[4.806]</td>
<td>[0.112]</td>
<td>[0.277]</td>
<td>[4.518]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Divided</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>-0.184</td>
<td>-8.121*</td>
<td>0.0315</td>
<td>-0.0527</td>
<td>-0.0525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.181]</td>
<td>[0.278]</td>
<td>[4.761]</td>
<td>[0.193]</td>
<td>[0.259]</td>
<td>[4.356]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Proposed</td>
<td>-0.00495</td>
<td>0.0160</td>
<td>-1.367</td>
<td>-0.0837</td>
<td>0.00196</td>
<td>-3.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.114]</td>
<td>[0.192]</td>
<td>[3.255]</td>
<td>[0.105]</td>
<td>[0.190]</td>
<td>[3.031]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Latent RT</td>
<td>0.398***</td>
<td>[0.0962]</td>
<td>0.482***</td>
<td>[0.0902]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-pt Scale</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in brackets (*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10).

Table 3.25 reports the findings for the ROK group that have average social conservatism score of one standard deviation above the mean score. I find significant decreases in approval levels in both scenarios for the ROK case. These findings remain even with the more substantial three-point scales. In addition, I find significant decreases in certainty levels in the PPP Divided conditions in both scenarios. As I find effective response changes and causal decreases in decision certainty levels, I rule out the possibility of the workings of the logic of habit for this relatively more dogmatic group within the ROK sample.
As explained earlier in chapter 1, the logic of habit is theorized to be domain-specific. Domain-general variables, such as dogmatism and thinking dispositions, do not necessarily predict the logic of habit. Taken-for-grantedness in an individual’s mind also has some exogenous condition at the social level and so it cannot be completely explained by a single-level explanatory factor. One needs, at the minimum, two levels of analysis to observe and explain the logic of habit, and the cross-national evidence from the additional tests reported above demonstrate support for this two-level ideational argument on the logic of habit.

### IV. Discussion

Overall, I use various measures, from response time, response change, decision certainty, and textual dimensions, to show that only the theoretical subgroup 1 indicate the workings of the logic of habit in both scenarios. There are subgroups, and other groups, that indicate the

---

**Table 3.25. ROK Social Conservatism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) A Log RT</th>
<th>(2) A Approval</th>
<th>(3) A Certainty</th>
<th>(4) B Log RT</th>
<th>(5) B Approval</th>
<th>(6) B Certainty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPP Divided</td>
<td>0.0952</td>
<td>-0.686**</td>
<td>-9.337**</td>
<td>-0.0126</td>
<td>-0.535**</td>
<td>-6.936*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0843]</td>
<td>[0.308]</td>
<td>[4.353]</td>
<td>[0.155]</td>
<td>[0.260]</td>
<td>[3.983]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Divided</td>
<td>0.0466</td>
<td>-0.782***</td>
<td>-1.666</td>
<td>0.0138</td>
<td>-0.772**</td>
<td>-3.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.120]</td>
<td>[0.280]</td>
<td>[3.609]</td>
<td>[0.217]</td>
<td>[0.315]</td>
<td>[4.750]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Divided</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>-0.659**</td>
<td>-6.232*</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>-0.303</td>
<td>-3.816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.140]</td>
<td>[0.284]</td>
<td>[3.672]</td>
<td>[0.203]</td>
<td>[0.249]</td>
<td>[4.080]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP Proposed</td>
<td>-0.128</td>
<td>-0.496**</td>
<td>2.848</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>-0.484**</td>
<td>1.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0974]</td>
<td>[0.215]</td>
<td>[3.045]</td>
<td>[0.131]</td>
<td>[0.199]</td>
<td>[3.210]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Latent RT</td>
<td>0.181***</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.270***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0512]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.0979]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-pt Scale</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in brackets (***) p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.10. N = 137, R^2 = 0.267, 0.443, 0.334, 0.165, 0.494, 0.338.
workings of the logic of habit in either one of the scenarios; when looking at the measures for the alternative vignettes, these other groups show other types of cognitive process.

Although the competing theoretical explanations similarly passed the first critical test, only my two-level ideational argument on the US allies’ joining behaviors passed the second critical test, leveraging the different logics of action. In particular, because I find support for the logic of habit, specifically for the theoretical subgroup in box (1), across both the UK and ROK samples, this is the strongest possible evidence that simultaneously confirms my expectations and disconfirms the expectations of alternative explanations. The other theoretical subgroups also show nuanced differences in the types of cognitive process too. The empirical evidence of the elaborate theoretical expectations provides a promising support for the mid-level theory, specified from the general level sociological theory of choice.

I further derived out and tested the alternative explanations for the observation of the logic of habit. I tested and disconfirmed the expectations of the high information/complete information context. I tested and disconfirmed the domain-general explanations on the logic of habit. The cross-national nature of the findings increases confidence in the theory and in the key explanatory variable of the degree of two-level contestation in relevant action knowledge. Most importantly, because the various measurement standards used in this survey experimental stage of the research design allowed for the findings that support the two-level ideational argument, I proceed with the same set of measures to operationalize the unobservable types of cognitive process in the next two empirical chapters that focus on the actual decision-making cases of the 2003 Iraq War. In the next two empirical chapters, I will use these actual decision-making cases of US allies to conduct the two rounds of critical tests, adjudicating the competing theoretical arguments.
4. 2003 Iraq War Decisions of the UK and ROK

I now move onto the target populations of government decision-makers in the UK and ROK at the time of the 2003 US-led Iraq War. In March 2003, the US allies and US security partners around the world faced a critical decision problem over participation or non-participation in the US-led coalitional operation against Saddam Hussein’s Iraq. This decision problem embodies a crucial instance of alliance bargaining over the foreign security policy stance toward a third-party. Because the United States, the United Kingdom, and Spain withdrew their resolution that seeks the UN Security Council’s authorization to use all necessary means, including the use of force, to disarm Iraq on March 17, 2003, the US-led coalitional operation that began on March 20, 2003 (local time in Iraq) lacked the mandate from the UN Security Council. The allied governments’ decision problem was highly salient and widely unpopular.

In such non-default, high-stakes decision-making context, one would least expect the logic of habit to be in operation within the minds and brains of the government decision-makers. This is why I argue that such alliance bargaining context, particularly over the foreign policy stance against the Iraq disarmament issue in March 2003, poses a hard test for my mid-level theory on US allies’ joining behaviors, specified from the general level sociological theory of choice. Yet, if I can document and show that the logic of habit, or the fast, taken-for-granted process, have generated the final decision outcomes that we observe, then we can more comfortably expect the logic of habit—or, the logic of doxa—to operate in many other decision-making contexts.

In this chapter, I detail the second stage of my cross-national, multi-methods research design of the dissertation study. I use various types of observational data to conduct the two
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rounds of critical empirical tests. In each of the UK and ROK decision-making cases, I focus on three individuals: 1) the Prime Minister/President, 2) the Foreign Minister, and 3) the Defense Minister. These individuals are not only the key decision-makers primarily responsible for the participation decisions in March 2003, but they are also embedded in real, high-stakes environments of international, domestic, and bureaucratic politics. These real, actual dimensions of the observational study, coupled with the controlled experiments on large-N citizen samples from the previous survey experimental chapter, ensure the validity and reliability of the findings of the two rounds of critical tests that adjudicate among the competing theoretical explanations.

I also explore the causal implications of my two-level ideational argument on the US allies’ joining behaviors in this particular context of US-led operations that lack any international institutional authorization to use armed force. As it is generally tough to experimentally manipulate ideational factors—be they strategic beliefs, identity understandings, personality traits, or dispositions, it remains difficult to experimentally test for the causal effects of different degrees of two-level contestation in the action knowledge. In my survey experiments, the treatments were conflicting response cue conditions; they did not involve different degrees of contestation in the relevant action knowledge, which concerns beliefs in bilateralism, multilateralism, and military effectiveness, for this specific issue area. I address this limitation by employing a within-individual cross-issues research design to test for the causal implications of the mid-level theory of US allies’ joining behaviors. Fixing the individual decision-maker of interest, I examine how the same actor provides justifications and reacts to different foreign policy issues at the time. I focus on the text-based measure, as this measure is available for different foreign policy issue areas for the same actor.
This chapter proceeds in four parts. First, I describe how I capture the variables of interest using observational data. Second, I report the findings from the two rounds of critical empirical tests. Third, I present the details and findings of the within-individual cross-issues research design, which aims to explore the causal implications of my two-level ideational argument. Lastly, I summarize the findings and discuss the implications.

I. Measurement and Operationalization

Before I conduct the critical empirical tests using the target populations of government decision-makers in the UK and ROK at the time of the 2003 US-led Iraq War, I discuss how I measure the variables of interest. I begin with how I capture the key explanatory variable—the degree of two-level contestation in the relevant action knowledge—for each of three government decision-makers of interest, and then review how one can systematically and rigorously operationalize the more difficult to measure, and utterly unobservable, dependent variable: the different logics of action, or types of cognitive process in decision-making.

In order to demonstrate that ideational factors are the primary explanatory variables, I need to first show that the relevant ideational factors are both external and antecedent to the decision problem being explained.\(^1\) In the international security studies literature, there are established ways to capture substantial beliefs at either the aggregate group level or the leader level.\(^2\) For the institutional level of analysis, I capture the degree of contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge by looking at the three relevant beliefs in official strategic documents, devised and circulated prior to the decision-making period of interest. Specifically, I take two

---

\(^1\) Please see Bennett and Checkel (2014), pp. 48-65.

\(^2\) For instance, please see Johnston (1995); O’Connor and Vucetic (2010); Saunders (2011).
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steps. First, I check if beliefs on bilateralism and multilateralism are stated in the official strategic documents. If only one of the two is stated, then clearly, the one that is stated is prioritized as a national security strategy to achieve and ensure the objectives. If both are stated in the official strategic document, then I look at the ordering: which of the two—bilateralism and multilateralism—comes first and is prioritized? If both are not stated in the documents, then I operationalize such clear absence as contestation in action knowledge. Institutionally, there are no prescriptions on which action to take. The second step is to examine the institutional level belief in military effectiveness. I check if the document notes of high threat levels, and if the armed forces are prepared to address threats and ensure security or to ensure peace and stability.

Likewise, for the individual level of analysis, I capture the degree of individual level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge by looking at the strengths of the relevant ideational factors—beliefs in bilateralism, multilateralism, and military effectiveness—from various published sources on the profile data and past foreign policy actions, including decisions on military actions, and focus on the data prior to the decision-making period of interest. From this sample of biographical data, I check if beliefs on bilateralism and multilateralism are present. If only one of the two is present, then clearly, the one that is present will be the stronger belief. If both beliefs are present, then I operationalize that as contestation in action knowledge. I also look at any available past foreign policy actions, including decisions on military actions abroad, and operationalize the strength of the belief in military effectiveness. When possible, I triangulate across sources and look for other independently reached conclusions on the degree of contestation in the relevant action knowledge at either or both levels of analysis.
Capturing the Independent Variable: The Degree of Two-Level Contestation in Action Knowledge

The UK: Institutional Level

To begin with the UK Prime Minister, I specify the aggregate group at the institutional level as the national security team, which is comprised of the politically appointed cabinet ministers and high-ranking career bureaucrats working at the Downing Street. I use media reports, memoirs, and declassified documents to measure the degree of ideational contestation for this group. In the case of Tony Blair’s Labour Government at the time, the Prime Minister faced intense institutional level contestation in action knowledge throughout the entire decision-making period of interest. Although the Defense Minister Geoff Hoon supported the UK’s participation in the US-led military action against Iraq, the Foreign Minister Jack Straw was undecided until the last minute, and other relevant figures in the team were opposed to military action without any authorization from the UN Security Council. For instance, Robin Cook, Blair’s Foreign Secretary from 1997-2001 and Hoon’s predecessor, resigned from his Cabinet position on March 17th, 2003, precisely over the issue of Iraq. As well, the Secretary of State for International Development, Clare Short, almost resigned in the lead up to the war and eventually quit on May 12th, 2003.

In fact, in the United States, the Bush administration seemed to have been aware of the UK Cabinet-level division, as early as in March 2002. Hence, this is an independently reached

---

3 Mr. Blair also announces this resignation in his statement to the House of Commons on March 18, 2003.

confirmation of my operationalization of Mr. Blair’s institutional level contestation in action knowledge. Indeed, the UK Prime Minister Blair himself notes of such deep divisions in both his House of Commons speech and his televised address to the nation in March 2003. As diverse sources commonly note of such division in the aggregate group at the institutional level of analysis for the UK Prime Minister Tony Blair, I measure it as ‘contestation’ in the action knowledge. In plain words, the very institutional level that Mr. Blair would refer to for the foreign security policy decision at hand was contested at the time.

For the Foreign and Defense Ministers, I specify the aggregate group at the institutional level of analysis as the bureaucratized state departments that they head. Here, I use the official white papers and practices to measure the degree of institution level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge. The UK government white papers are ideational frameworks, with foreign and defense policy objectives, that are disseminated and implemented across departments, and such ideational frameworks are, relative to the static ROK case, more frequently changed. One of the manifesto commitments of Tony Blair’s Labour Government was to conduct a foreign policy-led defense review, in order to reassess the UK’s national interests and overseas commitments in the post-Cold War security environment. Two main themes dominate the 1998 Strategic Defense Review (SDR): 1) the need to move towards more rapidly deployable expeditionary forces to meet any threats in any location, and 2) the creation of joint forces. I operationalize a high level of MI orientation, or strong belief in military effectiveness. Although a new SDR chapter was published by July 2002, this was right in the middle of the Iraq

---


7 Ibid.
War participation decision-making process and so the document fails the exogenous and antecedent criteria.

By 2002, there were no foreign affairs specific white paper published since the end of the Second World War, and so I use the one major document—1998 Strategic Defense Review—to capture the degree of institutional level contestation in action knowledge for both the foreign affairs and defense ministries. Unlike the ROK white papers, there is no clear, official prioritization of the special relationship with the United States in the 1998 SDR. This is not to say that there is no special relationship between the UK and the US; rather, the relationship is not formally prioritized in the strategic defense document. As I explain below, in the ROK white papers, and in the UK Strategic Defense and Security Review 2015, the security cooperation with the United States is highlighted as the integral national security strategy and is prioritized above all other strategies.

At the same time, unlike in the New Zealand white papers, there is no clear prioritization of the multilateral institutions and rules-based international order. Thus, without any clear prioritization of the relationship with either the United States or the international institutions, I operationalize the degree of institutional level contestation in action knowledge as ‘contested.’

There is no clear prescription on whether or not to participate in US-led operations that lack any international institutional authorization to use armed force. In the practice of diplomacy too, the UK Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs Office (FCO) has a Minister in charge of both Europe and the Americas. In contrast, the ROK Foreign Affairs Ministry further separates the Americas and has a Minister for North America, where the Department of North America is singularly distinguished as the most significant. Though there is high belief in military effectiveness,

---

because beliefs in bilateralism and multilateralism are not stated in the 1998 SDR document, I operationalize this as institutional level ‘contestation’ in action knowledge for the UK Foreign Minister Jack Straw.

With regards to practice, the UK Defense Ministry has been in charge of continuous Anglo-American operations, in Iraq in 1998, in Kosovo in 1999, and in Afghanistan in 2001. Thus, although there is an absence of formalized prioritization of the UK-US special relationship within the 1998 SDR, in the everyday practice of national defense, this may not necessarily be the case for the UK Defense Ministry and so I operationalize the UK Defense Minister’s institutional level contestation in action knowledge as closer to informal ‘non-contestation’ towards participation in US-led operations, even when there is a lack of any international institutional authorization to use armed force.

The ROK: Institutional Level

For the newly elected ROK President Roh Moo-hyun, who was just sworn into office on February 25th, 2003, the Iraq War participation decision was the first immensely challenging decision for the administration. I rely on two published memoirs and my own interviews with the ROK Foreign and Defense Ministers to operationalize the degree of institutional level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge for the ROK President.9 All sources uniformly tell that the President’s Foreign and Defense Ministers was united in support of joining the US-led coalitional operation in Iraq in March 2003. Of course there were other key administration officials, who were opposed to the ROK’s participation in the Iraq War, advocating instead for an independent and autonomous foreign policy.10 According to my theory, however, these other

---

9 One memoir is written by the ROK President Roh Moo-hyun. Please see 노무현 (2009), pp. 222-228, and 문재인 (2011), pp. 268-271.
administration officials at the Blue House do not count as the relevant national security team members, as I focus on the Foreign Affairs and National Defense Ministers and officials. While I commonly find, and thus operationalize, the UK Prime Minister Tony Blair’s degree of institutional level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge as ‘contested,’ I operationalize the ROK President Roh Moo-hyun’s degree of institutional level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge as ‘non-contested’ towards participation in US-led operations that lack any international institutional authorization to use armed force.

For the Foreign Minister and the Defense Minister, I specify the aggregate group of the institution level as the bureaucratic ministries or departments that they head. Here, I use the official white papers to measure the reference group level contestation. The ROK Foreign Affairs Ministry white papers are published annually, and the ROK Defense Ministry white papers are published biannually. I chose to read the oldest available white papers from both ministries and the white papers published prior to the decision-making period of interest.\(^\text{11}\) I find that the official white papers for both ministries consistently prioritize the ROK’s diplomatic and security relationship with the United States. The Foreign and Defense Ministers continuously talk about the importance of the ROK-US bilateral relationship in the preface. In the Foreign Affairs white papers, although other international relationships are discussed, the bilateral relations with the United States is always discussed and noted first. In the Defense white papers, the bilateral alliance with the United States is formally stated as the key strategy to achieving and ensuring national security. Hence, for both ministries, I operationalize the degree of institutional level

\(^{10}\) This is noted in 노무현 (2009), pp. 222-228; 문재인 (2011), pp. 268-271.

contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge as ‘non-contested’ towards participation in US-led operations that lack any international institutional authorization to use armed force.

**The UK: Individual Level**

To establish the exogeneity of the individual level ideational factors, a demonstration of the criteria of *antecedence* is absolutely critical. This is because leaders may say and do things under decision-making pressures that may not truly reflect what they believe. As well, stated beliefs during the decision-making process may be hooks that leaders employ to justify the decisions already made. Moreover, conflating beliefs and behaviors may risk being a tautological explanation.

For the UK case, I rely on various newspapers’ and parliamentary profiles of the government decision-makers. These sources are: 1) BBC Profile, 2) The Guardian Profile, and 3) Parliamentary Profiles. First, the UK Prime Minister Tony Blair is uniformly characterized as a “hawk.” By definition, Blair has strong belief in the efficacy of the use of force in achieving various foreign policy goals and objectives. He is also widely known as holding strong affinity for the United States, and especially, for having a close relationship with President George W. Bush. On the other hand, Blair seems to have a relatively weaker belief in the effectiveness of international institutions in ensuring national security objectives; for instance, prior to the Iraq War decision in 2003, Blair had authorized several British military operations overseas without any international institutional authorization to use armed force. These operations include the

---

12 For instance, please see, Saunders (2011), 13; Bennett and Checkel (2014), 65.

13 These concerns are discussed in Saunders (2011), Chapter 1.


15 For instance, please see, Shawcross (2004); Naughtie (2004).
Operation Desert Fox in Iraq in December 1998, Operation Allied Force in Kosovo in March 1999, and Operation Pallier in Sierra Leone in May 2000.\textsuperscript{16} Thus, given such strong affinity for the US, strong belief in military effectiveness, and relatively weaker belief in the importance of international institutions, I operationalize the UK Prime Minister Tony Blair’s degree of individual level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge as ‘non-contested’ towards participation in US-led operations that lack any international institutional authorization to use force.

Next, I examine the profile data for the UK Foreign Minister, Jack Straw. Jack Straw succeeded Robin Cook, and prior to assuming office, he was the Home Secretary. According to the Guardian profile, although Jack Straw supported the increasingly active Blair’s UK foreign policy, “Straw was never quite the true believer that Blair had become.”\textsuperscript{17} In fact, Jack Straw’s left-wing background and past are widely known, and talked about in parliamentary debates. His pacifist father avoided military service during World War II as a conscientious objector and his mother was also a socialist and pacifist.\textsuperscript{18} Although I did not detect any evidence of anti-Americanism/anti-bilateralism, because Mr. Straw did not hold as strong beliefs in the effectiveness of the use of force in general, I operationalize the degree of individual level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge as ‘contested.’

Finally, the UK Defense Minister, Geoff Hoon, assumed his position as the Defense Secretary in 1999, shortly following the conclusion of the NATO’s aerial campaign in Kosovo. He succeeded George Robertson, who was made NATO’s Secretary General in 1999, prompting

\textsuperscript{16} Please see Kampfner (2003).


the reshuffle in the Cabinet.\(^{19}\) Geoff Hoon is characterized as a “tough operator,”\(^{20}\) since he secured an increase from the Treasury in investment in the armed forces and committed substantial number of troops to the operation in Sierra Leone. Such past decision on Sierra Leone also tells me that there is weaker belief in international institutions and multilateralism in general for the Defense Minister Geoff Hoon. The Guardian also notes of his love of America, born in part from having an uncle in New Jersey, spending two years lecturing in law at the University of Louiville, Kentucky, and spending almost all of his family holidays in the United States.\(^{21}\)

Given such policy actions and affinity for America, I operationalize the degree of individual level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge as ‘non-contested’ towards participation.

**The ROK: Individual Level**

The ROK President Roh Moo-hyun had just campaigned on a more independent and autonomous relationship with the United States, ratcheting up the anti-American sentiments in the latter half of 2002 in the ROK. He was the leader of the leftist-progressive movement, and was widely known as the successor of the former President Kim Dae-jung’s reconciliatory Sunshine policy.\(^{22}\) Given such popularly backed campaign background and disbelief in military effectiveness, especially with regard to North Korea, I operationalize the degree of individual level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge as ‘non-contested’ towards *non-participation* in US-led operations that lack any international institutional authorization to use armed force, for the ROK President Roh Moo-hyun. Indeed, his own campaign and constituent

---


20 Ibid.


22 The former North Korean leader, Chairman Kim Jong-il, invited and met with the ROK President Roh Moo-hyun at Pyongyang in the fall of 2007.
bases were the most disappointed when they learned of his decision to participate in the US-led coalitional operation in Iraq in March 2003. I regard this as an independently reached conclusion of the ROK President Roh Moo-hyun’s individual level non-contestation in action knowledge.

Next, the ROK Foreign Minister, Yoon Young-kwan, was an academic. He was a Professor of International Relations at Seoul National University, and his earlier writings show support for the peaceful Sunshine policy of the former Kim Dae-jung administration. At the same time, his years of graduate training at Johns Hopkins SAIS and teaching at UC Davis, as well as his research time at the Wilson Center, indicate strong traditionalism and belief in the value of the alliance relations with the United States. Thus, such weak belief in military effectiveness, coupled with strong belief in the traditional alliance relations with the United States, suggests that the degree of individual level contestation in pre-existing action knowledge is ‘contested’ for the Foreign Minister Yoon Young-kwan.

Finally, I operationalize the ROK Defense Minister Cho Young-kil’s individual level contestation in action knowledge as ‘non-contested’ towards participation in US-led operations, even when there is a lack of international institutional authorization to use armed force. First, the Defense Minister himself had participated in the Vietnam War for three years (1967-1970) and from my interview, I could sense a strong belief in the importance of the ROK-US alliance.

---

23 Author interview with Mr. Yoon Young-kwan (ROK Foreign Affairs Minister 2003-2004) on August 21, 2014.

24 Mr. Yoon’s papers are available on his personal website.

25 Mr. Yoon’s cv is available on Seoul National University’s Department of Political Science and International Relations faculty page online.

26 Mr. Yoon describes himself as such in the first parliamentary committee meeting on March 21, 2003.
relationship.\textsuperscript{27} As Minister of National Defense, he attempted to make the ROK Armed Forces stronger, and I operationalize this as high MI orientation. With such extremely high belief in the effectiveness and importance of bilateralism, and strong belief in military effectiveness, I operationalize the individual level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge as ‘non-contested’ towards participation.

Now that I have separately captured the degrees of contestation in the action knowledge at each of the two levels of analysis, I will jointly consider the degree of two-level contestation in action knowledge for each of the government decision-makers of interest. I situate all six actors in Figure 4.1 below, where the degrees of individual level contestation in action knowledge are in columns and the degrees of institutional level contestation in action knowledge are in rows. To start with the UK case, the UK Prime Minister Tony Blair is in box (4), because while his institutional level was deeply divided, he himself carried non-contested action knowledge. The UK Foreign Minister Jack Straw is in box (5), because there is a complete two-level contestation in action knowledge. Finally, the UK Defense Minister Geoff Hoon is in the borderline of boxes (1) and (4). At the institutional level, there is informal non-contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge towards security cooperation and participation in US-led operations, and the Defense Minister himself held non-contested action knowledge towards participation.

For the ROK case, the ROK President Roh Moo-hyun is in box (3), since while his institutional level was undivided in support for participation in the US-led Iraq War in 2003, President Roh personally held non-contested action knowledge towards non-participation. The ROK Foreign Minister Yoon Young-kwan is in box (2), because the ROK Foreign Ministry has non-contested action knowledge towards participation, but Yoon himself was a dove, who simultaneously valued the bilateral relationship with the United States. Finally, the ROK Defense

\textsuperscript{27} Author interview with Mr. Cho Young-kil (ROK Defense Minister 2003-2004) on October 17, 2014.
Minister Cho Young-kil is in box (1), as there is complete two-level non-contestation in action knowledge towards participation in US-led operations, even when there is a lack of international institutional authorization to use armed force.

**Figure 4.1. The Independent Variable: Degree of Two-Level Contestation in Action Knowledge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Level Non-Contestation (Participation)</th>
<th>Individual Level Non-Contestation (Participation)</th>
<th>Individual Level Contestation</th>
<th>Individual Level Non-Contestation (Non-Participation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) ROK Defense Minister (Cho Young-kil)</td>
<td>(2) ROK Foreign Minister (Yoon Young-kwan)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3) ROK President (Rho Moo-hyun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Defense Minister (Goeff Hoon)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Figure 4.1, boxes (6)-(9) are unpopulated. Indeed, the last row (7)-(9) is especially highly unlikely in the UK and ROK cases. To capture the institutional level non-contestation in action knowledge as towards non-participation, the belief in the effectiveness of the bilateral security relations with the United States must be weak, but this is not yet likely in the cases of the UK and ROK ministries. Nonetheless, box (6) can be imagined in the case of the
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UK. For instance, if the former UK Labour leader, Jeremy Corbyn, becomes the Prime Minister, then he will likely be in box (6). From his statements in the past parliamentary debates, the former Labour leader holds weak belief in the effectiveness of the use of force, strong belief in international rules and institutions, and weak belief in bilateralism. His individual level contestation in action knowledge can be operationalized as ‘non-contested’ towards non-participation in US-led operations that lack any international institutional authorization to use armed force.

Still, I do not completely cut off the possibility of the last row for the UK and ROK cases. For instance, if a leftist party government is formed and there are enormous revisions in the UK and ROK strategic thinking in both formal (documented) and informal (practice-based) ways, then the degree of institutional level contestation in the relevant action knowledge may be operationalized as ‘non-contestation’ towards non-participation in US-led operations that lack the international mandate. Given that it is harder for the elected ROK administration to significantly revise and change the white papers due to mechanisms and reasons that lie outside the scope of this dissertation, the prospects for changes in the degree of institutional level contestation in action knowledge are greater for the UK case.

The Dependent Variables

To conduct the two rounds of critical tests, I need to measure two dependent variables. One is easier to observe, and the other is unobservable. First, I need to document the final decision outcomes adopted by the government decision-makers of interest. I would use this dependent variable in the first critical test, where I examine if the competing theoretical arguments do indeed explain the final decision outcomes that we observe. The second dependent variable—the logics of action or types of cognitive process generating the final choices—is
utterly unobservable. In this section, I review how one can systematically and rigorously measure the different types of cognitive process in decision-making contexts. Compared to the relatively direct measures obtained through survey experiments, the cognitive process measures obtained through the observational data are less precise. Still, I measure the different logics of action, or types of cognitive process, using three types of observational data: 1) texts of reasons for the adopted choice, 2) response time, and 3) response change.

**Text Classification**

I start with the text classification measure, as it is the key link between the experimental and observational measures. In the previous chapter, I discussed the two dimensions of bias in texts of reasons for the adopted position, and I use the same classification scheme to classify the texts of reasons given by the government decision-makers themselves. The first dimension of bias is the absence of any text about the non-adopted response, and the second dimension of bias is the imbalance of reasons or aspects. Based on the combination of these dimensions, I classify texts into different types of cognitive process. I measure taken-for-granted process with the absence of texts on the non-adopted response, and with the imbalance of reasons for the adopted response. In other words, there are only positive aspects and reasons ascribed for the adopted response.

Motivated process is measured with a clear presence of non-preferred response, but there is an imbalance of substantial reasons. Specifically, there are more negative aspects attached to the non-preferred response. Though the preferred policy may have some negative aspects, it is usually reasoned and stated in terms of the non-preferred response as having *even more negative* aspects. There are reasons why the alternative cannot be chosen.

For the socially constrained process, there can be at least two different types of socially
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constrained process: 1) while there is institutional level non-contestation in the action knowledge, there can be individual level contestation in action knowledge, or 2) there can be cross-level contestation in the action knowledge. For the former case, where there is individual level contestation, there is an absence of texts about the non-adopted action, but there is a balance of reasons for the chosen response. In other words, for the adopted response that is mentioned, there are both positive and negative aspects discussed. Such words of doubts and reservations would be a clear sign of socially constrained process. Other unique words for socially constrained process explicitly involve doubts and hesitations. For the latter case, where there is cross-level contestation, it is highly likely that the individual will be able to verbalize the effects of social, institutional and normative pressures. This would be the clearest sign of the socially constrained process. When there is cross-level contestation, individuals are able to register the conflicting response cues. They are able to verbalize these responses and evaluate them in a relatively balanced way.

Finally, I measure the non-motivated process with clear verbalization of the non-adopted response and a clear balance of reasons. In particular, positive aspects are attached to the non-adopted response. In survey experiments, I also measure ‘unsure,’ ‘undecided,’ and ‘need more information’ as non-motivated process, as choices are most indeterminate within non-motivated process. I use these two dimensions of bias to classify the texts of stated reasons into types of cognitive process.

Unlike in survey experimental settings, however, national leaders may just have to address the alternative responses, no matter how non-actual and absurd they believe these alternatives to be. What this means is that it will be exceedingly difficult to distinguish between a taken-for-granted and a motivated process, if national leaders have to address many different
policy options and state the reasons for not adopting the alternatives. And so, I further derive one possible way to distinguish the taken-for-granted and motivated processes here. I check for two additional aspects. First, I check for the most decisive words that would embody a categorical failure of conflict detection; that is, the clearest possible indication of active, swift dismissal of the alternatives. The decision-makers who engage in the logic of habit to generate the final decision would believe that alternatives are just non-actual and absurd. On the other hand, the decision-makers who engage in the motivated process to generate the final decision would register the conflict, but still, prefer the initial response. In other words, there would not be active, swift dismissal of alternatives, as they are not necessarily non-actual or absurd but are reasonable alternatives.

Second, I check if any negative aspects are ascribed to the adopted/preferred position. For the taken-for-granted process, the adopted decision is simply natural. It is harder to verbalize any negative aspects about such natural actuality, when choices are just taken-for-granted and seemingly natural. On the other hand, for the motivated process, the negative aspects about the adopted position may be registered and acknowledged, but the reasoning can still be one-sided in that there are even more negative aspects about the non-adopted policy. Alternatives are worse. Hence, if negative aspects are also acknowledged about the adopted position, then such presence of text can be used to distinguish between the taken-for-granted and motivated processes engaged by politically accountable government decision-makers. Here, I reiterate that the difference between the motivated and non-motivated processes lie in the presence of texts that highlight the positive aspects of the non-adopted position, and non-motivated process generated texts could show indeterminacy too.
Response Time

I use the process tracing method to find out which government actors made their individual level choices most quickly and most slowly. A priori, it is expected that those with a taken-for-granted process will likely make individual level choices most quickly. On the other hand, it is expected that those with a non-motivated process will likely make individual level choices most slowly. Although response time cannot be measured with an absolute scale of time (e.g. seconds, days, or weeks), ‘response time’ can nonetheless be measured in relative terms, especially across the government decision-makers of interest. From the point of the government level decision, one can trace back to how far ago individual members of the administration have made up their minds. The farthest one can trace this back could mean either taken-for-granted or motivated processes. The closest in time to the final government level decision could mean either socially constrained or non-motivated processes—individual minds were made up just on the eve of action or public announcement of the decision.

Response Change

I use the interview method in the post-decision period to check for the variation in the prospects for response change. The advantage of examining what the target population says, following the termination of all the UK/ROK military operations in Iraq, is that the prospects for response change are relatively higher than in other periods, such as the decision-making period or during the operational period. Not influenced by the heat of the moment or urgency of the mission, it can be argued that decision-makers, if they will, are in a better position to seriously engage in response decoupling, given the widely noted lessons learned from Iraq.

A priori, the most likely expectations are as follows. Those decision-makers who carried socially constrained cognitive process are most likely to show response changes, when they are...
out of office. In contrast, those decision-makers who had taken-for-granted or motivated processes are least likely to show response changes, even in the post-decision time period with grave lessons to be learned. Only those who had non-motivated process may show response change, but this is not necessarily required. Indeed, those who carried the prototypical, non-motivated process are most likely to vividly remember and regurgitate the tipping points in which they made up their minds. They can recall those points and still make the same choice. On the other hand, those who carried taken-for-granted or motivated processes are less likely to regurgitate these tipping points in time. The reasons stated at the decision-making time may have been hooks or covers, both intentionally and unintentionally, and so what they recall in the post-decision time period may be different from the reasons stated in the decision-making period.

Again, each of these observational data must be consistent with one another to most accurately and validly capture the type of cognitive process generating the final choice. As previously explained in chapter 1, no one measure can stand as an authoritative indicator of the types of cognitive process. The convergence across various measures would only increase the validity in operationalization and measurement of the types of cognitive process.

II. Critical Tests: The Findings

Critical Test 1—The Choice Outcomes

I first check if the competing theoretical arguments on the US allies’ joining behaviors do indeed explain the final choice outcomes that we observe. For both the UK and ROK cases in March 2003, all three government decision-makers of interest made the decision to participate in the US-led operation in Iraq.
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I will start with the objective holist arguments that focus on threats and alignment behaviors. For the UK case, one could argue that because the perceived threat from the target of the US-led operation, in this case, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, was so high at the time, the UK government decision-makers made the alignment and participation decision in 2003. For the ROK case, the perceived threat from the target of the operation may have been lower, but there is a clear existential regional threat. Because of the threat from North Korea, one could argue that the ROK government decision-makers made the US-alignment and participation decision in 2003.

To start with the UK case, the threat-based argument enjoys mixed support for three reasons. First, it does not account for the variation in the timing of individual level decisions to participate in the US-led military action, without the UN Security Council resolution. For instance, perceived threat from Saddam Hussein’s Iraq did not automatically lead the UK government decision-makers to endorse military action, without any international institutional authorization to use armed force. Most notably, the UK Foreign Minister Jack Straw was the last of the three decision-makers of interest to endorse such action.28 In other words, threat perception alone does not seem to ensure alignment and participation decisions. Second, there are other non-threat based motivations and justifications at the time. Military support and contributions were for the UK’s influence in the US government decision-making process, and regional modernization ideas were advanced.29 Again, the threat-based argument alone does not account for these other stated motivations. Finally, the government decision-makers of interest

---

28 This is evident from Mr. Straw’s statement to the House of Commons on March 17, 2003.

29 Porter (2018b) makes these arguments, and I also independently found these reasons stated at the time in the primary documents made available through the Iraq Inquiry.
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were aware of even greater threats and risks in the military operation,\textsuperscript{30} and such information is inconsistent with the threat-based argument.

For the ROK case, the regional threat-based argument does not hold up at all. None of the three government decision-makers of interest talked about the DPRK as a national threat. All sources converge on this absence of regional threat-based evidence. With regards to the other objective holist, side-payments argument, the ROK case fits more appropriately than the UK case. In exchange for the ROK’s support and participation in the US-led operation in Iraq, it is clear that the ROK government wanted a peaceful, diplomatic approach to the DPRK nuclear issue at the time. There is empirical evidence that the ROK government sought the US government’s support for a multilateral, peaceful approach to the DPRK nuclear issue and wanted to avert any military action on the Korean Peninsula.\textsuperscript{31} However, such foreign policy side deal is inconsistent across various sources, and it is especially inconsistent across time. This is why the objective holist, side-deal argument enjoys mixed evidence.

Next, I move onto the objective individualist argument, focusing on the government decision-makers’ electoral incentives. In both the UK and ROK cases, the governments did not face a major electoral competition, because they were leftist party governments and the main opposition of the rightist party was supportive of participation in the Iraq War. When there is bipartisan consensus on foreign security policy, then electoral constraints are lower. Moreover, in the ROK case, the ROK presidents cannot get reelected and the Foreign and Defense Ministers were not elected members of the parliament. As the leaders in both the UK and ROK cases did not face electoral costs, this argument passes the first critical test. It explains why the

\textsuperscript{30} This was independently verified by the Iraq Inquiry, as can be seen from Mr. John Chilcot’s public statement on July 6, 2016.

\textsuperscript{31} Memoirs written by Mr. Roh Moo-hyun and the incumbent president Moon Jae-in, as well as author interview with Mr. Yoon Young-kwan, converge on this point.
government decision-makers pushed ahead with widely unpopular decision to join the US-led operation in Iraq in March 2003.

Third, the subjective holist, or intersubjectivist, arguments would expect most members of the group that holds certain shared understandings to choose the same participation or non-participation decision. This group needs to have shared understandings, and so I focus on the leftist party members who are cabinet ministers/administration officials. In the UK case, although the three government decision-makers of interest made the same participation decision, other relevant Labour members of the Cabinet did not; for instance, Robin Cook, Blair’s Foreign Secretary from 1997-2001, resigned from his position on March 17th, 2003, precisely over the issue of Iraq, and the Secretary of State for International Development, Clare Short, almost resigned in the lead up to the war. In the ROK case, too, one can observe such division among the Leftist party members of the administration. While the ROK President Roh Moo-hyun in the end made the participation decision, other Leftist administration officials, who are also members of the National Security Council, opposed participation in the Iraq War in 2003. In general, intersubjectivist arguments cannot explain the observed individual-level variations among members of the same group.

Fourth, the subjective individualist, or subjectivist, arguments would expect those who hold certain beliefs and understandings to uniformly choose participation or non-participation decisions. Again, this argument enjoys mixed evidence. In the UK case, while the subjective belief-based argument explains the hawkish UK Prime Minister Tony Blair’s decision to participate in the 2003 Iraq War, it does not explain why the dovish Foreign Minister Jack Straw, with a pacifist background, supported military action against Iraq. To explain Straw’s
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32 문재인 (2011), pp. 268-271. This is also what Mr. Yoon Young-kwan recalled during the interview on August 21, 2014.
endorsement of military action, which even lacked the UN Security Council authorization to use force, one needs to closely follow the decision-making process and the diplomatic process at the UN Security Council. More critically, in the ROK case, President Roh Moo-hyun’s subjective beliefs and understandings do not explain his participation decision. President Roh was not only dovish, but also campaigned on a more autonomous alliance relations. The subjectivist explanation alone fails to explain the ROK President Roh Moo-hyun’s puzzling decision to send non-combat troops to Iraq in March 2003.

Lastly, the observed final choice outcomes support my two-level ideational argument of US allies’ joining behaviors. For the UK Prime Minister Tony Blair and the Defense Minister Geoff Hoon, they made the participation decision much earlier on. The theoretical argument also explains why the UK Foreign Minister Jack Straw most slowly made his participation decision, just on the eve of the onset of war. In the ROK case, the Defense Minister Cho Young-kil supported the participation decision and even advocated the deployment of more troops. The Foreign Minister Yoon Young-kwan and the President Roh Moo-hyun made the participation decision, despite the contestation in action knowledge.

In sum, the objective individualist argument based on domestic political constraints and electoral incentives as well as my two-level ideational argument clearly pass the first critical test. Other competing arguments enjoy mixed evidence.

**Critical Test 2—Different Logics of Action**

Before I conduct the second round of critical empirical test, leveraging the differentially expected logics of action, I will first report the findings of the types of cognitive process for each

---

33 This is noted in both of the presidential memoirs and obvious from the Q&A session in the ROK National Defense parliamentary committee meeting on March 21, 2003.
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of the government decision-makers of interest. I look at three types of observational data to measure and operationalize the types of cognitive process.

**UK Findings**

**Text Classification**

For the UK case, I use statements given by the three government decision-makers in the House of Commons. Among the numerous statements on Iraq, I choose the final statement, closest in time to the day of the substantive vote, in order to ensure that the given justifications are indeed the rationales for the final decision. I use the Prime Minister Tony Blair’s speech to the House of Commons on the day of the substantive vote, on March 18\(^{th}\) 2003. I use the Foreign Minister Jack Straw’s opening statement to the House of Commons on the day before the substantive vote, on March 17\(^{th}\) 2003. By the evening of March 17\(^{th}\), 2003, the Foreign Minister had finally decided to endorse British military action against Saddam Hussein and his regime, without the UN Security Council authorization to use armed force. The Defense Minister Geoff Hoon did not speak at these sessions. Although the Defense Minister Geoff Hoon’s opening statement to the House of Commons is further away from the day of the substantive vote, from the declassified documents, it is clear that the military action anticipated by the Defense Minister is real.

In Prime Minister Blair’s House of Commons speech on the day of the substantive vote on March 18\(^{th}\), 2003, the two alternative policy options of non-participation and participation are clearly stated from the very beginning:

“This is a tough choice. But it is also a stark one: to stand British troops down and turn back; or to hold firm to the course we have set.”
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The non-adopted policy option of ‘standing British troops down and turning back’ is stated in a reasonable and conceivable way. Blair then goes on to explain why turning back has serious negative consequences, from Iraq’s continued defiance of UN Security Council resolutions to the situation of the victims of the tyrannical regime to the challenges to freedom. Positive aspects of British military action are highlighted, though Blair talks about the negative aspects of the militant policy too. For instance, he mentions, “there is resentment of US predominance” and “there is fear of US unilateralism” but such registration of concerns over the adopted policy is possible, precisely because his own policy reference group has raised this, and there is, as he notes, “the first cabinet resignation over an issue of policy.”

He assures the divided audience by saying that, “I know all of this,” but what he does not verbalize and what is absent from his speech are the positive aspects of the non-adopted policy. Because the non-adopted policy is clearly stated in a reasonably conceivable manner, but there is an imbalance of reasons across the two policy options, I code the underlying cognitive process as motivated.

Again, I code his statement as motivated process, because there are no positive aspects ascribed to the non-adopted policy of non-participation in the 2003 Iraq War. For it to be classified as a non-motivated process, there needs to be a clear presence of positive aspects of non-participation, but I fail to find this dimension of text. As well, I code Blair’s statement as motivated, rather than taken-for-granted, because the non-adopted position is presented as a clearly reasonable and conceivable option and certain negative aspects are acknowledged about the adopted response.

The Foreign Minister Jack Straw’s opening statement on March 17th, 2003 starts, “With permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a statement in respect of Iraq and the debate that

---
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will be held in the House tomorrow.”

The policy options are tighter in this statement; it is taking military action without the UN Security Council authorization or pursuing further Security Council resolution on the issue. The Foreign Minister has always been open with strategic options. Mr. Straw says that it could achieve peace, if Saddam Hussein complies, and if he does not, it could result in UN-approved military action. In this statement, Straw does not necessarily dismiss the alternative option. In fact, he is in regret to conclude that the alternative option of a peaceful diplomatic process seems infeasible. He even asks for alternatives, “Of course this is a difficult issue, but I ask my right hon. Friends, as well as Opposition Members, who take a different view to spell out in detail what the alternative is.”

Neither Mr. Blair nor Mr. Hoon asks for such open-ended questions for feasible alternatives. Straw also keeps mentioning that the “wide variety of views” in the House should be respected and that these are all “strong views” and “different points of views.” In other words, Straw is not only asking for alternatives but approves of such a variety of views, and sees positive aspects about non-participation and pursuing peaceful diplomatic approach to this disarmament issue. Based on these text dimensions, I classify the statement made by the Foreign Minister on March 17, 2003 as non-motivated process.

Finally, I examine the Defense Minister Geoff Hoon’s opening statement on January 20, 2003. Mr. Hoon states that, “I am now in a position to be able to tell the House that we have reached a view on the composition and deployment of a land force package to provide military

---
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capabilities for potential operations against Iraq. He goes on to describe in detail the
composition of the land force package. Although he ensures that “none of the steps that we are
taking represents a commitment of British forces to specific military action,” his stated reasons
for such deployment of land forces are “to keep military options open” and “to provide a range
of military options.” Unlike the Prime Minister Tony Blair, the Defense Minister Geoff Hoon
does not at all address the alternative option of non-participation in the event of the absence of
the UN Security Council authorization. Indeed, from the previous debates, it shows that such
alternative course of action (i.e. non-participation in the event of the absence of UNSC
authorization) cannot be registered as an actual alternative by the Defense Minister. Based on
such absence of texts on the alternative response, and absence of any negative aspects ascribed to
the adopted response of contingency preparations for war, I code this statement as one-sided
taken-for-grantedness.

Response Time

From the text classifications above, I code the UK Prime Minister Tony Blair, Foreign
Minister Jack Straw, and Defense Minister Geoff Hoon, as motivated, non-motivated, and taken-
for-granted, respectively. I now look at two other measures based on response time and response
change. For the UK case, I use the declassified documents made available by the Iraq Inquiry, to
trace the sequence of final individual-level decisions. The Iraq Inquiry is a public inquiry
mandated by the UK government. The purpose of the Inquiry was to examine the United
Kingdom’s involvement in Iraq, including the way decisions were made and actions taken, to
establish as accurately and reliably as possible what happened and to identify lessons that can be
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learned. The Inquiry was launched on July 30th, 2009, as the UK combat troops withdrew from Iraq in July 2009 and the then UK Labour Government headed by the Prime Minister Gordon Brown judged that it was the right time to begin the inquiry. The inquiry covers the period from 2001 up to the end of July 2009.

According to the declassified documents, the Defense Secretary Geoff Hoon and the Prime Minister Tony Blair reached their participation decisions first, even prior to the official US requests. Before Prime Minister Blair visited President Bush at his ranch in Crawford, Texas on April 5-7, 2002, the Defense Secretary Geoff Hoon wrote to the Prime Minister in his letter dated March 22nd, 2002, “On Iraq, we should support President Bush and be ready for a military contribution. It would take our forces longer to get there than the US’s (if they are working on 90 days from decision).”

In fact, in Geof Hoon’s Iraq Inquiry transcript, when one of the Iraq Inquiry committee members, Lawrence Freedman, twice asked him about his assumption that the British might wish to make a military contribution, Hoon twice answered that although it was not an assumption or an expectation, there was such a “sense,” even prior to the Crawford meeting. I use their words:

**Geoff Hoon:** I think that in the military mind and in the Ministry of Defence, there was a sense that this was a possibility. I would put it no higher than that, certainly not an expectation, and that, therefore, we needed to be inside the process, both to influence it, but equally to understand what was happening, so that if, later on, there was such a request, we knew the nature of that request and why it had been made.

**Lawrence Freedman:** But your focus pre-Crawford was that we had to maintain our position in terms of being able to both influence and participate in some future military operation?

**Geoff Hoon:** Yes, that we needed to understand where the Americans were going, both in the political process but, equally, if necessary, militarily.

**Lawrence Freedman:** Thank you.

---


It also seems that Prime Minister Blair reached his individual level decision fairly early on, even
before he went to Crawford and met with President Bush. In his letter to Jonathan Powell, the
Chief of Staff to the Prime Minister (2001-2007), dated March 17th, 2002, and titled “Iraq,” Tony
Blair notes on the following three thoughts:

Three thoughts:

(1) In all my papers, I do not have a proper worked-out strategy on how we would do it. The US
do not either, but before I go, I need to be able to provide them with a far more intelligent and
detailed analysis of a game-plan. I will need a meeting on this with military folk.

(2) The persuasion job on this seems very tough. My own side are worried. Public opinion is
fragile. International opinion—as I found at the EU—is pretty skeptical.

Yet from a centre-left perspective, the case should be obvious. Saddam’s regime is a brutal,
oppressive military dictatorship. He kills his opponents, has wrecked his country’s economy and
is a source of instability and danger in the region. I can understand a right-wing Tory opposed to
‘nation-building’ being opposed to it on grounds it hasn’t any direct bearing on our national
interest. But in fact a political philosophy that does care about other nations—eg Kosovo,
Afghanistan, Sierra Leone—and is prepared to change regimes on the merits, should be gung-ho
on Saddam.

So why isn’t it? Because people believe we are only doing it to support the US; and they are only
ding it to settle on old-score. And the immediate WMD problems don’t seem obviously worse
than 3 years ago.

So we have to re-order our story and message. Increasingly, I think it should be about the nature
of the regime. We do intervene—as per the Chicago speech. We have no inhibitions—where we
reasonably can—about nation-building ie we must come to our conclusion on Saddam from our
own position, not the US position.

(3) Oil prices. This is my big domestic worry. We must concert with the US to get action from
others to push the price back down. Higher petrol prices really might put the public off.

PRIME MINISTER

Even though both Goeff Hoon and Tony Blair seemed to have made the joining decisions
fairly quickly, even a year before the actual military action in March 2003, there is a clear
difference in their reasoning and awareness. While the Defense Minister Geoff Hoon does not
show any particular reservations, Blair is very well aware of the divisions and oppositions to
British participation in the US-led military action and clearly exhibits post-hoc rationalization. One could argue that while Geoff Hoon does not have to consider these political oppositions, and therefore does not have to engage in rationalization, the Prime Minister has to. But even in parliamentary debate settings, where Geoff Hoon has to give a statement on the Defense Ministry’s policy and contingency planning, and take opposition questions from the floor, Hoon does not seem to register the opposition views and feasibility of alternative courses of action. One could resort to possible differences in various individual-level characteristics, but as I later show in Section III of this chapter, the same decision-maker exhibits different types of cognitive process, depending on the foreign policy issue area.

Finally, for the Foreign Minister Jack Straw, it seems like he made his final participation decision to endorse British military action, just one day before the substantive vote in the Parliament. From the declassified documents that note his phone call with the French Foreign Secretary Villepin, it is apparent that for Jack Straw, there was an understanding and still alive preference for some way ahead with the new UN Security Council resolution. Indeed, even in the last minute of the final government-level decision, Mr. Straw says that he gave further options to the Prime Minister. Thus, the UK sequence of final individual-level decisions is as follows: Defense Minister Geoff Hoon and Prime Minister Tony Blair made their individual level participation decisions surprisingly early on, while the Foreign Minister Jack Straw made his final individual level decision for participation in the 2003 US-led Iraq War, just on the eve of the onset of war.

---


45 It is noted in Mr. Straw’s first written statement to the Iraq Inquiry, and is also noted in Mr. Blair’s memoir, A Journey.
When I comparing these relative response time findings with the above text classification findings, the indicators are consistent with each other. For instance, from the text classification of stated justifications, I find a motivated process for the Prime Minister Tony Blair and he had indeed made up his mind fairly early on, even prior to his visit to Crawford in April 2002. Similarly, I find a taken-for-granted process for the Defense Minister Geoff Hoon and he had made up his mind early on too, prior to the Crawford meeting in April 2002. For the Foreign Minister Jack Straw, I had found a non-motivated process from his statement, and he made up his mind right on the eve of the government-level decision to join the military action against Iraq.

Response Change

I use the Iraq Inquiry as proxy interviews with the UK government decision-makers. All three government actors, among many others, appeared in person as witnesses, and the Inquiry’s interview format is a highly structured inquiry, consisting mostly of fact-oriented questions. I concentrate on two specific places in the entire inquiry for each decision-maker. At the very end of the inquiry, the committee asks each witness for any high level lessons learned. I look at their responses here. I also focus on areas where the decision-makers themselves use the phrase, ‘with the benefit of hindsight.’

Only the Foreign Minister Jack Straw shows regrets, in that he consistently states that he regrets the loss of life and the injuries. In addition, in his written statement, Straw writes that:

“The question of whether to go to war has also been one of the most divisive, certainly in my political lifetime. It made many people very angry at the time, and subsequently. That and the failure to find any WMD has undermined trust. Above all, there has been the grave loss of life—of our military personnel and civilians, others in the coalition, and the many thousands of Iraqis. I deeply regret this.”

---

46 He says this at the end of this final witness inquiry and writes about it at the beginning of his first statement.
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Although Mr. Straw goes on to write that, “I made my choice. I have never backed away from it, and I do not intend to do so, and fully accept the responsibilities which flow from that,” he does seem to accept the regretful sides of the decision. This is apparent in his written statement on January 21, 2010:

“But, to paraphrase Kierkegaard, whilst life can only be understood backwards, it has to be lived forward. We did not have the benefit of hindsight. I have gone over again and again the judgments we made at the time. Many were widely shared. “It is for the Iraqi regime to end this crisis by complying with the demands of the Security Council” was the view of the European Union, France and Germany included. It was my profound view too.”

For Prime Minister Tony Blair, there were two witness sessions. In his first session on January 29th, 2010, Blair’s answer to John Chilcot’s question of what broad lessons are drawn and any regrets about key aspects of the Iraq conflict was:

**Tony Blair:** I feel -- of course, I had to take this decision as Prime Minister and it was a huge responsibility then, and there is not a single day that passes by that I don't reflect and think about that responsibility, and so I should. But I genuinely believe that if we had left Saddam in power, even with what we know now, we would still have had to have dealt with him, possibly in circumstances where the threat was worse and possibly in circumstances where it was hard to mobilise any support for dealing with that threat.

**John Chilcot:** And no regrets?

**Tony Blair:** Responsibility but not a regret for removing Saddam Hussein. I think that he was a monster, I believe he threatened, not just the region but the world, and in the circumstances that we faced then, but I think even if you look back now, it was better to deal with this threat, to deal with it, to remove him from office, and I do genuinely believe that the world is safer as a result.

In his second session on January 21st, 2011, Tony Blair responds to the final question on the lessons learned as follows:

**Tony Blair:** At the conclusion of the last hearing you asked me whether I had any regrets. I took that as a question about the decision to go to war and I answered that I took responsibility. That was taken as my meaning that I had no regrets about the loss of life and that was never my meaning or my intention. I wanted to make that clear that, of course, I regret deeply and

---

profoundly the loss of life, whether from our own armed forces, those of other nations, the civilians who helped people in Iraq or the Iraqis themselves.

Then Blair goes on to the learned lessons on planning for nation building and civil policing, some frustrations on the structure of Downing Street, and to his own question of—is it really worth it? His final answer is, “My view obviously is clear that it is.”49 In both of his sessions, Blair argues that the world now is indeed a safer place than the counterfactual scenario of Saddam Hussein still in power. Again, no positive aspects are attached to the non-adopted response of non-participation, and there is no response change.

Finally, for the Defense Minister Geoff Hoon, his answer to the very last question for any high level lessons learned is: “No, I don’t think so. I have been grateful for the opportunity of setting out my thoughts and grateful to the Inquiry for the care with which they have approached them.”50 In his written evidence too, Geoff Hoon states that, “I accept now with the benefit of hindsight, that the balance of our preparations could have been different.”51 In sum, although none of the three government decision-makers stated that they would make a different choice, the benefits of hindsight contain serious regrets for Jack Straw.

The failure to find response changes in the Foreign Minister Jack Straw is not necessarily inconsistent with the other two measures. Mr. Straw can think through and still make the same judgment. The low prospects of response change were expected for the Prime Minister and the Defense Minister; in fact, if I had seen a clear response change and clear regrets, then these findings would be inconsistent with the other two measures and ultimately disconfirm my theoretical expectations. While I expected those with socially constrained process to highly


likely show response change, there is no one from the UK government decision-makers of interest, who indicates a socially constrained process. Response change was only most probable for Jack Straw, whose measures indicate a non-motivated process, but he does not say that he would have made another choice, and this is not inconsistent with the theory.

Overall, the three measures based on text classification, response time, and response change are consistent with one another for each of the three government decision-makers of interest. The UK Prime Minister Tony Blair, Foreign Minister Jack Straw, and Defense Minister Geoff Hoon engaged in motivated, non-motivated, and taken-for-granted processes in generating the participation decisions, respectively. I note a critical piece of evidence of the logic of practice for the UK Defense Minister Geoff Hoon. He literally verbalizes that he fleetingly considered non-participation and had asked his officers of what would happen if the UK did not participate in the operation. Such fleeting consideration is sufficiently different from the taken-for-granted cognitive process; UK participation for Mr. Hoon is based on practice, standard, and custom, and is not taken as natural.

**ROK Findings**

Now I move onto the ROK case and report the findings on the types of cognitive process for each of the three government decision-makers of interest. I measure the different logics of action based on three types of observational data: 1) text classification, 2) response time, and 3) response change.

**Text Classification**

In the ROK parliamentary system, the government decision-makers do not normally make statements and report to the whole unicameral parliamentary body. The Foreign and
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Defense Ministers, however, do regularly make statements and answer questions to relevant parliamentary foreign or military affairs committees. Thus, I use the Foreign and Defense Ministers’ statements to these committees on the day after the government-level decision to participate and deploy non-combat troops to Iraq has been reached. In the ROK case, the defense committee unanimously approved the government motion to support and participate in the US-led operation in Iraq. Once the government motion passes through the relevant committee, it goes to the whole National Assembly for a vote. Yet, it took some time for the whole National Assembly to vote on the government motion, sent in by the defense committee. There was a delay of about two weeks, because there was much more contention in the wider parliament level. For the first time in the ROK’s parliamentary history, the National Assembly held a special two-day meeting on the issue of Iraq deployment (국군부대의 이라크 파견동의안에 관한 전원위원회) over the weekend of March 28-29, 2003.

The ROK President Roh Moo-hyun also made a special, non-default, in-person speech to the National Assembly ahead of the parliamentary vote on April 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2003, and I classify the text in this speech given by the ROK President Roh Moo-hyun. In this speech, the ROK President clearly states the two policy options of participation and non-participation in the US-led operation in Iraq. He even verbalizes that if this were his own personal choice, and not a decision that he as the ROK President have to make, then he would have been opposed to the ROK’s participation in the Iraq War. He also mentions that he will not try to discuss or persuade others about the justness of the Iraq War. However, given the DPRK nuclear issue, Mr. Roh explains that cooperation with the United States is critical for a peaceful resolution of the DPRK nuclear issue.
2003 Iraq War Decisions

In Roh Moo-hyun’s and the incumbent ROK President Moon Jae-in’s memoirs, it is stated that President Roh did not actively try to persuade the nation on the positive aspects of the war, such as the need to address Iraq’s defiance of the UN Security Council resolutions over the past 12 years. In his own memoirs, Mr. Roh also wrote that he expects himself to be remembered as the President who made the wrong decision for the wrong war, but notes that he nonetheless has to make such a choice, because he is the one person in charge of the physical well-being of the nation. In his mind, building up the political capital to absolutely avert any US military action on the Korean Peninsula seems to have been the most vivid, compelling reason behind his alignment and participation decision. Because Roh Moo-hyun’s April 2nd speech clearly articulates both policy options, and indicates positive aspects of the non-adopted policy, while ascribing negative but necessary aspects of the adopted response, I code this as socially constrained process. It is also non-motivated, because Roh can discuss the positive aspects of both policy options. Yet, there is clearest evidence of social, and in particular, role constraints, as he says that as the ROK President, he has to make this decision.

There is an ample amount of evidence of a socially constrained process in Roh’s own memoirs. Mr. Roh writes that anyone can have any perspective on the ROK-US bilateral relations, but that Presidents have to maintain a strong relationship that is essential for the ROK and the United States. He also notes that he himself knew that he will be remembered as the President who committed “historical error” by making the participation decision, but
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refreshingly felt that he still has to. Mr. Roh added that the “place”\textsuperscript{56} of the President is difficult and weighty. He says that these are the “realities.”\textsuperscript{57}

For the Foreign Minister Yoon Young-kwan, I examine his statement to the Foreign Affairs parliamentary committee (통일외교통상위원회) made on March 21\textsuperscript{st}, 2003. In this statement, I do not find any mention of the non-adopted response of non-participation. After briefing on the background of the US-led military action against Iraq, Mr. Yoon says that the ROK wishes to support the US and the international community in their military action to disarm Iraq, that defied UNSC resolutions for the past 12 years, and that the deployment decision is for the peaceful resolution of the DPRK nuclear issue and for the ROK-US alliance.\textsuperscript{58} The Foreign Minister Yoon mentions that the government considered a host of factors—the debate on the Iraq issue, the need for non-proliferation of WMD, the importance of ROK-US alliance, and the domestic public opinion—and overall evaluated that the deployment of non-combat troops maximizes the national interest.\textsuperscript{59} Here, although there is no clear mention of the non-adopted policy of non-participation, there is a balance of reasons for the finally adopted choice. He notes that the UN Security Council efforts over the second resolution failed and that the South Korean domestic public opinion was divided right down the middle. The Foreign Minister Yoon did not just give one-sided, positive picture of the deployment choice. There were balanced assessments and analyses. He himself said that the government considered multiple factors and that on balance, this was the best decision. However, because this ‘balance’ was among the positive and negative aspects of the deployment choice, and not necessarily across the participation and non-

\textsuperscript{56} Please see 노무현 (2009), 223. This word choice is author’s translation.
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\textsuperscript{59} Ibid.
participation choice, I classify this statement as socially constrained process. The workings of social constraints here is that Mr. Yoon is not able to imagine the alternative response of non-participation in a full-fledged manner.

Finally, for the Defense Minister Cho Young-kil, I examine his statement to the Defense parliamentary committee (국방위 원회) on the same day of March 21\textsuperscript{st}, 2003. The stated reasons are clearly one-sided, as they are more focused on active support for the United States and on the importance of the alliance relationship with the US. He explains that, “our support for US military action is necessary because of our support for the international war against terrorism, contribution to world peace, and strengthening of the ROK-US alliance. The ROK’s participation will increase the armed forces’ ROK-US combined operational skills, stabilize the supply of energy, contribute to the post-conflict reconstruction effort, and maximize national interest.”\textsuperscript{60} In the statement, there are no concerns, reservations, doubts, or negative aspects of the adopted policy of participation. There are no words or indications of ‘balance.’ With regards to the international support for the war, he only mentions how many countries are already decided on participation and military contribution. As it is a one-sided, elaborately positive, reasoning for the adopted position of deployment of non-combat troops, I code this as a taken-for-granted process.

\textbf{Response Time}

From the text classification measures, I code the ROK President Roh Moo-hyun, Foreign Minister Yoon Young-kwan, and Defense Minister Cho Young-kil, as non-motivated and socially constrained, socially constrained, and taken-for-granted. I now look at two other measures based on response time and response change. For the ROK case, the ROK government

\textsuperscript{60} ROK Foreign Affairs parliamentary committee. March 21, 2003.
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decision-making process and the documents for the 2003 Iraq War participation decision is not
yet made public. Without access to these primary documents, I triangulate information on the
relative response time across various sources, including published memoirs and my own
interviews with the Foreign and Defense Ministers.

To begin with, the Defense Minister Cho Young-kil seemed to have been in preparation
of military deployment since his first day in office. In fact, it is noted that the Defense Ministry
had given early promises of military contributions to the Pentagon. The composition and size
of the military contribution seems to have been around 7,000-10,000 combat troops. The
Foreign Minister Yoon Young-kwan also seemed to have been aware of the debates in the UN
Security Council, but quickly reconciled his reservations through the option of deploying non-
combat forces and focused on the ROK’s reconstruction efforts in Iraq. In the memoirs, it is
stated that the entire Foreign Affairs-National Defense line of the Blue House was in support of
the ROK’s participation in the US-led operation in Iraq.

It is apparent that the ROK President Roh Moo-hyun took the longest time in finally
deciding to participate and deploy non-combat troops to the US-led operation in Iraq. It seemed
to be a momentous decision for the newly elected President. These findings that the ROK
Defense Minister Cho Young-kil was the first to make the participation decision, while President
Roh Moo-hyun was the last, are consistent with the text-based measures.

--
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Response Change

For the ROK case, I was able to conduct face-to-face interviews with the ROK Foreign and Defense Ministers in August and October of 2014, respectively. An interview with President Roh Moo-hyun was not at all possible, given that he passed away in May 2009. My interviews were semi-structured and I took notes during the interview. My notes were then supplemented by extensions immediately following the interview. I did not record the interviews. I had five core questions, mainly on the linkage between public opinion and the Iraq War participation decision, but I had a specific counterfactual question regarding the DPRK nuclear situation.

I conducted a face-to-face interview with the ROK Foreign Minister Yoon Young-kwan at his office in Seoul National University, on August 21\textsuperscript{st}, 2014. Below is a set of question and answers that are relevant for the measure based on response change.

\textbf{Author}: If the administration was aware of significant public opposition, then why did the administration go against the preference of the majority of the public?

\textbf{Yoon Young-kwan}: There were essentially two reasons why the President chose to deploy troops to Iraq. The first was to peacefully resolve the North Korean nuclear issue. At the time, strengthening the ROK-US cooperation was the key to peaceful resolution to the North Korean nuclear issue. The second reason was to honor the ROK-US alliance.

\textbf{Author}: If it was NOT the United States that asked for troop contributions in Iraq, would South Korea have still made the same decision?

\textbf{Yoon Young-kwan}: No.

\textbf{Author}: If it was still the US asking for troop contributions, but North Korea had no nuclear problems. Say that North Korea perpetually destroyed its nuclear potential/capabilities in the 1990s and North Korea was not stoking up any trouble. Would South Korea have sent noncombat troops to Iraq?

\textbf{Yoon Young-kwan}: I do see a possibility of not sending troops in this case.

His answer to this final hypothetical scenario indicates that response change is “possible” for the Foreign Minister, signaling that the specific features and contexts of the decision problem were
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taken into account on balance. In other words, such possibility signals that the decision-making process for Yoon was slow, serial, and controlled. The issue of whether he would really make a different choice is besides the aim and scope of this study, as there would still then be the effects of institutional level non-contestation in action knowledge towards participation and support for US-led operations, even when there is a lack of international institutional authorization to use armed force. The possibility of response change just indicates that Yoon’s decision in March 2003 had not been generated through taken-for-granted or motivated processes. I can confidently cross those two types of cognitive process out.

I conducted a face-to-face interview with the ROK Defense Minister Cho Young-kil at his office in at the Korea Institute for Military Affairs (한국군사문제연구원) on October 17th, 2014. Below is a set of question and answers that are relevant for the measure based on response change:

**Author:** If the administration was aware of significant public opposition, then why did the administration go against the preference of the majority of the public?

**Cho Young-kil:** National interest. It was for national security. Our alliance with the US contributes significantly to our security. ROK-US alliance is not as sturdy as you think. It is really just a political rhetoric. It is only maintained due to needs and interests. It is a very fragile relationship. This nation-to-nation relationship can break, due to a small thing. I had two things in mind: 1) ROK-US military alliance, 2) the safety of our soldiers.

**Author:** What if it was NOT the US asking for troop contributions?

**Cho Young-kil:** No, we wouldn’t have gone.

**Author:** What about the possibility of US strikes in North Korea? Did you consider this possibility when making the decisions?

**Cho Young-kil:** It’s true that the US seriously thought of this option in 1994, during the time of the first North Korean nuclear issue. However, President Kim Young-sam sternly said “No,” and the US can’t independently make such decisions. And so, I haven’t even imagined the possibility of Americans striking North Korea.
I did not ask further on the counterfactual scenario, because I did not expect this last answer from Mr. Cho. The question was just a way to go into the hypothetical scenario, fully expecting that he would answer somewhere along the lines of, ‘Yes, that was the main factor in the decision.’ But since he said that the DPRK nuclear issue was not an issue for his decision, I did not follow up with the question about the counterfactual scenario of no nuclear issue at the time. Nonetheless, the differences in reasons for the participation decision in the post-decision time period and the decision-making period of interest highlight that stated reasons may be intentional or unintentional hooks or covers. This is most likely in the cases of taken-for-granted or motivated processes. For the more slow and controlled types of cognitive process, such as the non-motivated and socially constrained, the tipping points in decision-making would be clear and more consistently stated across the time periods.

Although I could not interview the ROK President Roh Moo-hyun, in my two interviews as well as in the two memoirs, I could see Mr. Roh think deeply about the possibility of response change. For instance, in the interview, the Foreign Minister Yoon Young-kwan notes that, “I remember President Roh being highly conscious of US considerations to strike the nuclear facilities in Yongbyun, North Korea in 1994, when William Perry was the Secretary of Defense. The threshold of “highly” negative security implications is the possibility of military activities on the Korean Peninsula.”66 He also notes that, “There was a divide within the Roh administration. While the relevant government ministries advised the President to send noncombat troops to Iraq, the Blue House staff who manages Roh’s support groups was not supportive of such policy. These staff members encouraged an independent and autonomous foreign policy decision. In the end, though, the President chose to dispatch troops to Iraq for the two aforementioned key

---

66 Author interview with Mr. Yoon Young-kwan (ROK Foreign Affairs Minister 2003-2004) on August 21, 2014.
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reasons.” Since the Foreign Minister Yoon Young-kwan is the right witness, who was there all along, his answer of “I do see a possibility of not sending troops in this case” may also be the case with President Roh. Again, it is beyond the scope of this dissertation to make the case that such possibility will crystalize in actual non-participation, as there would still be the institutional level non-contestation in action knowledge towards participation. But such verbalization of possibility of response change does valuably indicate that the ROK President Roh Moo-hyun did not engage in taken-for-granted or motivated processes.

Moreover, Mr. Roh himself talks about the difference in responses in his speech as well as his memoirs. He says that if this were his private choice, he would choose otherwise. However, because he is the President, who is responsible for the physical well-being and safety of the people, he needs to cooperate with the United States in order to avert any US military action on the Korean Peninsula. Because Mr. Roh directly and clearly verbalizes such differences in response choices, I take this as strongest evidence of the effects of social and role constraints in his decision-making process.

Overall, the three measures based on text classification, response time, and response change are consistent with one another for each of the three government decision-makers of interest in the ROK case too. The ROK President Roh Moo-hyun, Foreign Minister Yoon Young-kwan, and Defense Minister Cho Young-kil engaged in non-motivated and socially constrained, socially constrained, and taken-for-granted, processes in generating the participation decisions, respectively. The operationalized logics of action in both the UK and ROK cases confirm my elaborate expectations on the types of cognitive process, and support my two-level

---

67 Author interview with Mr. Yoon Young-kwan (ROK Foreign Affairs Minister 2003-2004) on August 21, 2014.
ideational argument on the US allies’ joining behaviors specified from the general level sociological theory of choice.

**Addressing the Alternative Explanations on the Logic of Habit**

I now address the alternative explanations on why one might actually observe the logic of habit. I start with the objective holist arguments that focus on threats and relative dependence on the alliance. If existential regional threats are high, one might expect the national decision-makers to take security cooperation with the United States for granted. In the ROK case, however, I only observe taken-for-grantedness in the Defense Minister Cho Young-kil. For the Foreign Minister Yoon Young-kwan, the decision was more balanced and reserved, and for the ROK President Roh Moo-hyun, he openly verbalized the effects of social and role constraints on his participation decision.

As well, for the UK case, one could argue that because the perceived threat from the target of the US-led operation, in this case, the proliferation of WMD in Saddam Hussein’s Iraq, was so high at the time that the UK decision-makers took the alignment and participation choice for granted. Yet, again, only the UK Defense Minister Geoff Hoon closely exhibits the logic of habit, or more precisely the logic of practice, while the other two government actors show either motivated or non-motivated processes. I fail to find support for the objective holist explanations based on the complete information game.

Still, one could insist that only the Defense Ministers are fully informed of the threats to national security. These could be regional threats or threat from the target of the US-led operation. Only the Defense Ministers are in the complete information game, and so they are able to reach the participation decision quickly. If I examine the actual substance of the reasons and justifications given by the Defense Ministers, their fast, taken-for-granted cognitive process
is not driven by balance-of-threat incentives. The UK Defense Minister Geoff Hoon never once highlighted the threat of Saddam Hussein’s Iraq, while the ROK Defense Minister Cho Young-kil did not highlight the threat of DPRK’s nuclear issue. Rather, Geoff Hoon focused on the UK’s influence in US war planning and decision-making, while Cho Young-kil focused on the need to cooperate with the United States in order to peacefully resolve the DPRK’s nuclear issue. Such reasons of UK influence in the US decision-making process and ROK’s buying of political capital are not predicted by the neorealist arguments based on the balance-of-threat incentives.

With regards to the other objectivist side-payments argument, the ROK case fits more appropriately than the UK case. In exchange for the ROK’s support and participation in the US-led operation in Iraq, it is clear than the ROK government wanted and demand a peaceful approach to the DPRK nuclear issue. The ROK government sought the US government’s support for a multilateral, peaceful approach to the nuclear issue on the Korean Peninsula and wanted to avert any military action. Such clear side deals are evident across various sources, and yet, I fail to observe the logic of habit, or taken-for-grantedness, across all three government decision-makers. Besides the Defense Minister Cho Young-kil, the other two decision-makers exhibit social constraints in that the Foreign Minister Yoon Young-kwan does not seriously conceive of alternative responses, while the ROK President Roh Moo-hyun verbalizes that he personally does not wish to support the war and ROK’s participation in it, but that he nonetheless has to, due to his role constraints. If the security side-deal is so clearly beneficial, then on the basis of clear payoff structures, all government decision-makers should show the fast, taken-for-granted cognitive process, but I fail to find support for this expectation.

Moving onto the second alternative argument on why one would find the logic of habit, the objective individualist arguments expect that when national leaders do not face critical
political opposition, they may habitually choose to cooperate with the United States. The political office-seeking incentives are less clear for the ROK case, as ROK presidents serve only for one term, and the Foreign Minister and Defense Minister at the time were not members of the parliament. However, in the UK case, the UK Prime Minister Tony Blair enjoyed popularity and the Labour government was a majority government. All three government decision-makers of interest were members of the parliament and so they would have electoral incentives. The main opposition—the Conservative Party—was in support of UK’s participation in the Iraq War in 2003, and so there was no serious political contender. Nonetheless, I find motivated process for Mr. Blair, and non-motivated process for the Foreign Minister Jack Straw. The objective individualist argument does not hold up.

In general, the objectivist arguments expect the national leaders to be consummate calculators of the balance, prudently and deliberatively playing the two-level game. If the prototypical non-motivated process is supposed to underlie the decisions, then I fail to find support for this expectation of deliberating actors, because I only observe the prototypical non-motivated process for the UK Foreign Minister Jack Straw. Even in this case, though, Mr. Straw’s ultimate maximization problem did not concern balance-of-threats or votes.

Next, the subjective holist, or intersubjectivist, explanation expects the logic of habit, but it is not clear when the logics of habit and non-habit would play out. My two-level ideational arguments aims to fill this theoretical gap and there is decisive cross-national evidence.

Finally, the subjective individualist, or subjectivist, explanation expects those with strong and consistent attitudes to show the logic of habit, or the fast taken-for-granted cognitive process. If I only look at the individual level of analysis, the UK Prime Minister Tony Blair, the UK Defense Minister Geoff Hoon, and the ROK Defense Minister Cho Young-kil have strong and
consistent attitudes. They are in Figure 4.1 column (1). As well, the ROK President Roh Moo-hyun also has a strong and consistent attitude towards non-participation in US-led operations that especially lack any international mandate. These four individuals are the likely candidates to show the logic of habit. However, only the ROK Defense Minister Cho Young-kil exhibits taken-for-grantedness, according to the three different measures, and the other three actors show the logic of practice, motivated process, as well as non-motivated and socially constrained process. In other words, there are a wide variety of the types of cognitive process generating the final choice across these individual decision-makers who have similarly strong and consistent attitudes on the particular foreign security policy issue.

Because I fail to find support for these alternative arguments on why we would expect to observe the logic of habit, I conclude that there is ample cross-national empirical evidence for my two-level ideational argument focused on the degree of two-level contestation in action knowledge.

III. Exploring the Causal Implications

In this section, I tackle the second major objective of this chapter, which is to explore the causal implications of my two-level ideational argument on the US allies’ joining behaviors. In the survey experiments, I did not directly test for the independent causal effects of the different degrees of two-level contestation in the action knowledge. Hence, I employ the controlled comparison method to explore the independent causal effects of the different degrees of two-level contestation in the action knowledge for each of the government decision-makers of interest. Specifically, I employ a within-individual cross-issues design to investigate how the same actor provides justifications and reacts to various foreign policy issues. The strength of
such within-individual cross-issues design is that it holds the individual level attributes, including traits and dispositions, constant, while changing the issue areas that plausibly have different degrees of two-level contestation in action knowledge. Thus, with this within-individual cross-issues research design, I am also able to address the alternative individual level explanation on the types of cognitive process that focuses on domain-general attributes.

To ensure that the individual level factors are constant, I narrow down the time period to the same 2002-2003 decision-making period of interest. Any further removed periods may not necessarily ensure that the individual level attributes are constant, as orientations and dispositions could potentially change over time. Thus, I try to focus on the time period as close as possible to the Iraq War decision-making period. Further, I fix the social setting for each decision-maker, in order to control for various effects that could come from different rules and procedures as well as audiences. This means that for all government decision-makers, except for the ROK President Roh Moo-hyun, I focus on the parliamentary settings. For the UK decision-makers only, I even fix the dates of these settings, in order to keep all others factors constant.

I use the two dimensions from my Codebook to classify the textual data. My theoretical expectations are that, for each actor, the two textual dimensions would be different across different issue areas. However, if the two text-based dimensions are mainly driven by individual level attributes, other than the degree of two-level contestation in pre-existing action knowledge, then these dimensions may be the more or less similar across the foreign policy issue areas. For instance, the UK Prime Minister Tony Blair would tend to engage in motivated reasoning across most issue areas, while the UK Foreign Minister Jack Straw would likely show non-motivated process across most issue areas.

68 For the ROK President Roh Moo-hyun, as it is extremely rare in the ROK case that the president discusses and engages in day-to-day debates in the National Assembly, I focus on his public speeches on various foreign policy issues and analyze those texts.
UK Findings: Within-Individual Cross-Issues Variations

For the UK case, I have narrowed the parliamentary debates to those sessions where the government decision-makers are moving motions, giving statements, or leading debates on government policy on the Iraq’s Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) issue during the six-months period prior to the 2003 Iraq War (September 2002-March 2003). With regards to terrorism and foreign security policy, issues on Israel and the Middle East process, Northern Ireland, and Kosovo were frequently brought up during these parliamentary debates. Of these, Northern Ireland is a domestic issue, but it still offers a good comparison across issue areas, and the question was in terms of terrorist concerns within the terrorism debate.

Tony Blair

To begin with the UK Prime Minister Tony Blair, the parliament was recalled to debate on the issue of Iraq’s WMD issue on September 24th, 2002. The Prime Minister’s opening statement highlighted that the containment policy and sanctions were not working. He argues that “the weapons of mass destruction programme is not shut down; it is up and running now” and highlights all the negative aspects about Saddam Hussein’s regime. In this opening statement, he goes through a list of questions: But why Saddam? Why now? Why should Britain care? I code this opening statement in September 2002 as motivated process, because there are clearly two alternative options with a clear imbalance of reasons. No positive aspects are ascribed to the alternative option of inaction.

On this same day, during this same debate, several Members of the Parliament (MP) asked if the Prime Minister would be similarly committed to the enforcement of the UN Security Council Resolutions concerning Israel and Palestine. Blair was simply one-sided about the issue;

in short, UN resolutions would be implemented in a peaceful way. I do not find a single 
utterance or text of military action or even a possibility of military action to enforce the UN 
Security Council resolutions. As such, there is an absence of texts on why a military enforcement 
action would be undesirable. The Prime Minister’s answers are in the lines of: “We are working 
with the Americans and others to try to put together a proper conference on the issue to get the 
peace process restarted. We stand ready to help, in any way we can, on issues of both security 
and political reform, which are important prerequisites to getting that peace process under way,” 
“we must give thought to how we engage with the Arab world. In that context it is important that 
we try to push forward the middle east peace process without apportioning blame on either side: 
we can blame one side or the other for a long time and get nowhere. We need a huge 
mobilization of energy to get that process going.” In other words, such one-sided reasoning just 
for the peaceful process suggests that Blair was taking the peaceful approach for granted; a 
forceful approach is non-actual and unimaginable.

Again, on this same day, during this same debate, there was a comment on the situation 
in Northern Ireland. When David Trimble, a Northern Irish MP of Upper Bann, makes the 
comment, “while many people applaud the clarity and the vigour with which the Prime Minister 
is pursuing this matter, many people feel that there are similar problems nearer home that would 
benefit from the same approach,” and Blair replies:

**Tony Blair:** I still believe that the peace process in Northern Ireland offers a better opportunity 
for a peaceful future than does any other alternative.

First, Blair is able to verbalize both peace process and any other alternative. Although it is clear 
that Blair prefers the peace process in Northern Ireland, the comparison across the alternative 
options is in terms of *positive* aspects, meaning that Blair has regarded and registered the positive
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aspects of the alternative options. He uses the word ‘better’ than ‘worse.’ This is quite different from his earlier opening statement and answers to the many questions on Iraq, wherein only the negative aspects are highlighted for the alternative option of doing nothing about the problem. From this first serious debate on the Iraq WMD situation alone, I find strong evidence of within-individual cross-issues variations in the textual dimensions for the UK Prime Minister Tony Blair. In this session on September 24th, 2002, his answers to the questions on Iraq, Northern Ireland, Israel and Palestine indicate motivated process, non-motivated process, and taken-for-granted process.

Jack Straw

I also find within-individual cross-issues variations for the Foreign Minister Jack Straw. On November 25th, 2002, when Jack Straw reports back to the House of Commons on the unanimous adoption of the UNSC resolution 1441, which is explained to “represent the considered view of the international community that Iraq must end its decade of defiance of the United Nations,” he gets to talk about Kosovo and Israel. But before I go into Kosovo and Israel, I point out that even in this momentous session on November 2002, Jack Straw clearly registered the MP questioning on the UK military action with or without the UN Security Council authorization to use force. When the MPs asked about, however unlikely, at the end of the tunnel, if the inspectors report that they are receiving full cooperation and that Iraq is moving towards the removal of WMD, Straw says, “Yes, there is a pathway to peace,” and replies in the following way:

Jack Straw: Felicitous though all who speak from the Treasury Bench must be with words, the words would not come if Iraq had properly complied with the resolution yet one of us had to come to the House to explain, why, not withstanding that fact, we were going to take military

In his answers, Straw addresses two clear possibilities: both a pathway to peace and the pathway to military action, and remains open and balanced towards the two diametrically alternative policy options.

On this same day, during this same session, he argues that Kosovo was the right decision, even when the military action against Milosevic took place in the absence of the UN Security Council resolution authorizing the use of force. He also comments that this judgment was never challenged. I code these statements as one-sided reasoning. The following are his remarks on Kosovo:

**Jack Straw:** As for humanitarian action, exactly this issue arose in 1999 in respect of Kosovo. Could there be military action against Milosevic, whom we now know to have been a brutal dictator, in the absence of a clear United Nations Security Council resolution, and given also that the Russian Federation, a member of the P5, moved an unacceptable resolution that we had to veto? The judgment was that the international community could take action, and that has never been challenged.

**Jack Straw:** Aside from self-defence and other issues, the problem within this framework arises only if there is a clear prospect that the right thing to do is likely to be vetoed by other members of the Security Council, as happened over Kosovo in 1998.\(^{71}\)

In his answers and comments about military action in Kosovo, Mr. Straw does not utter a word about in-action or peaceful process. The adopted response of military action is verbalized and he considers it as the right thing to do. There are only one-sided, positive aspects about military action against Milosevic. There are hints of no response change. As such, these text-based dimensions suggest a taken-for-granted cognitive process for Mr. Straw. As well, on this same day, during this same session, there was a question with regards to Israel:

\(^{71}\) UK House of Commons Hansard. November 25, 2002.
Llew Smith (Blaenau Gwent): As consideration has obviously been given about going to war with Iraq, has similar consideration been given to going to war with Israel, because it too has weapons of mass destruction, it too is daily breaking UN resolutions, it too is invading another country and it too has a leader in Sharon who is a state terrorist?

Jack Straw: The point that my hon. Friend seeks to make is about the proper and full enforcement of all UN Security Council resolutions. We support the proper and full enforcement of all resolutions, including 242, 338, 1397, and 1402 in response of the Middle East. Those resolutions impose obligations not just on the state of Israel—and we want to see them enforced—but on the Palestinian Authority and on the other Arab states. There is a process for dealing with those. The chapter VII resolutions of which Iraq stands in breach impose particular unilateral obligations on the Government of Iraq.

Again, for this particular question on Israel, there is no verbalization of the alternative option of military action to enforce the UN Security Council resolutions. In fact, when the Foreign Minister Jack Straw makes a statement to the House of Commons on Global Terrorism/Iraq, on January 21st, 2003, Peter Tapsell raises, “What about Israel?” and Mr. Straw straightforwardly replies that there will be no military action:

Jack Straw: There are no sanctions against Israel. There are no mandatory resolutions against Israel. A series of resolutions apply to Israel and the occupied territories—to the Palestinians and the Arabs—and we want them all to be implemented, but we are not going to resolve the conflict between Israel and Palestinians by military action.

Here, the fact that Straw can verbalize no military action, signals something in between one-sided taken-for-grantedness and motivated process. In all, I find strong evidence for within-individual cross-issues variations in the textual measures for the Foreign Minister Jack Straw. These variations are even from one parliamentary session, on November 25th, 2002, when he updated the parliament about the unanimously adopted UN Security Council resolution 1441. On this same day, during the same session, his answers and comments on Iraq, Kosovo, and Israel indicate non-motivated process, and one-sided taken-for-grantedness, respectively.
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Geoff Hoon

Finally, I find within-individual cross-issues variations for the Defense Minister Geoff Hoon. On November 25th, 2002, when the Foreign Secretary Jack Straw was present and briefing the House of Commons about the UN Security Council resolution 1441, the Defense Minister was also present at the same session. Yet, the Defense Minister Geoff Hoon could not register the differences in opinions and frequently said that he does not accept the question’s validity. When he sees the Opposition members trying to ask questions on military action in Iraq, the Defense Minister Geoff Hoon’s replies are along the lines of “I cannot take interventions on my replies to interventions at this stage,” “The Opposition are preparing themselves for opposition; there is no sign whatever of them preparing for government,” or “Sit down.”73 In this respect, the Defense Minister is different from the other two decision-makers. While the Foreign Minister shows non-motivated process on the issue and the Prime Minister exhibits motivated process, the Defense Minister cannot seem to register the conflict in the first place. There is a categorical failure of conflict detection.

Nonetheless, on the same day, during the same session, the Defense Minister Geoff Hoon clearly could register the message on the Israel question:

Mohammad Sarwar (Glasgow, Govan): In 1967, Israel occupied Palestinian land. In that same year, the United Nations Security Council passed resolution 242 unanimously, demanding that Israel withdraw its armed forces from the occupied territories. Any proposal to implement that resolution was vetoed by the United States of America. Israel has defied 32 United Nations resolutions. Does my right hon. Friend agree that, without bringing peaceful resolution to the middle east conflict, there can be no peace?

Geoff Hoon: My right hon. Friend the Foreign Secretary dealt with those issues at some length in this opening speech, and I do not intend to repeat all that he said. I want to make it clear, however that the Government want to see the implementation of United Nations resolutions. We are not discriminating between different resolutions. Those to which my hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow, Govan (Mr. Sarwar) refers should indeed be enforced. We want to see them enforced—involving, as they do, obligations of a number of different states.

Here, the variations are subtler for Geoff Hoon. Mr. Hoon still answers in a one-sided way, but on questions with regards to Israel, Mr. Hoon is at least able to register the meaning of the question and address it, rather than “not accepting” or discounting alternative arguments as those made for the sake of opposition.

In sum, I do find within-individual cross-issues variations in text-based measures for the three government decision-makers responsible for the UK’s participation decision in 2003. These findings imply that the same individual actor can engage in different types of intervening cognitive process depending on the issue area.

**ROK Findings: Within-Individual Cross-Issues Variations**

For the ROK case, because the newly elected President Roh Moo-hyun was sworn into office in February 25th, 2003, I focus on the foreign policy issues of the first year in office (March 2003-February 2004). The main issues that preoccupied the ROK government decision-makers are the Iraq troop deployment issue, relocation of the US military bases in the ROK, the DPRK nuclear issue, and the ROK’s first bilateral FTA with Chile. The last issue of ROK-Chile FTA is a foreign economic policy issue, but it still offers a good foreign policy comparison for the time period under consideration.

**Roh Moo-hyun**

To begin with the ROK President Roh Moo-hyun, I look at his speeches to the domestic public audience, available in the online ROK Archive of Presidential Records. On the North Korean nuclear issue, it is clear that he is only trying to resolve the issue peacefully. The non-preferred policy of resolving the issue through military action is not considered, imagined, or verbalized. As well, the reasons behind the peaceful approach are not necessarily well articulated.
Peaceful approach to resolving the DPRK nuclear issue is just supposed to be obvious and self-evident, when there are clearly numerous other plausible courses of action.

However, for the ratification process of the ROK-Chile FTA, President Roh’s speeches indicate a motivated process. I found two public speeches on the ROK-Chile FTA. One was addressed to the agricultural audience on the Farmer’s Day, on November 11th, 2003. He argues that the ROK cannot fall behind on the global trends of liberalization. Despite the difficulties and worries, he argues that the ROK needs to overcome them, and that optimism and more proactive attitude is required. Because President Roh understands these negative aspects, he does not take liberalization as natural given. Despite these worries and doubts, he asks for trust. He argues that this is the road to competitiveness. In his speech on November 28th, 2003, he addresses both businesses and labor. Again, he emphasizes that the ROK cannot be the only lonely nation, falling behind in the global trends of liberalization. He argues for a speedy ratification of the ROK-Chile FTA in the National Assembly. Although two options are clearly articulated, there is an imbalance of reasons and aspects in President Roh’s speeches on the ROK-Chile FTA.

Although President Roh’s speeches are not addressed on the same day, his speeches on the deployment of non-combat troops to the US-led operation in Iraq, the peaceful way to resolve the North Korean nuclear issue, and the pressing importance of the ratification for the ROK-Chile FTA indicate non-motivated process, taken-for-grant process, and motivated process, respectively. Again, the time period was focused on just his first year in office, in order to fix potential changes in other individual level factors, and I focused on Mr. Roh’s speeches.

Yoon Young-kwan

On the North Korean nuclear issue, the Foreign Minister Yoon Young-kwan also exhibits taken-for-grantedness. The alternative option of military action is not imagined or verbalized. It
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is clear that the Foreign Minister prefers peaceful and cooperative strategies, such as the inter-
Korean dialogues and multilateral talks. The reasons for the peaceful dialogue-based approach to
the issue are not fully articulated in his case too. It seems taken-for-granted that peaceful talks
are obviously the way to resolving the nuclear issue. Within this strategy of a peaceful approach,
there are detailed discussions on the structure of the peace talks, how the terms should be defined,
who are the members of the talks, etc.

Finally, on December 26th 2003, the foreign and trade affairs parliamentary committee
managed to get started with the ROK-Chile FTA ratification process. In his opening statement,
the Foreign Minister Yoon Young-kwan argues that the speedy ratification is inevitable and
necessary. He talks about the global trend of FTAs and further liberalization. Yoon warns that if
only the ROK does not keep up with this global trend, the ROK will fall behind and that the
country’s dependency on exports will heavily increase and become burdensome. On the MP
questions about the negative impacts of the ROK-Child FTA, he tries to minimize those negative
aspects. Instead, he highlights that there are greater economic benefits to this bilateral FTA. He
warns that further delay would only amass in the material loss as well as market loss for the
ROK main exports, such as automobiles and cell phones. He also warns of the damages on the
ROK-Chile relations as well as on the prospects for FTAs with other countries. I code his
statement and answers as motivated process, because two policy actions are clearly articulated as
reasonable options but there is an imbalance of aspects. Hence, the text-based dimensions on the
Iraq troop deployment issue, the peaceful way to resolve the North Korean nuclear issue, and the
pressing ratification for the ROK-Chile FTA indicate socially constrained process, taken-for-
grant process, and motivated process, respectively.
Cho Young-kil

For the period under study (March 2003-February 2004), the Defense Minister Cho Young-kil consistently shows taken-for-grantedness in security cooperation with the United States across various issue areas. Even when the relocation of the US 2\textsuperscript{nd} Infantry Division from Yongsan to Pyeongtaek became an issue, and 147 National Assembly men and women signed a resolution opposing such relocation, the Defense Minister tried to persuade the committee that this relocation is, in fact, going to enhance the ROK’s deterrent capabilities. Mr. Cho asked the defense committee to hold back on the resolution opposing the relocation, as it might affect the relocation negotiation processes. Several defense committee members criticized the Defense Minister Cho for his extremely careful and passive behavior, and tried to persuade him that such parliamentary resolution would, in fact, increase the ROK military’s bargaining power. The Defense Minister was not convinced and was adamant about a cooperative bargaining process.

Although I do not find within-individual cross-issues variations for the Defense Minister Cho in the period of study, it is fair to say that the issues examined are all related to the ROK’s alliance relationship with the United States. In this light, the cross-issues are not really across foreign policy issues that would encompass different degrees of two-level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge. Besides the failure to find within-individual cross-issues variations for the ROK Defense Minister Cho Young-kil, I do find within-individual cross-issues variations in the textual measures for the other two government decision-makers responsible for the ROK’s participation decision in March 2003. These findings imply that the same actor can engage in different types of cognitive process, depending on the issue domain.

Indeed, recent studies in the conflict detection literature show that cognitive reflection, thinking dispositions, cognitive ability, and other individual level factors play a small role in
conflict detection. Further, Durrheim and Foster (1997) had shown that tolerance of ambiguity is not a generalized personality trait, but rather, content-specific. The additional tests in this chapter and in the previous experimental chapter, as well as these independently reached studies, increase confidence in the key explanatory factor of the theoretical argument.

IV. Summary

In this chapter, I aimed to test my argument on the US allies’ joining behaviors using the actual decision-making cases of the UK and ROK governments in March 2003. I explained why this particular context poses a hard test for my two-level ideational argument. Again, the second round of critical empirical test offers decisive results: only my two-level ideational argument can explain both the final choice outcomes and the types of cognitive process generating these decisions. I fail to find support for the alternative explanations on the observed logic of habit.

I also employed the within-individual cross-issues research design to explore the causal implications of my two-level ideational argument. The findings show that same individuals talk about different foreign policy issues in significantly different ways. The strongest evidence comes from the UK findings, because the same government decision-maker shows different text-based measures across different issue areas in the same setting, on the same day. The cross-national empirical evidence of this observational chapter complements the cross-national survey experimental evidence of the previous chapter.

74 Within the conflict detection set-up, please see, Pennycook and Thompson (2012); Srol (2018); Srol and De Nyes (forthcoming).
5. 2003 Iraq War Decisions of Other US Allies

In this chapter, I conduct external validity tests of my two-level ideational argument on the US allies’ joining behaviors by examining the decision-making cases outside of the two main UK and ROK cases. These additional cases ensure against any biases stemming from the focus on the two main cases and allow for more confidence in the generalizability of the findings of the critical empirical tests adjudicating the competing theoretical explanations. In this last stage of my cross-national, multi-methods research design, I examine two paired comparisons. The first pair, Australia-Canada, match my original UK-ROK pair in terms of the degrees of institutional level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge. Like the UK, Canada had institutional level contestation in action knowledge in March 2003. Like the ROK, Australia has had institutional level non-contestation in action knowledge towards participation in US-led operations, even when there is a lack of international institutional authorization to use armed force. These additional cases should be similarly explained by my two-level ideational argument.

I also examine the untested theoretical case where there is institutional level non-contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge towards non-participation in US-led operations that lack any international institutional mandate. I look at New Zealand-Philippines pair and test if the two-level ideational argument explains their non-participation decisions in March 2003.

The rest of this chapter proceeds in three parts. First, I describe how I capture the key explanatory variable—the degree of two-level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge—for each of the three government-decision makers of interest. Then, I report the findings of the two rounds of critical empirical tests. In the last section, I summarize the findings across paired comparisons.
I. Measurement and Operationalization

Before I conduct additional rounds of critical empirical tests using the out-of-sample decision-making cases for the 2003 Iraq War, I discuss how I measure the key explanatory variable—the degree of two-level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge—for each of the three government decision-makers of interest for each country. I start with the institutional level and move onto the individual level of analysis. I follow the operationalization procedures detailed in Section I of Chapter 4.

Capturing the Independent Variable: The Degree of Two-Level Contestation in Action Knowledge

Canada: Institutional Level

To begin with Canada’s Prime Minister Jean Chretien, I specify the aggregate group at the institutional level as the national security team, comprised of the politically appointed cabinet ministers and high-ranking career bureaucrats. I use parliamentary documents and my own interviews to measure the degree of contestation in action knowledge for this team of national security members. As early as February 19, 2002, more than a year before the Iraq War in March 2003, it is clear from the House of Commons’ oral question period that the Foreign Minister, Bill Graham, had strategic options open, from participation in the US-led operation against Iraq to sharpening of the sanctions.\(^1\) Similarly, from my interviews with the Defense Minister, John McCallum, it is clear that he was waiting for the Prime Minister to make the final decision.\(^2\) This means that the relevant members of the national security team for the Prime Minister Jean
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\(^2\) Author interview with Mr. John McCallum (Canada’s Minister of National Defence 2002-2003) on November 4, 2014.
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Chretien can be operationalized as ‘contested’ in the pre-existing action knowledge in that options were open until the last minute.

Indeed, the Leader of the Opposition (Canadian Alliance) questions the Foreign Minister Bill Graham:

“Mr. Speaker, the government's position on Iraq is more confusing each day.

First the Prime Minister said that Canada would not support military action against Saddam Hussein's Iraq. Yesterday he said that military action against Iraq was completely hypothetical. The Minister of Foreign Affairs said that he was open to all options.

What exactly is our government's position on Iraq and the war against terrorism?”

The confusion in the government’s foreign policy towards Iraq, and participation in the US-led coalition of the willing, is a recurring theme in the parliamentary debates throughout the year prior to the onset of war in March 2003. On March 17, 2003, Stephen Harper, the Leader of the Opposition (Canadian Alliance) criticizes that “we have a government here that is indeed half-pregnant,” because certain number of military personnel were in exchange with the British and American troops in surveillance and other non-combat duties in the Iraq theatre. Prime Minister Jean Chretien accepts that the forces are there and that “they will carry on their duty that they started some months ago.”

Another critical piece of evidence for the institutional level contestation in action knowledge for the Prime Minister Jean Chretien is as follows. On February 19, 2002, another Conservative member of the Opposition criticized that, “Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Prime

---

3 Canada House of Commons Hansard. February 19, 2002.
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Minister is more concerned with the fight in his own cabinet than the fight against terrorism.”

And to this comment, the Foreign Minister Bill Graham affirmed, “Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the discussions we have in our cabinet about this issue. A free and democratic society likes to have an open debate about issues and we rejoice in it.” From these parliamentary debates at the time and my own interviews with the Foreign and Defense Ministers, I operationalize the national security team’s level of contestation in action knowledge was ‘contested.’ There were no institutional level prescriptions on what stance to take.

For Canada’s Foreign and Defense Ministers, I specify the aggregate group at the institution level of analysis as the bureaucratized state departments that they head. Again, I use the official white papers published prior to the decision-making period, in order to measure the degree of institution level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge. As Canada’s White Papers on Defence discuss both foreign and defence policies within one document, I look at the foundational 1964 White Paper on Defence and the 1994 White Paper on Defence (the most recent white paper for the decision-making period of interest). For the UK’s strategic documents, I have found that there are neither formalized priority of the bilateral relationship with the United States nor the importance of international institutions. Because these foreign and defense policy strategies were absent from the UK strategic document, I had operationalized the degree of institutional level contestation of the pre-existing action knowledge as ‘contested.’ In Canada’s case, the degree of the institutional level contestation of action knowledge is similarly ‘contested,’ but there are some striking differences.

To begin with Canada’s 1964 White Paper on Defence, starting from Section I, Introduction’s ‘Objectives,’ it is stated that:

---
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“The objectives of Canadian defence policy, which cannot be dissociated from foreign policy, are to preserve the peace by supporting collective defence measures to deter military aggression; to support Canadian foreign policy including that arising out of our participation in international organizations, and to provide the protection and surveillance of our territory, our air-space and our coastal waters.”

Then, in Section II, four parallel methods by which the objectives of Canadian defence policy have been pursued are noted. They are:

(a) Collective Measures for maintenance of peace and security as embodied in the Charter of the United Nations, including the search for balanced and controlled disarmament;
(b) Collective Defence as embodied in the North Atlantic Treaty;
(c) Partnership with the United States in the defence of North America;
(d) National Measures to discharge responsibility for the security and protection of Canada.

From both the ‘Objectives’ part, and the ordering of strategies pursued to achieve and ensure those national security objectives, I see that multilateralism is officially prioritized over bilateralism, but that these two strategies are equally pursued from at least since 1964.

In the 1994 White Paper on Defence, these two strategies—multilateralism and bilateralism—are, again, formally stated in the strategic document, but the ordering has changed. The chapter on bilateral Canada-United States Defence Cooperation (Chapter 5) comes prior to the chapter on Canada’s contribution and advocacy of multilateral security institutions (Chapter 6). In fact, in Chapter 5, the United States is singled out, among other NATO allies, as “Canada’s most important ally” and that the “Canada-US defence cooperation continues to provide highly valued stability in a volatile and turbulent world.” That Canada is in favor of strengthening the UN and striking an appropriate balance between NATO’s traditional mission and its newer roles
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in the post-Cold War period are stated in the later Chapter 6. With such clearly stated strategies of both bilateralism and multilateralism, and the evidently changed ordering of the two, I operationalize the degree of institutional level contestation in action knowledge for both the Foreign and Defense Ministers as ‘contested.’

**Australia: Institutional Level**

To begin with Australia’s Prime Minister John Howard, the aggregate group at the institutional level can also be specified as the national security team, comprised of the politically appointed cabinet ministers and high-ranking career bureaucrats. Again, I use the parliamentary documents and my own interviews to measure and triangulate the degree of contestation in action knowledge among the key national security team members at the time. Unlike the Canadian Opposition’s recurring theme of confusion in the government’s policy on Iraq, the Australian Opposition’s (Labor Party) recurring theme of criticism lies in the Howard government’s unity, and the conservative National Party’s unity, in support for the US-led unilateralism on the Iraq disarmament issue.

Kevin Rudd, then an elected Labor member from Griffith, says this most potently at the debate in the House of Representatives on March 18, 2003. Rudd first argues that, “we have always striven to maintain a bipartisan national security policy.”\(^{11}\) He specifies that the Australian consensus was around the centrality of its alliance with the United States, the centrality of its adherence to the UN collective security system, and the centrality of our strategic engagement in our region, but notes that “these have been the three pillars of **Australian Labor Party** national security policy.”\(^{12}\) He goes on to say that, “But, under this government, two of the


\(^{12}\) Ibid.
three pillars have collapsed… It is for these reasons that our bipartisan consensus on national security policy has collapsed: because you on that side of the House have abandoned it—and have abandoned it comprehensively.”  

The united support for the US-led military action against Iraq within the Howard government is confirmed in my own interviews with the Foreign and Defense Ministers, as they were in support of Australia’s participation in the US-led coalitional operation against Iraq in March 2003.

For Australia’s Foreign and Defense Ministers, I specify the aggregate group at the institution level of analysis as the bureaucratized state departments that they head. Again, I use the official white papers produced prior to the decision-making period, in order to measure the degree of institutional level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge. I look at two documents. The first is the 1976 White Paper for Defence and the second is the 2000 White Paper for Defence. As with the previous strategic documents, the 1976 White Paper for Defence recognized that Australia must be prepared to address threats and meet situations on its own, rather than relying on the help from other allies. In Chapter 3, on Australia’s Defence Requirements, self-reliance as a national security strategy comes first. Still, the bilateral relations with the United States is next emphasized as an important strategy, and then comes the relations with Europe, particularly with Britain. From this document, I can see a strong traditional and continuing reliance on the United States for Australia’s defense.

In the 2000 White Paper on Defence, in Australia’s Strategic Interests and Objectives section, it is stated that, “Australia’s most important long-term strategic objective is to ensure the
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defence of Australia and its direct approaches.”\(^\text{16}\) The last (fifth) strategic objective is to contribute to the efforts of the international community, especially the United Nations, to uphold global security, and it says that, “we will continue to support the United States in the major role it plays in maintaining and strengthening the global security order.”\(^\text{17}\) Here, the understanding of the international community and the UN is conflated with the United States maintaining and strengthening the global security order. This fifth strategic objective comes last—following other priorities in the security of Australia’s immediate neighborhood, Southeast Asia, and the Asia Pacific region.\(^\text{18}\) International institutions and multilateralism are least prioritized.

Following the Strategic Interests and Objectives Section, the document discusses Australia’s International Strategic Relationships. This section begins as follows:

“Most of the time, Australia pursues its strategic objectives in close cooperation with its allies, neighbours and regional partners. Our strong alliance with the United States, in particular, is a key strategic asset that will support our bilateral, regional and global interests over the next decade and beyond.”\(^\text{19}\)

This bilateral relationship with the United States is also prioritized in Chapter 5, above all other strategic relationships. Because support for global (collective) security is conflated with support for the US maintenance of global security, and the bilateral alliance with the United States is singled out as key strategic relationship, and military force in international affairs is still thought to be highly effective in minimizing and eliminating risks and threats, I operationalize the degree of institutional level contestation in action knowledge for both the Foreign and Defense
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Ministers as ‘non-contested’ towards participation in US-led military operations, even when there is a lack of international institutional authorization to use force.

**New Zealand: Institutional Level**

During the mid-1980s, the United States suspended its alliance commitments to New Zealand due to serious differences over nuclear policy. New Zealand Labour Party government’s legislation made the country nuclear-free, which had the effect of barring visits from nuclear-powered or nuclear-armed ships. When the US Navy ships with nuclear weapons could not embark in New Zealand, the ANZUS (Australia, New Zealand, United States) collective security treaty of 1951 was unilaterally suspended by the United States. Due to this suspension of alliance treaty, one could ask if the New Zealand case fits in as an instance of alliance bargaining. Formally, in terms of the collective security treaty, New Zealand and the United States did not, and still do not, have alliance relations, but New Zealand has remained a close security cooperation partner of the United States in that New Zealand has been one of the “Five Eyes” nations that participate in intelligence sharing with the United States, and welcomes US presence in the Asia-Pacific region.\(^{20}\) New Zealand has also made a significant contribution to the war on terror; hundreds of military personnel, two frigates, and number of aircraft have been deployed to the war zone in the Gulf.\(^{21}\)

Thus, in terms of a significant security cooperation partnership, with a history of formal alliance relations, the New Zealand case provides a suitable instance of inter-state bargaining between security cooperation partners over the foreign policy stance against a third-party. In addition, due to the US suspension of its alliance commitments in 1986, New Zealand could be
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placed in the last row of Figure 5.1, where there is institutional level non-contestation in action knowledge towards non-participation in US-led operations that lack any international institutional authorization to use armed force. At the least, the New Zealand case allows me to test the untested theoretical cases in this last row.

To begin with the New Zealand Prime Minister Helen Clark, the aggregate group at the institutional level is specified as the national security team, comprised of the politically appointed cabinet ministers and high-ranking career bureaucrats. Again, I use the parliamentary documents and my own interviews to measure and triangulate the degree of contestation in action knowledge among the key national security team members at the time. The parliamentary documents, including the House of Representatives vote on March 18, 2003, show that there was not only government unity but also Labour Party unity behind support for non-participation in the US-led military action against Iraq. For instance, while all sitting members of the Labour Party in the House voted ‘noe’ to the motion concerning the UN Security Council Resolution 1441, all sitting members of the conservative National Party voted ‘aye.’

From my interview with the Foreign Minister, Phil Goff, it seemed like the final decision was reached through numerous conversations between the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister, who were good friends since their undergraduate years at the University of Auckland. They were both supportive of the nuclear-free policy in the mid-1980s, even if that meant a strong stance against the United States. The Defense Minister, Mark Burton, was also an elected Labour Party member since 1993, and was the New Zealand Cabinet minister throughout.
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Helen Clark’s tenure as Prime Minister. Although I could not interview Mark Burton myself, there is no note of any Cabinet level contestation over foreign policy options and the diplomatic stance at the time. As there was a strong consensus, I operationalize the Prime Minister Helen Clark’s degree of institutional level contestation in action knowledge as ‘non-contested’ towards non-participation in the US-led military action against Iraq.

For New Zealand’s Foreign and Defense Ministers, I specify the aggregate group at the institution level of analysis as the bureaucratized state departments that they head. Again, I use the white papers produced prior to the decision-making period, in order to measure the degree of institutional level contestation in action knowledge. I look at two documents. The first is the 1991 Defence White Paper, following the US suspension of the ANZUS commitments in 1986, and the second is the 1997 Defence White Paper, which is the most recent white paper for the decision-making period of interest. Since the 1991 Defence White Paper, drafted and circulated by the National Party government, the defense budget and capabilities in New Zealand were significantly reduced. The next 1997 Defence White Paper, drafted and circulated by the Labour Party government, sought to maintain a modest combat capability across three service arms and reinforce a more effective defense relationship with Australia. In other words, I see that New Zealand is more modest in combat capabilities and prioritizes Australia as an important security cooperation partner over the United States during the decision-making period of interest.

Indeed, it is widely noted that the differences over nuclear policy significantly constrained the bilateral New Zealand-US relationship for many years since the mid-1980s. Relations only began to improve in the early 2000s, when New Zealand sent special forces to

---


27 Please see Vaughn (2017).
Other US Allies

support the US-led war against terror in Afghanistan in 2001. Overall, Vaughn (2017) also notes that New Zealand’s foreign policy largely supports a rules-based international order, collective approaches to promote stability, and the peaceful resolution of disputes. Thus, I operationalize the degree of institutional level contestation in action knowledge for both the Foreign and Defense Ministers as ‘non-contested’ towards non-participation in US-led military operations that especially lack any international institutional authorization to use armed force.

The Philippines: Institutional Level

Although the Philippines and the United States have had the bilateral security alliance bound by the Mutual Defense Treaty of 1951, there are widespread anti-US sentiments originating back to the Filipino resistance during the US colonial period (1898-1946). As well, throughout the post-independence 1946-1992 period, the issue that predominated the Philippine-American relations was that of the US military bases. When the Philippine Senate rejected the proposed Philippine-American Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Security in 1991, which would have possibly extended the stay of US forces in the country, the United States closed its military bases in the Philippines in 1992. As a result, the “once-strong” and “once-special” Philippine-American relationship became essentially moribund. At the same time, the Philippines is one of five founding members of ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations) and prioritizes the maintenance of multilateral frameworks in its foreign policy.

This is why I use the New Zealand-Philippines country pair as tests of my untested theoretical case of the last row, where there is institutional level non-contestation in action knowledge towards non-participation in US-led operations lacking any international institutional authorization to use armed force.
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authorization to use armed force. My operationalization of institutional level non-contestation in action knowledge towards non-participation is also shared by Morada. Morada (2003) notes that, “Philippines appears to have achieved a higher degree of national consensus on the issue of America’s war on Iraq: that is, no support for U.S. unilateral action.” Morada even notes of the bipartisan elite consensus on the issue of Iraq and provides that the majority public opinion was against participation in the Iraq War. Hence, I operationalize the degree of institutional level contestation in action knowledge as ‘non-contested’ towards non-participation in the US-led coalitional operation against Iraq in March 2003 for the Philippine President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo.

For the Philippines’ Foreign and Defense Ministers, I specify the aggregate group at the institution level of analysis as the bureaucratized state departments that they head. I examine the relatively constant national security objectives and foreign policy strategies, available online at the Department of Foreign Affairs’ website. The framing and pillars are concise, and they are stated as follows:

The most important provisions of the 1987 Philippine Constitution which pertain to the framing of Philippine foreign policy are as follows:

- Article II, Section 2: The Philippines renounces war as an instrument of national policy, adopts the generally accepted principles of international law as part of the law of the land and adheres to the policy of peace, equality, justice.

- Article II, Section 7: The State shall pursue an independent foreign policy. In its relations with other states the paramount consideration shall be national sovereignty, territorial integrity, national interest, and the right to self-determination.

- Republic Act No. 7157, otherwise known as “Philippine Foreign Service Act of 1991,” gives mandate to the Department of Foreign Affairs to implement the three (3) pillars of the Philippine Foreign Policy, as follows:

1. Preservation and enhancement of national security
2. Promotion and attainment of economic security

31 Please see Morada (2003), pp. 235-236.
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Although internally, or domestically, the Philippine governments have shown and demonstrated strong belief in the efficaciousness of the use of armed force in suppressing the political and armed resistance, the Philippine Constitution renounces war as an instrument of national policy. Thus, there is relatively weaker belief and practice in the use of military force abroad to achieve and ensure national security objectives and other foreign policy goals. As well, it states that the Philippine Constitution adopts the generally accepted principles of international law and adheres to the policy of peace, equality, and justice. Moreover, the independence and autonomy of foreign policy is stressed, and so I operationalize the institutional level contestation as ‘non-contested’ towards non-participation in US-led military operations that lack any international institutional authorization to use armed force for both the Foreign and Defense Ministers of the Philippines.

**Canada: Individual Level**

To begin with Canada’s Prime Minister Jean Chretien, it is clear that the Prime Minister had relatively stronger beliefs on the effectiveness of the UN processes and multilateralism than in bilateralism with the United States. When he was first elected to the House of Commons in 1963, he experienced the successive administrations of Lester B. Pearson and Pierre Elliott Trudeau. Jean Chretien became a parliamentary secretary to the Prime Minister Lester Pearson in 1965, a minister of state in 1967, and minister of national revenue in 1968, and he experienced how then Prime Minister Lester Pearson refused to send troops to Vietnam, lacking the UN
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Security Council authorization.\(^{33}\) Still, Mr. Chretien had similarly high MI and CI orientations, as he authorized Canada’s participation in the NATO-led operations in Kosovo in 1999, without the UN Security Council resolution.\(^{34}\) Indeed, because of this high MI orientation, Canada’s Prime Minister Jean Chretien gave moral support for the US-led operation against Iraq in March 2003. With such relatively stronger belief in multilateralism, coupled with strong belief in military effectiveness, I operationalize the degree of individual level contestation in action knowledge as ‘contested’ for the Prime Minister Jean Chretien.

Next, I examine the profile of Canada’s Foreign Minister, Bill Graham. Bill Graham went to Paris to pursue a doctorate of laws, with a focus on international law, as well as to improve his French.\(^{35}\) He also actively promoted bilingualism in Canada.\(^{36}\) I operationalize such educational and civic affairs history as providing at least as similarly strong belief in multilateralism, and particularly in bilateral relations with France. In addition, as then Foreign Minister, Bill Graham supported Canada’s participation in NATO-led operations in Kosovo in 1999, even without the UN Security Council resolution. Because I capture at least as strong belief in multilateralism and strong belief in military effectiveness for the Foreign Minister Bill Graham from the period prior to the decision-making time frame of interest, as well as high MI orientation, I operationalize the degree of individual level contestation in action knowledge as ‘contested’ for the Foreign Minister.

Finally, I examine the profile of Canada’s Defense Minister, John McCallum. John McCallum is born in Montreal, Quebec, has a diploma of higher studies from the Pantheon-
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Sorbonne University in Paris, and was a professor at various universities, including a French-language university, University of Quebec, in Montreal.\(^\text{37}\) Again, I operationalize such educational and professional history as providing at least as similarly strong belief in multilateralism, and particularly in bilateral relations with France. As Defense Minister, John McCallum also achieved what was then the largest increase in the annual defense budget in more than a decade.\(^\text{38}\) As I capture at least as strong belief in multilateralism and a high MI orientation, I operationalize the degree of individual level contestation in action knowledge as ‘contested’ for the Defense Minister too.

All three government decision-makers of Canada at the time belong to the second column in Figure 5.1, where there is individual level ‘contestation’ in action knowledge. Because the degrees of institution level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge are also similarly ‘contested,’ the three government decision-makers are placed in box (5) in Figure 5.1 below. There is a complete two-level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge.

**Australia: Individual Level**

To start with Australia’s Prime Minister John Howard, it has been noted that John Howard vigorously identified with the West than with Asia.\(^\text{39}\) In particular, Howard forged close relations with the George W. Bush administration and Manne notes that, “John Howard had been, throughout his political life, a conventional ANZUS and American-alliance enthusiast. As Leader of the Opposition he had been highly critical of the smallest hint of any Labor
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government deviation from the US foreign policy line.” In addition, from his authorization of the 1999 Australian-led UN East Timor engagement, I can capture a high MI foreign policy orientation. Hence, for Australia’s Prime Minister John Howard, I operationalize the degree of individual level contestation in action knowledge as ‘non-contested’ towards participation in US-led operations, even when there is a lack of international institutional authorization to use armed force.

Next, for Australia’s Foreign Minister Alexander Downer, I note a similar identification with the West, and particularly with the UK. Alexander Downer’s grandfather, Sir John Downer, was one of the founding fathers of the Australian Commonwealth, while his father, Sir Alexander Downer, was Australia’s High Commissioner to the United Kingdom. The Foreign Minister was educated at Radley College in England, and although this assignment has taken place in the period after the 2003 Iraq War decision, the Foreign Minister Alexander Downer himself served as Australia’s High Commissioner to the United Kingdom. In addition, when the Prime Minister John Howard authorized the 1999 Australian-led UN operation in East Timor, Alexander Downer was the Foreign Minister and so I capture a high MI orientation too. For the 2003 Iraq War, in particular, because the UK Prime Minister Tony Blair supported the US initiatives, such British support would have only contributed to the complete non-contestation in action knowledge for the Foreign Minister Alexander Downer. Thus, for Australia’s Foreign Minister, I operationalize the degree of individual level contestation in action knowledge as ‘non-contested’ towards participation in the 2003 Iraq War, even where there is a lack of international institutional authorization to use armed force.

40 Please see Manne (2006).
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Finally, I examine the profile for Australia’s Defense Minister, Robert Hill. Robert Hill earned a master’s degree in law at the London School of Economics. In 1994, Hill had ambitions to be Foreign Affairs Minister, but it seems to have been frustrated by Alexander Downer’s grip on the job. Hill has commented that, “It didn’t work out and I’m perfectly happy with the opportunities that have presented.” I could not find any note of opposition or criticism against the centrality of traditional relations with the US and the UK. As Defense Minister, Robert Hill has also floated contentious ideas about pre-emptive warfare, strategic doctrine, and Defense organization and acquisition policy. From these ideas and policies, I capture a high MI orientation. And so, for Australia’s Defense Minister, I operationalize the degree of individual level contestation in action knowledge as ‘non-contested’ towards participation in US-led military operations, even when there is a lack of international institutional authorization to use armed force.

While all of the three government decision-makers of interest for the case of Canada were placed in box (5) in Figure 5.1 below, all of the three government decision-makers of interest for the case of Australia are place in box (1) in Figure 5.1. Australia’s Prime Minister, Foreign Minister, and Defense Minister at the time had relatively stronger belief in bilateralism than in multilateralism and carried high MI orientations. Because the degrees of institutional level contestation in action knowledge are also similarly ‘non-contested’ towards participation in US-led operations lacking any international institutional authorization to use armed force, there is
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complete two-level non-contestation in action knowledge towards participation for Australia’s three government decision-makers at the time.

**New Zealand: Individual Level**

For the New Zealand case, I discuss my operationalization for the Prime Minister Helen Clark and the Foreign Minister Phil Goff together. From my face-to-face interview with the Foreign Minister Phil Goff, I learned that the two leaders of the Labour Party have been close friends since their undergraduate years at the University of Auckland. They were ardent supporters of the nuclear-free policy, even if that meant standing strong against the United States in the 1980s. The Foreign Minister also said that the Labour Party has always been multilateralist, preferring peaceful diplomatic processes and approaches. From such past actions and beliefs of low MI and high CI orientations, I operationalize the degree of individual level contestation in action knowledge as ‘non-contested’ towards non-participation in US-led military operations, especially when lacking any international institutional authorization to use armed force.

For New Zealand’s Defense Minister Mark Burton, I look at various speeches made by the Prime Minister Helen Clark and Mark Burton himself to conclude that Mark Burton too was a multilateralist, with high CI orientations. In her Prime Ministerial statement on F-16 lease agreement with the United States dated March 20, 2000, Helen Clark says:

> “Prior to the elections and subsequently, Mr Goff, Mr Burton, and I have made it very clear that the government will support the urgent re-equipment of the New Zealand Defence Force. Our priorities will be on the army’s mobility and communications, on air and maritime surveillance,
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and on naval and air support. It is our firm intention that New Zealand will continue to offer its services to keep the peace in our region and internationally. We will work together with others, including our closest defence partner, Australia, the partners in the Five Power Defence Arrangement and the United States. We will participate in United Nations mandated operations, including those under Chapter VII of the UN Charter. To do this, New Zealand needs to have a properly equipped Defence Force.\textsuperscript{50}

From her statement, it is clear that the renewed defense spending was most efficiently allocated to provide the necessary equipment across all three services. From Mark Burton’s explanations of the June 2000 Defense Policy Framework and the May 2001 Government Defense Statement, which are statements made prior to the decision-making period of interest, it is also the case that New Zealand Defense Force is being necessarily updated to maintain peace and security and to build international goodwill.\textsuperscript{51} In other words, defense is not used to address threats, or for preemptive strikes. In these statements, Mark Burton describes New Zealand as a “responsible international citizen” of “international community of nations.”\textsuperscript{52} He does not once single out the United States or the United Kingdom as strategic partners, and instead talks about New Zealand’s many international relationships, including the one with Australia. This is why I operationalize the degree of individual level contestation in action knowledge as ‘non-contested’ towards non-participation in US-led military operations that lack any international institutional authorization to use armed force for the New Zealand’s Defense Minister.

Hence, all three government decision-makers of New Zealand at the time can be placed in the previously unpopulated box (9) in Figure 5.1 below. The New Zealand case allows me to test the previously untested theoretical case of the last low.


\textsuperscript{52} Ibid.
Philippines: Individual Level

For the Philippines case, I discuss my operationalization for the President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo and the Defense Minister Angelo Reyes together. Angelo Reyes was the Philippine Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces, when he joined the Opposition during the four-day bloodless revolt that ousted then-President Joseph Estrada in January 2001. His decisive role won him the favor of the Macapagal-Arroyo administration, and President Macapagal-Arroyo appointed him as the Secretary of Defense from 2001 to 2003.

Both the President and Secretary of Defense were educated in the United States. President Gloria Arroyo studied for two years at Georgetown University’s Walsh School of Foreign Service, and the Secretary of Defense earned a Masters in Public Administration from Harvard University’s Kennedy School of Government in 1999. In addition, Angelo Reyes studied trust corporations at Northwestern University and logistics management at the Naval Post-Graduate School in Monterrey, California. This is a significant contrast to the educational background of the incumbent Philippine President, Rodrigo Duterte, who was educated throughout in the Philippines.

In addition to their educational backgrounds in the United States, the 1999 Visiting Forces Agreement with the United States was signed while they were both in the government. In 1999, Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo was the Vice President of the Joseph Estrada administration.

---

54 Ibid.
56 https://news.abs-cbn.com/nation/02/08/11/death-general-who-was-angelo-reyes
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and Angelo Reyes was the Commanding General of the Philippine Army.\textsuperscript{58} Indeed, both the President and the Defense Minister were frequently criticized for violating the Philippine Constitution. Their past backgrounds and policy actions indicate that they at least highly value bilateral security cooperation with the United States. As such, I operationalize the degree of individual level contestation in action knowledge as ‘contested’ for both the Philippine President and the Defense Minister at the time.

Finally, for the Philippine Foreign Minister Blas Ople, I gather that he was regarded as a “pragmatic nationalist.”\textsuperscript{59} Blas Ople was a nationalist, but also a pragmatist, as he backed the 1999 Visiting Forces Agreement, which allowed the US forces to return to Philippines for short-term training exercises.\textsuperscript{60} He also fought in the Second World War as a teenage officer of the Del Pilar Regimet, Bulacan Military Area, until the capture of General Yamashita in 1945.\textsuperscript{61} Again, due to such pragmatic nature of beliefs and actions, I operationalize the degree of individual level contestation in action knowledge as somewhere in between contested and non-contested towards non-participation in US-led operations that lack any international institutional authorization to use armed force for the Philippine Foreign Minister, Blas Ople.

I operationalize some degree of ‘contestation’ in action knowledge at the individual level of analysis for the three government decision-makers for the Philippine case. Because the degrees of institutional level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge are ‘non-contested’ towards non-participation in US-led military operations that lack any international

\textsuperscript{58} Republic of the Philippines. Department of National Defense. Angelo T. Reyes, 23\textsuperscript{rd} Secretary of National Defense.


\textsuperscript{60} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{61} Republic of the Philippines. Senate of the Philippines, 18\textsuperscript{th} Congress. Blas F. Ople.
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institutional authorization to use armed force, these three government decision-makers of the Philippines are placed in box (8). Again, the two additional cases of the Philippines and New Zealand allow for further tests of the theory, particularly for this last row where there is institutional level non-contestation in action knowledge towards non-participation in US-led operations lacking any international institutional authorization to use armed force.

Unfortunately, the degree of individual level contestation cannot be more fine-grained, as was possible with the survey experimental design and data in Chapter 3. Still, I focused on the relevant ideational factors that were external and antecedent to the decision-making problem at hand and to the decision-making period of interest.

**Figure 5.1. The Independent Variable: Degree of Two-Level Contestation in Action Knowledge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Level Non-Contestation (Participation)</th>
<th>Individual Level Non-Contestation (Participation)</th>
<th>Individual Level Contestation</th>
<th>Individual Level Non-Contestation (Non-Participation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Australia Decision-Makers</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Level Non-Contestation (Participation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Canada Decision-Makers</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Level Contestation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(8) The Philippines Decision-Makers</td>
<td>(9) New Zealand Decision-Makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Level Non-Contestation (Non-Participation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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II. Critical Tests: The Findings

Critical Test 1—The Choice Outcomes

Before I check if the competing theoretical explanations on the US allies’ joining behaviors, for this specific context of US-led operations that lack any international institutional authorization to use force, do indeed explain the final choice outcomes, I report the actual final decisions for each of the three government decision-makers of interest for each country. To start with the case of Canada, from my two interviews with the Foreign Minister Bill Graham and the Defense Minister John McCallum, both Ministers have said that the ultimate decision was made by the Prime Minister Jean Chretien. This means that the two Ministers’ own choices were indeterminate, until Prime Minister Chretien decided not to participate in the US-led operation without the UN Security Council authorization to use force against Iraq. For Prime Minister Jean Chretien too, the final choice was indeterminate—he was open to participation, provided that there is an authorization from the UN Security Council to disarm Iraq. These prospects were only crystallized a few days before the actual onset of the Iraq War in 2003.62

For the case of Australia, all three government decision-makers were on board with joining the US-led operation against Iraq in March 2003. The Australian forces were already “predeployed to the gulf to acclimatise and contribute to the campaign to persuade Saddam Hussein into compliance.”63 On March 18, 2003, the Prime Minister John Howard informed the House of Representatives that the government has now authorized the defense forces to take part in coalition operations.

62 The United States, the United Kingdom, and Spain introduced a new resolution in the Security Council to authorize military action against Iraq, but it was not voted in. This new resolution superposed the UNSC Resolution 1441, and they did not get the authorization from the Security Council.
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Next, for the case of New Zealand, all three government decision-makers decided on non-participation in the US-led military action against Iraq. Further, unlike Canada and the Philippines, the New Zealand leaders did not lend any moral support for the US-led coalitional operation in March 2003. They stood with other nations, such as France and Russia, at the time, in insisting upon the diplomatic disarmament process. In her statement to the House of Representatives on March 18, 2003, the Prime Minister began as follows:

“The Government deeply regrets the breakdown of the diplomatic process over the Iraq crisis. The New Zealand Government, like most Governments, has been a strong supporter of that process running its course. Like most countries, our strong preference was for the disarmament of Iraq to occur peacefully, through a strong and intrusive weapons inspection process.”

She ended her statement emphasizing again the preference for a more peaceful diplomatic process. She adds that as with the majority of other nations on the Security Council, the New Zealand government supports and endorses the judgment that the diplomatic process has not ceased to run its course. All three government decision-makers were on board with non-participation and refraining from morally supporting the US-led operation in March 2003.

Finally, for the Philippines case, in September 2002, the Arroyo administration categorically stated that it would not support any US attack on Iraq, unless there is UN Security Council resolution authorizing military action against Iraq. Yet, in the same statement, the Philippine Government still reserves the right to provide support for an attack on Iraq, such as the use of Philippine airspace. However, this airspace offer to the United States was quickly withdrawn, as administration officials agreed that any Philippine resort to force against Iraq must

---


65 Please see Morada (2003), 236.

66 Ibid.
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have the mandate of the United Nations. In October 2002, the Foreign Minister Blas Ople reiterated this point that the Philippines was not prepared to join a US military strike against Iraq. Meanwhile, President Arroyo gave her diplomatic and moral support for the US-led Iraq War in 2003 and faced heavy domestic criticisms. The flip-flop of government’s airspace offer indicates a tremendous amount of contestation in action knowledge at the time.

Given that none of the foreign security policy advisers resigned from their positions from the administrations, and I have the final decision outcomes noted, I now proceed with the first round of critical empirical test. I examine if the existing theoretical explanations on the US allies’ joining behaviors do indeed account for the observed final choice outcomes. I start with the objective holist arguments that focus on levels of threats and alignment behaviors. One could argue that Canada is able to afford not to participate in the coalitional operation against potentially grave threats from the proliferation of WMDs in Iraq, because Canada enjoys the integrated system of defense of North America with the United States. By this geostrategic logic, though, one would expect the geographically isolated US allies in the Asia-Pacific to align with the United States and join US-led operations to eliminate existential threats. Yet, only Australia joined the US-led Iraq War in March 2003, and New Zealand and the Philippines stayed out.

What is more puzzling is that all three countries in the Asia Pacific—the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand—were struggling with the threats of terrorism. The Philippines was fighting the war on terror domestically with the help of the United States, and Australia had experienced violent terrorist bombings against Australian citizens in Bali, Indonesia in October 2002. The terrorist threats from Southeast Asia are actively discussed at the Australian House of

67 This is noted in Morada (2003), 236.

68 Ibid.
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Representatives on March 18, 2003. As well, even in New Zealand, Winston Peters, the Leader of New Zealand First, asks the Government at the House of Representatives’ Debate on Iraq on March 18, 2003:

“We already have suspected terrorist in New Zealand. They have come here, shredded their passports, gone through the immigration system—such as it is—and applied to become refugees or asylum seekers. New Zealanders have no idea how many such people there are of that ilk in this country, and neither does the Government. We do not know what the authorities are doing to track them down, except that we know there is one, at least, at leisure in Paremoremo prison. He has been there for months, and New Zealanders must be scratching their heads in utter amazement over why the Government did not put him on a plane back to the place where he came. … We want to know what measures are in place to keep terrorists out, and what checks are being carried out within the country for those who have already arrived, as every other Western nation has been doing for the last year.”

Although the geostrategic threat-based argument may explain the non-participation decision of Canada at the time, it does not account for the observed variation in the joining behaviors of three similarly isolated island countries in the Asia-Pacific. Not only are the three island countries similarly isolated, but the political elites also similarly perceived high levels of threat from militant Islamist groups. Although the Iraq issue concerned the Iraqi regime’s disarmament, it was known that the initial threat assessments came after the September 11 terrorist attacks and that the risks of proliferation and transfer of the weapons of mass destruction to extremist groups were threatening. John Howard verbalizes this logic in his statement on March 18, 2003:

“That these weapons may become commonplace in arsenals of sovereign states is frightening enough, but it would be nightmare for the international community if they were to find their way into the hands of terrorists. And we have every reason to be concerned about the expansion and increasing sophistication of international terrorist networks. We know as a matter of fact that terrorist networks such as al-Qaeda want to obtain weapons of mass destruction. They are actively seeking them. They desire them because of their potency. With such weapons at their disposal, terrorist could target entire cities and regions. Their victims would number not in the hundreds or the thousands but potentially even more.”

---


The other objective holist argument based on side-payments and side-deals is more puzzling. Of all the allied government decision-making cases examined in this chapter, as well as in the previous chapter, the Philippine government received the most material side-payments and military deals from the US government at the time. These military aids were directly utilized to suppress the violent, and secessionist, Islamist Abu Sayyaf Group and the Moro Islamic Liberation Front in the islands of Basilan and Mindanao. In addition, the Philippines has been one of the largest recipients of US foreign assistance in Southeast Asia, including both military and development aid. Still, the Philippines decided not to join and contribute troops to the US-led operation against Iraq in March 2003. Even when the decision was going against the US abduction policy and requests to remain in Iraq, the Philippine President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo pulled troops out of Iraq when a Philippine worker, Angelo de la Cruz, was abducted. Nationals of the UK, Australia, and South Korea have all been abducted in Iraq, but none of these US allies pulled out. And so the objective holist argument based on cost-benefit calculus of the state fails to explain the most-likely case.

Moving onto the objective individualist arguments based on the electoral incentives of national leaders, I look for the degree of bipartisan consensus on the issue of participation and non-participation in the 2003 Iraq War. In the previous chapter on the UK and ROK cases, there was largely bipartisan consensus on the participation decision, as it was the leftist party government making the joining decision, while the major rival rightist party was supportive of

---
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that decision. And so, the objective individualist explanation based on domestic politics and electoral incentives of government decision-makers was able to explain why the UK and ROK leaders were able to push through with the unpopular participation decisions.

For the additional cases that I examine in this chapter, the objective individualist argument does not explain the observed decision outcomes. In Canada and New Zealand, the leftist party governments decided not to participate in the US-led operation against Iraq, when their rival rightist parties were ardently supportive of participation. According to the same set of explanations for the UK and ROK cases, when the rival rightist parties are supportive of and calling for participation in US-led operations, then it should be politically safe for the leftist party governments to join the US-led military action. Without a sufficient theory on the allied government decision-makers’ preferences and beliefs, the sole focus on the electoral constraints and domestic political situations cannot explain these observed variations in the joining behaviors of leftist party governments of US allies.

What is even more puzzling is the case of Australia. It was the rightist party government making the participation decision, when the competing leftist party was clearly opposed to Australia’s participation in the Iraq War in March 2003. For the Philippine President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo, she had publicly stated and affirmed that she will not be running for re-election, and so the objective individualist argument based on electoral incentives cannot account for her decision. In short, the explanatory focus on the electoral incentives and domestic political constraints cannot account for the observed variation in the joining behaviors of similarly situated governments.

Next, I address the subjective holist, or intersubjectivist, arguments based on shared understandings. In the previous chapter, I have shown that this intersubjectivist argument cannot

account for the observed variation in the final choice outcomes of relevant national security
council members of the UK and ROK governments at the time. For instance, Robin Cook, the
former Foreign Minister resigned precisely over the Iraq War participation issue, while in the
ROK administration, some key officials including the chief of the national intelligence service
were opposed to the participation decision. Indeed, in the case of Canada, the Foreign Minister
Bill Graham admits that there is a fight within the Cabinet over the issue of participation in the
US-led operation against Iraq. 76 Although this was over the issue of US troops in the Philippines,
then-Foreign Minister Teofisto Guingona also resigned from his office over the return of US
bases issue. 77 The observed variations in the preferences and final choices of individual decision-
makers within the same administration indicate that the individual level analysis is critically
needed, in addition to the shared ideational factor.

Finally, I move onto the subjective individualist, or subjectivist, arguments based on
individual level beliefs and understandings. Again, in the previous chapter, I discussed how the
subjectivist argument could not explain why the dovish Foreign Minister Jack Straw, with a
pacifist background, supported military action against Iraq and why the dovish, anti-US ROK
President Roh Moo-hyun, who had campaigned on more autonomous foreign policy just three
months ago, decided to contribute non-combat troops to the US-led coalitional operation against
Iraq in March 2003. In this chapter too, individual level beliefs on one aspect of foreign security
policy are not enough to explain the observed variations in the final decisions.

Overall, with the increase in the number of decision-making cases to examine, the
competing theoretical explanations do not easily pass the first critical test. My two-level
ideational argument, focused on the degree of two-level contestation in the relevant action

---


knowledge, not only explains the US allies’ binary participation and non-participation decisions but also accounts for the presence and absence of diplomatic understandings and moral support for the US-led coalitional operation against Iraq in March 2003. For instance, the New Zealand’s non-participation decision is qualitatively different from the non-participation decisions of Canada and the Philippines in that the New Zealand government stops short in offering any understandings and moral support for the US-led military action against Iraq in March 2003. The Philippine government’s non-participation decision also shows even more contestation in action knowledge than the open, conditional foreign policy choices of the Canadian government.

I re-emphasize the explanatory value of the action knowledge, which is very domain-specific and less general than identity understandings. Many other pre-existing beliefs and understandings may be analyzed as relevant ideational factors contributing to the domain-specific action knowledge. To further test the explanatory value of the degree of two-level contestation in this ‘action knowledge,’ I turn to the second critical test leveraging the different logics of action.

**Critical Test 2—Different Logics of Action**

In this second round of critical empirical test, leveraging the differentially expected logics of action, I look at three types of observational data to measure and operationalize the types of cognitive process generating the final choice outcomes. Specifically, I examine the text-based measure, response time, and response change, and focus on the convergent validity across these measures. I have argued that *a priori* the logic of habit is a uniquely constructivist cognitive process concept. If I can document and show the operation of the logic of habit for the appropriate theoretical subgroups, then this empirical evidence would simultaneously confirm the expectations of my two-level ideational argument, while disconfirming the expectations of
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other competing arguments on the US allies’ joining behaviors. In addition, if the different types of cognitive process can be found for the different theoretical subgroups, then such additional cross-national empirical evidence would further increase the confidence in the generalizability of the findings of the critical tests and ultimately in the theory.

I discuss how I operationalize the types of cognitive process, wherever data is available. I could not provide the types of cognitive process for all 12 government decision-makers of interest, as I cannot locate their statements in March 2003, which would reflect their rationales for the final choice, or I cannot test for their response changes. This was the case for the New Zealand Defense Minister Mark Burton, Philippines Defense Minister Angelo Reyes, and Philippines Foreign Minister Blas Ople; Blas Ople passed away while in office in December 2003. 78 Before I conduct the second round of critical empirical test, leveraging the differentially expected logics of action, I first report the findings of the types of cognitive process for each of the government decision-makers of interest.

Canada: Findings

To get the text-based measure, I look at the statements made by the three government decision-makers of interest in the House of Commons on March 17, 2003. These statements on this particular date ensure that the verbalized rationales are the reasons for the final decision. To begin with the Prime Minister Jean Chretien, I read balanced aspects for both policy options. Jean Chretien says Iraq must comply fully with the UN Security Council resolutions, but that Canada would require Security Council approval as a condition for any participation in a military campaign. Although he chose not to participation in military action, he did not dismiss the non-adopted action of military action against Iraq. He was open to both options. In fact, the decision
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seems yet to be made; Canada’s participation in the coalitional operation would be a conditional one. If military action is launched without a new resolution, then Canada will not participate.

Prime Minister Jean Chretien says,

“I wish to make the Government of Canada’s position clear. We believe that Iraq must comply fully with the UN Security Council resolutions. We have always made it clear that Canada would require Security Council approval as a condition of nay participation in a military campaign.

In recent weeks, the Security Council has been unable to agree on a new resolution authorizing military action. Canada has expended every effort in seeking a compromise solution which would close the gap between the various members of the Security council. This initiative has, unfortunately, not been successful. It military action is launched without a new resolution, Canada will not be part of it.”

The alternative policy option is not dismissed, and there are positive aspects ascribed to military action to disarm Iraq. Yet, because the final decision is conditional, his statement shows some indeterminacy. The final decision would follow the concrete events on the ground. It is open to alternative courses of action. In this respect, the response time is slow.

Another aspect that I consider in operationalizing the type of cognitive process is the prospect of response change. As I was unable to personally interview the Prime Minister Jean Chretien, I use publicly available proxy interview data. In particular, the CTV News interviewed Jean Chretien on March 12, 2013, as the 10th anniversary of the Iraq War was approaching. Jean Chretien said he has no regrets about rejecting Canada’s participation in the US-led operation. He said, “It was a very important decision, no doubt about it. It was, in fact, the first time ever that there was a war that the Brits and the Americans were involved and Canada was not there.”

Chretien said that he refused to commit to military action in Iraq without a resolution from the UN Security Council and also mentioned that he was not convinced that Iraq had weapons of

80 “Saying ‘no’ to Iraq War was ‘important’ decision for Canada: Chretien.” CTV News, Mar. 12, 2013.
mass destruction. The reasons given in the interview ten years on were identical to the reasons stated in the parliamentary debates and from the data I gather from my interviews, and I argue that this convergence in reasons point to non-motivated process.

Because the Prime Minister Jean Chretien talked about the two policy options in a balanced way, and his statement reflects conditional action (i.e. undecided/need more information), I code this text data as non-motivated process. The slow response time is consistent with the text-based measure too. Although the prospects for response change are high for non-motivated process, it does not necessarily have to be. In this case, there is no response decoupling, but this is not inconsistent with the other two measures. Based on the text dimensions, response time, and response change data, I code non-motivated process for Canada’s Prime Minister Jean Chretien.

I code non-motivated process for the other two Foreign and Defense Ministers as well. In the oral question session during the House of Commons debate on March 17, 2003, the Foreign Minister Bill Graham discussed alternative courses of action, ranging from war to peace, albeit he notes that it will be very difficult to be optimistic.

**Bill Graham:** Mr. Speaker, I believe the Prime Minister made Canada’s position very clear today in the House. We will not go to war without the support of the United Nations. We will let the American authorities know this and they will draw their own conclusions. I believe that our position is clear and consistent with Canada’s longstanding position. That has been the Prime Minister’s position from the outset.

**Ms. Francine Lalonde (Mercier, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, of course we are happy with the position that Canada has just taken. However, as an advocate for multilateral institutions, Canada cannot accept having the Security Council lose all of its strength, being forced to kowtow to the United States, or become a meaningless body. What does the Minister of Foreign Affairs plan to do in response to this situation that is threatening world peace?

**Bill Graham:** Mr. Speaker, we will continue to do what we have done since the outset. We will work with all of the other countries in the world to build consensus where possible at the Security Council and come up a solution. Obviously, as the Prime Minister said today, it is very difficult
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to be optimistic, but that does not mean that we will cease our efforts to find peace through the Security Council.²²

Again, from the Foreign Minister Bill Graham’s statement and answers, there is a conditionality in Canada’s future course of action. He says that Canada will not cease efforts to build consensus and find peace. With such indeterminacy (undecided/need more information), the response time is slow, and from my own interviews with the Foreign Minister Bill Graham, there is fascinating amount of response decoupling:

“If the facts were correct, if Saddam had weapons – if we believe that there were chemical weapons, biological or nuclear weapons that he could use, then there is threat there. If there is global danger there and something has to be done, then our government would have gone even without the UN approval. But you see, if the facts were correct, then the French and Germans would have been there and it wouldn’t be a problem in the UN. Oh, but who knows what the Russians would do. But if the facts were correct, maybe even the Russians would have agreed.

So even if the public were against it, we are going. There were two UN resolutions already – and some were saying that we do not need a subsequent resolution. But even then, the public opinion would have been different. It all would have been different! World is a complicated place.”³³

Unfortunately, the Defense Minister John McCallum only talked about the logistics of the tactical group of 20 ships in the Gulf at the oral questions session on March 17, 2003. However, I was able to conduct one-on-one interview with the Defense Minister John McCallum, and he said that the final decision was ultimately the Prime Minister’s decision. This shows that there is some indeterminacy on his part too. He said that Canada was against military action without the UN Security Council approval for various reasons:

“You see, we didn’t have to send over one solider to join. Our navy was already there in the Gulf, 2000 sailors, for the mission in Afghanistan. We only had to say we were helping you, and the U.S. would have been delighted. It was not very costly for us to do it, but we didn’t. We didn’t
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like unilateralism. There was no legal basis. We didn’t think Saddam had weapons of mass destruction. We didn’t like George Bush. All these things -- didn’t want to go. And public opinion. You put public opinion first, as the primary factor, but I would put it in a mix of all these things.”  

As was the case with the Foreign Minister Bill Graham, the Defense Minister John McCallum also shows a fascinating amount of response decoupling:

“We also didn’t get along with George Bush – the fact that he was spearheading this was a factor. Obama could have made a difference. In reality, you know, it does make a difference – if it is someone you can trust and relate to. In real life, it is easier to go along with that person who you prefer. And we were not 100% sure whether weapons of mass destruction existed or not. We saw these presentations – but these were so circumstantial and lacked credibility.”

Since there is indeterminacy, or conditionality, in the final choice outcomes, slow response time, and high levels of response change for both the Foreign and Defense Ministers, I code non-motivated process for the two government actors of Canada at the time.

Australia: Findings

Again, for the text-based measure, I look at the statements made by the three government decision-makers in the Parliament on March 18, 2003. This ensures that the stated justifications are rationales for the adopted course of action. To begin with the Prime Minister John Howard, he announces that the government has now authorized the defense forces, pre-deployed to the gulf, to take part in coalition operations. He argues that joining the US-led military action against Iraq is in Australia’s national interest. He says, “Just as we believe action against Saddam Hussein’s regime is in our nation’s best interest, so too we believe it is clearly in our interest to

84 Author interview with Mr. John McCallum (Canada’s Minister of National Defence 2002-2003) on November 4, 2014.

85 Author interview with Mr. Bill Graham (Canadian Minister of Foreign Affairs 2002-2004 & Minister of National Defence 2004-2006) on November 6, 2014.
help rebuild a stable and prosperous Iraq,” and ends his statement with such national interest based argument. He concludes, “This decision has been taken by the government in the belief that it is in the long-term interests of this country. It has been taken against a background of a world environment changed forever by the events of 11 September.”

While the Prime Minister Howard argues that participation in the US-led coalitional operation against Iraq is in Australia’s national interest, he dismisses other viewpoints and alternative courses of action. He says that the argument in favor of peaceful diplomatic process to the Iraqi disarmament issue is ‘fundamentally flawed,’ and says that the government ‘totally’ rejects such peaceful diplomatic actions supported by France and others. Specifically, his statement reads as follows:

“The position articulated by those opposed to action is fundamentally flawed. They recognize that the threat of military action has been the only way to elicit a positive response from Iraq. Does anybody imagine that the weapons inspectors would have returned to Iraq had it not been the American military build-up? Kofi Anan does not believe so. Hans Blix does not believe so. Even Dominque de Villepin, the French foreign minister, acknowledges that reality, as does his President. So the position articulated by those who have been so critical of the Americans and others is fundamentally flawed.”

“We reject totally the argument put by France and by some other countries that the presence of inspectors will lead, over the passage of time, to disarmament. We cannot and will not ignore the experience of the last 12 years. We believe that the time has come to disarm Iraq, by force if necessary. We are participating in the US-led coalition to achieve this objective.”

Because the alternative courses of action, or conflicting response cues, are fundamentally and totally rejected, and only the positive aspects are highlighted about the participation decision, I code this statement on March 18, 2003 as taken-for-granted cognitive process. The ‘fundamental’
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and ‘total’ rejection indicate absolute dismissal of alternative courses of action and that serious conceptions and considerations of these alternatives were absent. The response time also seems to have been fast, even for the observers at the time. When Prime Minister John Howard said that the participation decision was made on the day of, Mr. Albanese cried out, “Six months ago!”90

In addition, I do not find any response change in the post-decision time period. When speaking in the wake of the publication of the Iraq Inquiry in the UK, Prime Minister John Howard said, “I believed that the decision to go into Iraq was justified at the time and I don’t resile from that because I thought it was the right decision.”91 As well, I note a difference in the substantial reason given by the Prime Minister ten years on in 2013 from the justifications given in 2003. In Mr. Howard’s 2013 address to the Lowy Institute on the 10th anniversary of the Iraq War, he says:

“Although the legal justification for the action taken against Iraq was based on her cumulative non-compliance with UN Security Council resolutions, and a properly grounded belief that Saddam possessed WMDs, a powerful element in our decision to join the Americans was, of course, the depth and character of our relationship with the US… At that time, and in those circumstances, and given our shared history and values, I judged that, ultimately, it was in our national interest to stand beside the Americans.”92

Mr. Howard even provides a quantifiable percentage scale. He says that, “In my view the circumstances we recall tonight necessitated a 100 percent ally, not a 70 or 80 per cent one, particularly as no compelling national interest beckoned us in the opposite direction…”93
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91 Doherty, Ben. 2016. “John Howard defends Iraq war, saying it was ‘justified at the time.’” The Guardian, Jul. 7.
93 Ibid.
In this 2013 address, Howard claims that besides the legal justifications, a powerful element in the decision to join the Americans was the ‘depth and character of Australia’s relationship with the US,’ and that it was in Australia’s national interest to stand beside the Americans. He goes on to say that, “There were many who argued that we should stay out, we should say “no” to the Americans for a change; that the true measure of a good friend was a willingness to disagree when the circumstances called for it…” but verbalizes that, “That argument escaped me then, and it still does.”

This word choice of ‘escape’ clearly shows that arguments for alternative courses of action have not been properly registered by the Prime Minister back then and now. ‘Escape’ of alternatives is probably the closest textual, or verbal, self-expression of the categorical failure of conflict detection.

Indeed, on March 18, 2003, the future Labor leader and Prime Minister Kevin Rudd notes of such escape. Mr. Rudd says that counter-arguments and alternative viewpoints are swept again under the great carpet of history. He says, “We have had no response to either of these fundamental, logical assaults on the core element of the Prime Minister’s argument for engaging in a unilateral military attack on Iraq. On this day of all days, when we have a formal debate in the parliament, and a formal presentation from the Prime Minister and the foreign minister, are any of these challenges and charges met directly with any form of argument? No. They are swept again under the great carpet of history in the hope that no-one will resurrect these arguments in the future.”

From the verbalizations of categorical failure in conflict detection, fast response time, no response change, differences in reasons across time periods, and an extremely high percentage of ‘100 percent ally’ all point to the same direction of taken-for-granted cognitive process for
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Australia’s Prime Minister John Howard at the time. Here, I note that such taken-for-granted process can manifest in addressing of the alternative courses of action; it is just that they are not taken as reasonable and serious. The adopted position can also be supported with national interest based argument, and this argument can be elaborate with all the positive aspects about the chosen strategy. There are no doubts, hesitations or negative aspects about the taken-for-granted response.

Next, I look at the measures for the Foreign Minister Alexander Downer. At the House of Representatives on March 18, 2003, he praises the UK Prime Minister Tony Blair for standing up for what is right. It was interesting to see that given my operationalization of the key independent variable for the Foreign Minister Alexander Downer, based on exogenous and antecedent profile data, Mr. Downer singled out the British Prime Minister’s leadership.

Alexander Downer said,

“I think Tony Blair is a courageous man, actually. The British Labour Party has the advantage that it has a true and a strong leader—something that you in the Australian Labor Party very much regret. This is not just an issue about Iraq; it is about the future. It is about whether the international community’s will, as expressed through the Security Council, amounts to anything more than a few words.” 96

While Mr. Downer highlighted why it is necessary to fight for the future, he said that the cost of inaction is too high. He says, “This is not an easy choice and is not an easy role, but the cost of inaction is to leave our future too much at risk.” 97 It is clear that Mr. Downer cannot seriously conceive of the alternative course of action of the peaceful diplomatic process to the Iraqi disarmament issue. They seem to be non-actual for him, as he says:

_____________________________________________________
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“There are many good countries that are prepared, sometimes in the teeth of public opposition, to stand up for what is right and for what is important because in the end, even if it is not altogether popular, we will provide a framework for a much more stable and secure world.”

As was the case with the Prime Minister John Howard, the Foreign Minister also mentions that joining the US-led operation against Iraq is in Australia’s national interest, and so he gives both instrumental and normative reasons. He also says that, “in contemplating this course of action, the government has been very conscious of the wellbeing of the Iraqi people. Every effort will be made to win the war quickly and to minimize civilian casualties.” Hence, the logic of habit does not prohibit deliberation. Yet, this deliberative process starts from a truncated decision tree. The other, diametrically opposed, alternatives are seem as to be non-actual and absurd.

With regards to response time, I cannot say without empirical evidence if the decision to participate in the US-led coalitional operation was indeed made six months prior to March 2003. However, in my interview with the Foreign Minister Alexander Downer, he said that when the Americans made the request, the Australian government was happy to help. There was no hesitation, doubt, or deliberation. The response seemed virtually automatic.

With respect to response change, there is no note of response change. When the Interpreter hosted a debate on the Iraq War ten years on in 2013, Alexander Downer said, “I’m one of those few people who occasionally part company with foreign policy realists… the international community has to stand for something. It has to have some universal values.”

Again, there is a universal value-based reasoning. Mr. Downer also said that Iraq has an unsteady democratic government and its economy is growing. “All that’s a big improvement on pre-2003

---
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Iraq.” There is no response change. The textual dimensions and no response change also point to taken-for-granted cognitive process for the Foreign Minister Alexander Downer.

Finally, for the Defense Minister Robert Hill, I look at his statement at the Senate on the same day of March 18, 2003. He repeats the prepared speech, similarly made by the Prime Minister John Howard at the House of Representatives. Yet, the Defense Minister Robert Hill also uses the critical lines, such as “the position articulated by those opposed to action is fundamentally flawed,” with slightly different reasons. For instance, he says:

“They recognize the only way to elicit a positive response form Iraq. Yet they squander the leveraging power of a military force by clearly demonstrating they are never prepared to actually use it. This strategy not only is illogical but ignores the practical reality: it is not possible to keep our forces in the gulf on alert indefinitely.”

Because the reasons that Mr. Hill provides are slightly different from those in the Prime Minister’s speech, I take this as some agency and voluntarism in Mr. Hill’s statement. Mr. Hill also says that, “The government does not accept that the only thing required to achieve complete and comprehensive disarmament is more time,” and similarly uses the words, “We reject totally the argument put by France and by some other countries that the presence of inspectors will lead, over the passage of time, to disarmament.” These words, such as I do not accept/I reject/I resist are the language used by the UK Defense Minister Geoff Hoon in the parliamentary debates, and I had coded it as the logic of practice. In contrast, the UK Foreign Minister Jack Straw, who shows non-motivated process, had addressed the counter-arguments and other viewpoints sufficiently by explaining why he disagrees or why the alternative courses of action

101 “Why the Iraq war was right.” Lowy Institute, The Interpreter, Mar. 26, 2013.
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may be infeasible based on logic and analysis. Mr. Straw does not use the languages of fundamentally flawed/reject/resist/I do not accept, etc. Further, the Defense Minister Robert Hill adds new arguments, such as:

“It is inherently dangerous to allow a country such as Iraq to retain weapons of mass destruction, particularly in light of its past aggressive behavior. If the world community fails to disarm Iraq, we fear other rogue states will be encouraged to believe that they too can have these most deadly of weapons and that the world will do nothing to stop them.”

Although I cannot check for the actual response time, I do find no response change from my interview with Mr. Hill:

Author: This is a hypothetical scenario, but say that various international agencies made it clear that there were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. Do you think the Administration/Cabinet would have made a different decision?

Robert Hill: At one time, Saddam Hussein had aspirations about nuclear weapons and clearly had chemical weapons and used it against his people. He had biological weapons. It was WMD debate and the UN and the issue was whether he disposed of those, and the issue was that he couldn’t unequivocally convince the international community that he had disposed of those weapons.

Indeed, back in the debate at the Senate on March 18, 2003, the Defense Minister argues that, “Saddam Hussein is married to his weapons of mass destruction. He will never give them up willingly. Militarism and aggression are the foundations of this regime.” Based on the textual dimensions, response time, and response change, I observe the logic of habit or the fast, taken-for-granted cognitive process in generating the final choice outcomes for the three government decision-makers of Australia at the time.
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New Zealand: Findings

For the case of New Zealand, I report the observable measures for two of the three government decision-makers of interest. This is because the New Zealand Defense Minister, Mark Burton, did not speak at the House of Representatives on March 18, 2003, and I was unable to interview him. I report the three measures for the Prime Minister Helen Clark and the Foreign Minister Phil Goff. To begin with the Prime Minister’s statement at the House of Representatives on March 18, 2003, she starts off with:

“The Government deeply regrets the breakdown of the diplomatic process over the Iraq crisis. The New Zealand Government, like most Governments, has been a strong supporter of that process running its course. Like most countries, our strong preference was for the disarmament of Iraq to occur peacefully, through a strong and intrusive weapons inspection process.”

She explained that, “our Government does not believe that the diplomatic process, backed by inspections and leading to disarmament, has run its course… For the majority of nations on the council, the threshold for the use of force had not been reached. Our Government supports and endorses that judgment.” In her speech, there is even a line where she explains why it is not possible to justify one’s friends taking such action. She asks, “it may be possible to justify one’s friends taking such action, but where then is our moral authority when other nations use the precedent that is not being set?” In short, the non-participation position taken by the New Zealand government decision-makers is more extreme than the non-participation decisions taken by the governments of Canada and the Philippines, as these latter two allies gave moral support for the US-led coalitional operation in Iraq in 2003.

---
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Although the Prime Minister refrains from criticizing close allies, she does negate any serious possibilities of war. Her words show that war, military action, or New Zealand’s joining of the US-led operation against Iraq are simply inconceivable, because war is a catastrophe to be avoided at all times. She says, “We have consistently said that only through full compliance could Iraq avert the catastrophe that war would bring to its people.” She again notes, “at this eleventh hour (of the 48 hour ultimatum) our Government urges Iraq to seize this very last opportunity to avert the catastrophe of war.”

While war is described as a catastrophe, the adopted policy of endorsement of peaceful disarmament process through inspection and monitoring were attached with only positive aspects. She said, “New Zealand’s position on the this crisis has at all times been based on our strong support for multilateralism and the rule of law, and for upholding the authority of the Security Council. It is a principled position, it has integrity, and we believe it is well understood by our friends.” Her reasons for the adopted position are based on principles, rule of law, and upholding the authority of the Security Council, but again, these substantial reasons are one-sided in that they bolster the preferred policy, while any other military possibilities are heavily discounted. There are no negative aspects ascribed to the peaceful process.

With regards to response time, this preferred policy of peaceful diplomatic approach to the Iraqi disarmament issue seems to have been adopted and decided on early on in the decision-making period of interest. This is clearly evident in her statement. When the Prime Minister Helen Clark talks about the UN Security Council resolution 1441 adopted in November 8, 2002, she mentions that, “New Zealand strongly backed that process, going so far as to send 13 military personnel to the UN weapons inspection team. The head of the team, Dr. Hans Blix, has singled out the New Zealand continuation for special recognition in his reports to the UN.

---
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Security Council.\textsuperscript{111} Such significant commitment of military personnel demonstrates the New Zealand government’s diplomatic and peaceful stance on the disarmament issue. She also says that on February 18, 2003, when the New Zealand Government took the opportunity afforded by the open debate at the Security Council to state its view on the conduct of the Iraq crisis, the Government said that,

\begin{quote}
“We placed considerable weight on the inspection and disarmament process, and that as long as the inspectors’ reports suggested that their work was useful in pursuing the Security Council’s objectives, that work should continue. We reiterated that we could not support military action against Iraq without a mandate from the Security Council.”\textsuperscript{112}
\end{quote}

In the second open debate in the Security Council on March 11, again, the Prime Minister said that, “we urged that he diplomatic process, which had gained traction, be allowed to run its course and that Iraq move rapidly to comply with all requirements made of it.”\textsuperscript{113} Thus, the same position seems to have adopted and made clear over and over, from at least the fall of 2002.

With regards to response change, although I was unable to interview the Prime Minister myself, there are numerous proxy interviews. She said that she does not regret her decisions, even whilst New Zealand’s powerful friends like the United States and the United Kingdom pressured the country to join the US-led coalitional operation in 2003.\textsuperscript{114} The textual dimensions, fast response time, and no response change all point to the fast, taken-for-granted cognitive process for the Prime Minister Helen Clark.

\begin{footnotes}
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Next, I look at the Foreign Minister Phil Goff’s statements at the House of Representatives on March 18, 2003. He starts with, “Decisions have now been taken that portend events, probably within 48 hours, that will result in death and destruction.”¹¹⁵ Like the Prime Minister, Mr. Goff literally speaks of war as a catastrophe to be avoided at all times. He says:

“Why have we resisted the use of force at this time? We have resisted it, as a Government and as a country, because the other options have not been exhausted. We have resisted it because, as Kofi Annan has said, ‘War is always a catastrophe.’ People suffer and people die, not only as a result of bombs and bullets but as a result of the destruction of the infrastructure that takes away their shelter, their food supply, their water, and their medicines. War should always be avoided, while there are alternative ways of resolving problems, we believe that those alternatives still exist.”¹¹⁶

Thus, it is clear that the non-preferred action of joining the US-led coalitional operation against Iraq is a non-actual policy option. Military action and war cannot be seriously conceived of. He literally says, “This has been a serious debate, and I welcome that. But various speakers have made comments with which I strongly disagree.”¹¹⁷ In giving the reasons for the adopted course of action of staying out of the US-led campaign, Mr. Goff says:

“I believe that it was possible to achieve disarmament by intense diplomatic pressure… after the 4-year absence of United Nations inspection teams from Iraq, the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission had been readmitted, and it had been there for less than 4 months. In the words of Hans Blix, a person for whom I have great personal respect, it was making progress. We had seen the inspections recommenced. We had heard the debate over the use of U2 flights, won by the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission team. We had seen the al-Samoud missiles destroyed. We had seen the questioning of the scientists begin.”¹¹⁸


¹¹⁶ Ibid.

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ Ibid.
And then Mr. Goff explains,

“The reason that route was stopped was not that there was any imminent or immediate threat from Iraq. As long as the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission team was there, no threat was posed by that country. Threats would have been posed long term if that process had not been carried through. The tragedy is that the timetable we are working to is a timetable driven by the build-up of military forces in the region and the approach of summer.”

He also adds that, “I am proud of the fact that as a small but sovereign country, we have been prepared to do what we believe is right, and to take the stance that we have taken because of a sincerely and strongly held belief.”

Again, the reasons given for the adopted course of action is based on values and beliefs. Yet, Australia’s Foreign Minister Alexander Downer also uses this language of standing up for what is right, and the need to fight for universal values. The substance of the reasons for the adopted choice can be various; it can be about national interest, values, or principles, but there is a key similarity in that the non-adopted course of action is not seriously taken as a reasonable alternative. There is also textual absence of negative aspects about the adopted course of action, as it is so apparent and given.

I know that the response time is similarly fast for the Foreign Minister Phil Goff, as he was in charge of New Zealand’s actions and statements at the UN Security Council. In my interview, Mr. Goff also said that as the Foreign Minister, he was in charge of these international actions and stances. The peaceful diplomatic stance was made clear over and over again, since at least November of 2002. I unfortunately do not have data on the prospects of response change for the Foreign Minister Phil Goff, but based on the textual dimensions and fast response time, I code a taken-for-granted cognitive process for Mr. Goff. As none of the three types of observational data are available for the Defense Minister Mark Burton, I cannot measure the type
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of cognitive process for this government actor. Yet, for both the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister, I observe the workings of the logic of habit, or the fast taken-for-granted process at the time.

**The Philippines: Findings**

For the case of the Philippines, I unfortunately could not view the statements made by the three government decision-makers in March 2003. This is because the House of Representatives’ text of House bills, resolutions and committee reports are available online via the Legislative Documents of the House website from the 13th Congress (2004 - 2007) onward. Hence, I use various sources to get the text-based measure, response time, and response change for the Philippine President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo. I use the 2003 House Journals, or the official record of the session proceedings in the House, scholarly research, and proxy interviews.

In October 2002, the Philippine President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo “underscored the realities that shape her foreign policy even as she emphasized the relevance of the bilateral relationship between the Philippines and the United States.”121 Morada notes that, this included among other things the growing importance of ASEAN in the Philippines’ foreign policy decision-making and the continuing significance of the international Islamic community for the Philippines.122 Indeed, in her speech made before the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, she stressed the importance of resolving conflict through diplomacy and pursuing the processes of the UN Security Council.123 However, in the President’s speech delivered before the Philippine Military Academy, she had supported the impending US-led war
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against Iraq.\textsuperscript{124} The House of Representative Ocampo pointed out that this was a “marked shift in the position of the government” from advocating a peaceful, multilateral approach to supporting the US-led Iraq War.\textsuperscript{125} Such shift in the foreign policy stance of the Philippine government, and the President’s usage of the word “realities” that shape her foreign policy, indicate contestation in action knowledge and point to a socially constrained process.

The response time seems to have been slow too. Morada notes that the opposition Senator, Aquilino Pimentel advised the President that it would be prudent for the administration to wait for a UN Security Council resolution on the matter before formulating a stand.\textsuperscript{126} Meanwhile, administration Senator Loren Legarda agreed that any resort to force against Iraq must have the mandate of the United Nations.\textsuperscript{127} And so, like Canada, the options were open until the last minute. But in the end, without the UN authorization, Morada notes that, the Philippines’ stance on the issue is “primarily anchored on the strong domestic support for a multilateral and diplomatic approach in resolving the issue between Iraq and the United States.”\textsuperscript{128}

Privately, though, it seems that President Macapagal-Arroyo wanted to support and contribute more to the US-led coalitional operation. With regards to fuel stops and overflights of US war planes in the Philippines, President Macapagal-Arroyo herself described it as “traditional”\textsuperscript{129} and that it would not require any permission from Congress. And so, on March
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17, 2003, the House of Representative Ocampo said out that if the President really wanted to arrive at a consensus and comply with the requirements of the Constitution, then she can call for extra session days; this, he emphasized, “would enable the Members to clarify the position of the Chief Executive regarding the war of the US against Iraq.” The executive’s traditional airspace offer seemed to flip-flop, and it was not made clear.

In addition to the range of foreign policy stances entertained by the Philippine government, albeit all within the bounds of non-participation in the US-led coalitional operation, and the slow response time, for this to represent a socially constrained process, response change should be highly likely. In particular, there should be a distance between the President’s own personal preference and her chosen course of action as the President of the Philippines. Besides her word choice of “realities” that constrain her foreign policy, I point to a decisive line during her interview with PBS News Hour, on May 20, 2003, on exactly the bilateral relations between the Philippines and the United States, including the Iraq issue. When the interviewer, Gwen Ifill, asked, “You have decided not to run for reelection, last I checked, in 2004. Why not?” President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo answered:

“I feel that if I am freed of the burden of politics, then I can do more and I can take more unpopular decisions. I can have as my guidance for decision whatever is right, not whatever is popular.”

---
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This line clearly demonstrates a distance between her own preferences and her chosen policies. Due to the textual dimensions, slow response time, and response distance, I code a socially constrained process for the Philippine President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo at the time.

Overall, the measured logics of action, or types of cognitive process in generating the final decision outcomes, map nicely onto my theoretical expectations. I find the workings of the logic of habit for the government decision-makers in boxes (1) and (9). This is the case for the government decision-makers of Australia and New Zealand. Such finding confirm my theoretical expectations and disconfirm other competing explanations of US allies’ joining behaviors, as they do not a priori expect to see the logic of habit in such non-default, high-stakes decision-making context. I also observe a non-motived cognitive process for the government decision-makers of Canada, while I observe a socially constrained process for the Philippine President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo. Because the two dependent variables—the final choice outcomes and the logics of action—support the highly elaborate set of theoretical expectations, I find promising support for my two-level ideational argument of the US allies’ joining behaviors, specified from the general level sociological theory of choice.

Addressing the Alternative Explanations on the Logic of Habit

I now address how the competing theoretical arguments on the US allies’ joining behaviors would explain the observed logic of habit. I start with the objective holist arguments that focus on threats and relative dependence on the alliance. If existential threats are either evidently high or low, one might expect the national decision-makers to make foreign security policy decisions through a fast, taken-for-granted cognitive process. This would be akin to the complete information game. If all the parameters were known, then the final action would be
adoption very quickly. With regards to levels of information, all four governments are close intelligence cooperation partners of the United States, especially in the post September 11 period.

One could argue that the Australian decision-makers were able to engage in taken-for-granted process due to high existential threats from Iraq and its WMD program. However, this threat-based argument does not go far. It does not explain why the Philippine President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo, who was fighting terrorism in her own country, with the significant help from the United States, does not show the fast, taken-for-granted cognitive process. One could argue that the New Zealand decision-makers were able to engage in taken-for-granted process due to low levels of threats. Yet again, this argument does not travel far. The Canadian decision-makers with low levels of threats do not show the fast, taken-for-granted process. I fail to support consistent support for this alternative explanation based on the complete information game.

From the previous chapter on the UK and ROK cases, only the Defense Ministers exhibited the fast, taken-for-granted process, or the logic of practice. In this chapter, I was able to operationalize the logic of action for one more Defense Minister. Canada’s Defense Minister, John McCallum, does not show such similarly fast, taken-for-granted cognitive process that could be inherent to the position. Canada’s Defense Minister John McCallum shows indeterminacy, and fascinating amount of response change. I can confidently cross off the logic of habit for John McCallum, and with this, I can more confidently conclude that the fast logics are not only reserved for the government positions of Defense Ministers.

With regards to the other objectivist side-payments argument, the Philippines case is the prototypical case. With President Macapagal-Arroyo deciding not to run for reelection, she did not have politics to think about and was not constrained by electoral incentives. With the extraordinarily high benefits and aids from the US government at the time, she should be the
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most likely leader to engage in the fast, taken-for-granted process. All the cost-benefit calculus would expect the President to reach the participation decision through the fast, taken-for-granted process. Yet, she adopts a non-participation, but morally supportive, decision through a socially constrained process.

Moving onto the second alternative argument on why one would find the logic of habit, the objective individualist arguments expect that when national leaders do not face critical political opposition, they may habitually choose to adopt their preferred position. Besides the Philippines case, in all the other three cases, the governments faced the rival political party with a different foreign policy stance towards Iraq. In Canada, the conservative party wanted Canada to join in the US-led military action against Iraq. In Australia, the Labor party wanted Australia to stay out of the US-led military campaign. In New Zealand, the conservative parties wanted New Zealand to join in the US-led coalitional operation against Iraq. Nevertheless, I still observe the logic of habit in the government decision-makers of Australia and New Zealand. Thus, I fail to find support for this alternative explanation on the logic of habit, based on domestic political constraints.

In general, the objectivist arguments expect the national leaders to be consummate calculators and maximizers of balance-of-threat as well as votes. They are supposed to be actively playing the two-level game. However, in this prototypical non-default, high-stakes decision-making context, I only observe the three government decision-makers of Canada to be engaged with the non-motivated process. And even then, they are not considering the threat or electoral consequences. I generally fail to find support for this expectation that national leaders are deliberating actors.
Next, I address the alternative argument based on shared understandings. Although intersubjectivist arguments certainly do expect to observe the logic of habit, it is unclear when one should observe the logic of habit and why. My two-level ideational argument focused on the degree of two-level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge closes this theoretical gap.

Finally, I address the alternative subjectivist explanation based on strong and consistent attitudes. The additional cases examined in this chapter support this alternative explanation. Those who show the logic of habit are those with strong and consistent attitudes. These are the cases for the government decision-makers of Australia and New Zealand at the time. However, in the previous chapter, I have explained that the UK Prime Minister Tony Blair is different from the Defense Ministers Geoff Hoon and Cho Young-kil in a subtle, yet significant, way. Based on his statement, I see that Tony Blair seriously conceives of the alternative course of action of calling the British troops back home. He gives reasons why this would be an even worse choice. He notes the criticisms and negative aspects of the adopted course of action of joining the US-led war in Iraq. On the other hand, for the UK and ROK Defense Ministers, the alternatives cannot be seriously conceived and there are no negative aspects attached to the preferred course of action of joining the US-led coalitional operation. Furthermore, this subjectivist alternative explanation based on the strong and consistent attitudes cannot explain why the ROK President Roh Moo-hyun chose to participate and send non-combats to the US-led coalitional operation in Iraq in March 2003.

Overall, when I look at all six, cross-national decision-making cases for the 2003 Iraq War, only my two-level ideational argument, specified from the general level sociological theory of choice, passes the two rounds of critical empirical tests. The varying degrees of two-level contestation in action knowledge best explain both the final choice outcomes and the cognitive
process generating these final decisions. The comparative, multi-methods aspect of the research design increases my confidence in the generalizability of the findings of the critical empirical tests, adjudicating the competing theoretical explanations of the US allies’ joining behaviors.

III. Summary

The cross-national findings from these two additional paired-comparisons in this chapter strongly support my two-level ideational argument against the existing alternatives. In the first critical test, only my two-level ideational argument passes the test, while others cannot account for the observed variations in the final choice outcomes. In the second critical test, only the subjective individualist argument passes the test in that the individual level strength and consistency in beliefs explain why the government decision-makers of Australia and New Zealand exhibit the logic of habit. However, I bring in the findings of the UK and ROK cases in the previous chapter to argue that this alternative explanation on the logic of habit is insufficient in accounting for the observed variations, even among those government actors who belong to the extreme columns of individual level non-contestation in action knowledge. Moreover, because there are sufficiently different logics of action exhibited by other theoretical subgroups, the additional cross-national empirical evidence documented in this chapter strongly supports the two-level ideational arguments.
6. Conclusion

In this dissertation, I have delved into the various logics of action as developed and conceptualized in International Relations theory. I have further specified how these logics of action map onto the types of cognitive process as documented in the cognitive sciences over the last four decades. On the surface, all the different logics of action can potentially generate the same observable choice of participation, or non-participation, in US-led operations of interest. On the surface, politically accountable national leaders will (have to) address the multiple courses of action endorsed by diverse viewpoints among the elites and the publics. Leaders and officials will say that they have deliberated over the issue and that on balance the chosen course of action is based on national interests or principles and values. Such clear presence of alternative courses of action, verbalization of deliberative thought process, and existence of some sort of utility make it challenging for anyone to observe, let alone establish, the non-deliberative and non-utilitarian logic of habit. Indeed, what we can see from the surface is biased against the finding of the enigmatic logic of habit.

Besides the challenges of observing the logic of habit, one could raise the ultimate question: So what? Why does it matter if the decision outcome we observe is generated through the logic of habit or any other logics of non-habit? My short answer is that our causal understandings are at stake. Habits are said to reside in social structures, and when there is a complete symmetry between the social structures and the individual minds, then the logic of
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habit, or taken-for-grantedness of the given and natural, becomes possible.\(^2\) If we do not zoom in on the intra-individual level cognitive process, and do away with the logic of habit, then we are in the realm of individualism and utility; the social universe is effectively bypassed in analyzing the decision-making problem of interest. Like others, I emphasize that serious inferential errors may result, precisely because individual preferences, beliefs, and certainty levels may be endogenous to the omitted variable of pre-existing social universe.

In this dissertation, I propose a joint analysis of subjective individualism and subjective holism to account for the variation in the unobservable types of cognitive process within the minds and brains of individual decision-makers as well as the variation in the observable behaviors. The dependent variable is integrated: from the mind, brain, and behavior. Such proposal for a joint analysis is unoriginal. Such ‘fifth way’ has indeed been advanced by Berger and Luckmann (1966). In IR, there have been continuous calls for the social constructivists and political psychologists to join forces in the study of international relations.\(^3\) In his most recent work on the quantum mind, Wendt also brings individuals back in and describes the holographic individual.\(^4\)

Still, I provide two contributions to the table. One is theoretical, and the other is empirical. First, I address a theoretical gap in the literature: we know less about when the logic of habit would play out, and when the other logics of action—namely, the logic of consequences, the logic of appropriateness, and the logic of rationalization—would unravel within the minds and brains of individual actors in decision-making contexts. The sociological theory of choice

\(^2\) This is the classic argument by Berger and Luckmann (1966).

\(^3\) For instance, Wendt (1992); Shannon and Kowert (2011); Jervis (2017); and Kertzer and Tingley (2018) encourage studies that connect these ideational approaches at different levels of analysis.

\(^4\) Please see Wendt (2010, 2015).
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developed in this dissertation specifies these conditions. In particular, the explanatory variable that I advance is the degree of two-level contestation in relevant action knowledge. Some sort of utility or purpose is the not the baseline; the non-deliberative and non-utilitarian logic of habit, or taken-for-grantedness in the human cognition, is certainly possible and explicitly explained.

The added value of the sociological theory of choice is manifold. In addition to explaining when and why the different logics of action would generate the observable behaviors, the general level theory of choice enriches our horizons of uncertainty. It not only provides a richer account of different kinds of uncertainty but also adds the possibility of complete certainty. Specifically, there are naturalistic certainty/uncertainty as well as subjective certainty/uncertainty for the actors under study. Such distinctions in uncertainty have already been documented in the judgment and decision-making literature. The logic of habit, or taken-for-grantedness, can operate when there is naturalistic certainty of the adopted course of action.

The general level theory also distinguishes at least three kinds of biases in choice. The first kind is the most widely known. There is a bias in choice due to selective attention and motivated processing, which lead to further confirmation and disconfirmation biases. I find that the UK Prime Minister Tony Blair engaged in motivated processing. Unlike the UK Defense Minister Geoff Hoon, who exhibited the logic of practice, Mr. Blair was able to register the conflicting response cues. He succeeded in detecting the conflicting policy options and addressed why the preferred policy may be a better course of action.

Another kind of bias in choice results from social influences and constraints. Although there may not necessarily be a bias in the information processing stream (i.e. selective attention and motivated processing), a bias in choice still results from social constraints. In this

---

5 Please see Juanchich, Gourdon-Kanhukamwe, and Sirota (2017).
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dissertation, I find this bias in choice to be most unstable across social environments and time periods. Those government actors with socially constrained processes—the ROK President Roh Moo-hyun, the ROK Foreign Minister Yoon Young-kwan, and the Philippine President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo—either clearly state their own personal preference, which is different from the choice of action that they took in their official capacity, or remain open to response change possibilities. Although the sample size is three, all three actors show response change, and this is a clear indication of socially constrained process, which also is consistent with the other types of measures.

Comparatively speaking, I had a sample size of four government decision-makers, who indicated non-motivated process. They include the UK Foreign Minister Jack Straw, Canada’s Prime Minister Jean Chretien, Canada’s Foreign Minister Bill Graham, and Canada’s Defense Minister John McCallum. Of these four actors, one said that there are no regrets in the decision made, as it was the best judgment at the time. This was the case for the UK Foreign Minister Jack Straw. Such absence of response change in the post-decision period is not necessarily inconsistent with the non-motivated cognitive process concept or with the other measures. Canada’s Prime Minister Jean Chretien said that, in addition to the absence of the UN Security Council authorization of the use of force, the intelligence on Iraq’s WMD issue was not convincing. Indeed, in my own interviews with Canada’s Foreign and Defense Ministers, the two government actors at the time commonly said that if there were more convincing evidence, Canada would have joined in the US-led military action against Iraq—even without the UN mandate. I maintain that this readiness, albeit hypothetical, to adopt a diametrically opposite, alternative course of action is strongly indicative of a non-motivated process and of the logic of
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either instrumental or normative consequences. This is the prototypical instance of decision-making process undergirding the expected utility theory of choice.

Finally, it has been argued that the most durable bias lies in habit, doxa, or reality. This is because the alternative courses of action seem non-actual, and so they cannot be seriously conceived. All three government decision-makers of interest for the cases of Australia and New Zealand indicate that the fast, taken-for-granted process generated the participation and non-participation decisions, respectively. The ROK Defense Minister Cho Young-kil also exhibits such fast, taken-for-granted process in his parliamentary committee statements and responses to my interview questions. Unlike the motivated process, which is the closet kind of bias in choice, the taken-for-granted process has some unique characteristics. First, it does not ascribe any negative aspects to the adopted course of action. And second, it fundamentally and totally rejects and dismisses the alternative courses of action. Whether it is participation or non-participation in US-led military campaigns of interest, there is naturalistic certainty of the chosen action, and this explains the ‘categorical failure of conflict detection.’

Many IR scholars have been calling for an updated decision-making framework where biases are explicitly incorporated. Since the sociological theory of choice predicts and explains three different kinds of biases in choice, I believe that this is a huge gain in our understandings of biases in decision-making in general.

Further, the theory illuminates when and why individual level variables, including dispositions and traits, would matter most in explaining the final choice. First of all, individual leader level beliefs would matter most, when there is institution level contestation in the relevant

---

6 For instance, please see, Bourdieu (1977); Eagleton and Bourdieu (1992); Hopf (2010); and Crossley (2013).

7 For instance, please see, Lake (2011); Hafner-Burton et al. (2017); Kertzer, Rathbun and Rathbun (forthcoming).
action knowledge. If leaders have individual level non-contestation in the relevant action knowledge, the theory expects motivated processes and subsequent biases in the final choice outcomes. If the leaders have individual level contestation in the relevant action knowledge too, then the final choice is most indeterminate. The final decision will closely follow the events and information on the ground at the time. A careful process-tracing would be essential to uncover the causal trigger or tipping point in this case.

I expected the individual leader attributes, such as leadership styles and self-monitoring traits, to have an independent effect on the final choice outcomes, when there is institutional level non-contestation in the action knowledge, while there is either leader level contestation in the action knowledge or cross-level contestation in the action knowledge. Depending on the leader attributes, the theoretically expected socially constrained cognitive process will be more likely or less likely. In this dissertation study, three government actors fell in this sample; they were the ROK President Roh Moo-hyun, the ROK Foreign Minister Yoon Young-kwan, and the Philippine President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo. Although this particular, small sample showed high levels of social influences, this does not necessarily negate the theoretical possibility of independent effects of individual leader attributes in this case.

Overall, the general level sociological theory of choice developed in this dissertation is not an alternative to the classical expected utility theory of choice. Rather, it subsumes the expected utility theory, and explains when the logic of habit (absence of utility) and the various logics of instrumental, normative, and motivated rationality (presence of utility) would hold and why. Similarly, the sociological theory of choice is not an alternative to the behavioral theories of choice. It subsumes the behavioral theories, as it specifies when the motivated process would unravel and why. It also specifies when the other types of fast processes, documented in the
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‘heuristics and biases’ program, would play out and why. The wide array of these other fast processes—namely, heuristics, stereotypes, practice-based varieties, and emotions—could and do play out in non-conflict conditions, where conflicting response cues are not directly prompted upon the individual actor. And so, the conflicting response cue conditions ensure the narrowing of this wide array of fast processes and isolating of the taken-for-granted process, or the ‘categorical failure of conflict detection.’

The second contribution of this dissertation is empirical. Because the observable surface is poised against the observation of the non-deliberative and non-utilitarian logic of habit, it was vital to build a priori measurement standards with which anyone could easily operationalize any one of the logics of action, especially in decision-making contexts where there are conflicting response cues. There were many readily available options: one could ask the subjects of interest, one could use various brain scan and monitoring techniques, and one could use physiological measures. I did not pursue these options due to measurement validity concerns, feasibility issues, especially when the target populations are national leaders and government officials who may even be deceased, and exorbitant measurement costs.

Instead, I drew upon a large body of experimental literature in the thinking and reasoning field of the cognitive sciences. Specifically, I found and explained why the ‘conflict detection hypothesis’ that there is a causal increase in response time across non-conflict to conflicting

---

8 Rogers, Moore, and Norton (2017) ask respondents if they think their beliefs are objective or subjective.

9 Botvinick, Cohen, and Carter (2004); Klein et al. (2007); and Banks and Hope (2014) employ brain scans and monitoring techniques within the conflict detection framework.

10 Ball et al. (2006); and De Neys, Moyens, and Vansteenven (2010) use physiological measures within the conflict detection framework.

11 Please see Pronin (2007).

12 Please see Bennett and Cheekel (2014), Chapter 1.
response cue conditions, and the ‘categorical failure in conflict detection’ in the most biased subset of respondents, may be the most suitable and useful way to think about and build the much-needed measurement standards. I employ three measures that are already standardized in this literature. I use response time, response change, and decision certainty measures. In controlled experimental settings, the researchers can randomly assign participants in non-conflict and conflicting response cue conditions and operationalize the types of cognitive process, using the causal changes in these three measures of response time, response change, and decision certainty levels. In observational settings, the researchers would first have to ensure that there are conflicting response cues, in order to narrow down the wide array of fast processes. One can still manage to examine the relative response times. In post-decision periods, one can examine the prospects of response change. And in the future, there can be dictionaries of words that indicate different kinds of certainty and uncertainty.

In addition to the three standardized measures of response time, response change, and decision certainty, I devised a classification scheme based on texts of the reasons, aspects, and thoughts produced once the final choice is made. Instead of using the concurrent verbal protocol, I use the retrospective verbal protocol, as developed by Ericsson and Simon (1993), to classify the appropriate sample of texts into types of cognitive process generating the final choice outcome. The open-ended texts from my cross-national survey experiments on the UK and ROK adult citizens on a variety of questions provided the stepping-stones to read and classify the primary and secondary materials in the observational chapters 4 and 5.

Indeed, the text-based measure of the types of cognitive process in decision-making contexts can be a readily available measure for both experimental and observational researchers. Before I reiterate on the two dimensions of the classification scheme, I will note the differences
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across the experimental and observational settings. The major difference across these two settings was precisely in the fast, taken-for-granted cognitive process. While in my online survey experiments, survey respondents could just regurgitate their choices without any substantial justifications, this may not be possible for the publicly accountable national leaders and officials. In this respect, they would also have to address the multiple courses of action, endorsed by diverse group of elites and publics.

If this had to be the case, I had to further derive out how to disentangle the taken-for-granted process from the motivated process, as the motivated process can be classified as addressing alternative courses of action but with an imbalance of substantial reasons. I derived out two textual features that could distinguish these two processes. The first is to see how seriously the speaker is engaged with the non-adopted, diametrically opposed, alternative course of action. One can examine if these alternatives are not adopted based on logic and analysis of available evidence. Some keywords of ‘categorical failure of conflict detection’ were: the opposition is fundamentally flawed/we totally reject/we resist/(alternatives) escape me/I do not accept. In addition, the second critical textual aspect is that there is an absence of negative aspects ascribed of the adopted course of action, as there is naturalistic certainty in it.

Given these further specifications, the two textual dimensions that one can look at are as follows. First, one can examine if the alternative courses of action are “seriously” conceived or not. One can examine if the non-adopted courses of action are treated as absurd or not. If one gives reasons and analyses on why the alternative courses of action should not be adopted, then this would be signs of other types of cognitive processes. Yet, if these alternatives are too swifty and fundamentally dismissed, then this may indicate a taken-for-granted process. The second dimension is the balance of substantial reasons. If there is an absence of negative aspects
ascribed to the adopted response, then this may indicate taken-for-grantedness. If there are negative aspects ascribed to the adopted response, but there are even more negative aspects about the non-adopted response, then this could indicate motivated process. If both negative and positive aspects are ascribed to the adopted response, then this could indicate a socially constrained process. If positive aspects are attached to the non-adopted response, then this could indicate non-motivated process. It is relatively easy to differentiate between the motivated and non-motivated processes, as there are positive aspects ascribed to non-adopted response. It is also relatively easy to differentiate between the socially constrained and non-motivated processes, as there are keywords that verbalize on the social constraints; there is verbalization of personal versus official preference and there may be verbalized awareness of “realities.”

Again, if these text-based classifications are consistent with the other available measures, such as response time, response change, and decision certainty levels, then that would significantly increase one’s confidence in the measurement validity. In both experimental and observational arms of the multi-methods research design of this dissertation study, I checked and confirmed the consistency across the variety of measures.

Equipped with these measurement standards, I demonstrated the explanatory value of the sociological theory of choice by deriving and testing contextualized propositions. The concrete context concerned an instance of alliance bargaining. I address the question of what explains the US allies’ joining behaviors in US-led operations that lack the international institutional authorization to use armed force. I have argued that this particular context consists a hard test for the sociological theory of choice and for the mid-level theoretical argument specified from it. I explained why it would be the least-likely time and place to observe the logic of habit within the minds and brains of government decision-makers. If I can show that the two-level ideational
argument, specified from the sociological theory of choice, outperforms the existing alternative explanations in this hard case, then the explanatory value of the general level sociological theory of choice would be markedly demonstrated.

Indeed, the general level sociological theory of choice can be applied to explain the choices and actions in many other domains. It does not necessarily have to the international security domain, and even the domain of international relations. It can be applied to explain national and subnational politics. It can be applied to domains outside of politics. Regardless of the substance and level of analysis of the decision-making problem, the three theoretical specifications are as follows. First, for each of the actors of interest, one would need to locate which aggregate group or institution counts as the institutional level, which provides the baseline reality for the action under inquiry. Second, one would need to inductively recover the ideational factors that make up the relevant action knowledge. This action knowledge may include the relevant part of the identity understandings of other actors involved in the decision-making problem, and it can also include other beliefs. Finally, one would need to theorize on the relative strengths of each of these ideational factors so that there can be a degree of contestation in this action knowledge. Such theorization would need to involve how and when the actors of interest would know what to do and what not to do. Other combination of beliefs should logically lead to contestation in the action knowledge; actors would not know what to do.

In this concrete context of alliance bargaining over the foreign policy stance against a third-party, I have made the following three specifications from the general level sociological theory of choice. First, I specified the institution level for each of the individual actors under study. For the chief executive, I specified that the institution would be his or her national security team. For the Foreign and Defense Ministers, I specified this institution as the bureaucratic state
organization that they head. Then, I specified which of the pre-existing ideas would contribute to the relevant action knowledge. Because the decision-making problem involves the domain of national security policy and the use of force abroad, I specified that the pre-existing beliefs on national security strategies as well as on military effectiveness would be relevant. As there are other actors involved—namely, the United States and the United Nations—I include the parts of identity understandings that should be relevant for the pre-existing action knowledge too.

Finally, I theorized that when the pre-existing belief in the effectiveness of bilateralism is stronger than that of multilateralism, and there is strong belief in military effectiveness, then the degree of contestation in action knowledge would be ‘non-contested’ towards participation in US-led operations of interest. On the other hand, if the pre-existing belief in the effectiveness of multilateralism is stronger than that of bilateralism, and there is weak belief in military effectiveness, then the degree of contestation in action knowledge would be ‘non-contested’ towards non-participation in US-led operations of interest. In cases of any other combinations of these beliefs, the degree of contestation in the relevant action knowledge should be ‘contested’ over what to do.

I look at the degree of two-level contestation in this action knowledge and derive expectations on two dependent variables: 1) the final choice outcomes, and 2) the types of cognitive process generating the final choice. Whenever there is a complete two-level non-contestation in action knowledge, the taken-for-granted process is most likely to play out. When there is institutional level non-contestation in action knowledge, while there is individual level contestation in the action knowledge, I expect a socially constrained process. Similarly, when there is cross-level contestation in action knowledge, I expect a socially constrained process. Next, when there is institutional level contestation in action knowledge, while there is individual
Conclusion

level non-contestation in the action knowledge, I expect a motivated process to unravel. Lastly, whenever there is a complete two-level contestation in action knowledge, the non-motivated process is likely to unfold.

I set up two rounds of critical empirical tests. In the first round, I check if the competing theoretical arguments explain the observed variation in the final choice outcomes. Given the problem of equifinality, already much exposed in international security studies,\textsuperscript{13} I set up a second round of critical test, leveraging the differentially expected logics of action. I argue that \textit{a priori} only the constructivist arguments would expect to observe the logic of habit, even in this least-likely case. I also further derive alternative explanations of the logic of habit, if one were to observe it, and address these alternative arguments.

I employ a cross-national, multi-methods research design to conduct the two rounds of critical tests. I chose to focus on two special US allies—the United Kingdom and the Republic of Korea—as these allies almost always receive US requests to join the military operations, and yet, they are vastly different from one another. Any similar findings from these two allies could increase my confidence in the generalizability of the findings from the critical empirical tests. Still, I check against any biases stemming from the two main cases by examining additional, out-of-sample cases. I study the decision-making cases of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines. The findings of the two rounds of critical empirical tests across each stage of the three stages in the cross-national, multi-methods research design overwhelmingly support the two-level ideational argument on the US allies’ joining behaviors, specified from the general level sociological theory of choice.

The rest of this conclusion chapter proceeds in three parts. First, I provide a summary of findings of the two rounds of critical tests, adjudicating the competing theoretical explanations,

\textsuperscript{13} Please see Johnston (1995); Walt (2011).
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across the three empirical chapters 3-5. Second, I discuss the practical policy implications of this dissertation study. Finally, I address the limitations and discuss directions for future research.

I. Summary of Findings

I first start my cross-national, multi-stage research design with survey experiments on adult UK and ROK citizens, primarily in order to check for the validity of the derived measures, develop a text classification scheme, and test my hypotheses on large-N samples. The large-N citizen samples provide statistical confidence of not only the measurement standards of the types of cognitive process but also the propositions of my two-level ideational argument on the US allies’ joining behaviors, specified from the sociological theory of choice. The strength of randomization in controlled experiments is that it ensures a clean causal inference of treatment effects, which in this case are the effects of conflicting response cue conditions. With the survey questionnaires, I also operationalize the subgroups of theoretical interest in a highly precise manner. The various measures of the types of cognitive processes—response time in seconds, response change, decision certainty in a scale from 0 to 100 percent, and open-ended responses to write-aloud tasks—can be most precisely obtained and operationalized through survey questionnaires.

For the first critical test, I could not test the objective holist explanation based on side-deals and side-payments and I could not test the objective individualist explanations based on electoral and policy incentives of national leaders. Yet, all other existing explanations as well as my two-level ideational argument on US allies’ joining behaviors were tested using the cross-national survey experimental data on the approval levels. In terms of the final choice outcomes, all the competing explanations were similarly supported. However, in the second round of
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critical test, only my two-level ideational argument explained the observed variation in the different types of cognitive process.

In particular, I found the operation of the logic of habit for the subgroup in box (1) across both the UK and ROK samples across two different scenarios. The other theoretical subgroups show nuanced differences in the types of cognitive process too. Such cross-national survey experimental evidence is decisive, as they simultaneously confirm my theoretical expectations, while disconfirming the expectations of alternative objectivist and single-level explanations. I further derived out and tested the alternative explanations for the observation of the logic of habit. I tested and disconfirmed the expectations of the high information/complete information context. I tested and disconfirmed the domain-general explanations on the logic of habit. The cross-national aspect of the findings helps increase confidence in the critical test results and ultimately in the key explanatory variable of the degree of two-level contestation in relevant action knowledge.

Once I had a sure footing on the measurement standards of the different types of cognitive process in decision-making contexts, I moved onto the actual government decisions in the UK and ROK. I focused on the specific decision-making case for the 2003 US-led Iraq War. In this second stage of the empirical research, I used a variety of observational data to operationalize the variables of interest. In the first found of critical test, the objective individualist argument based on domestic political constraints and electoral incentives, as well as my two-level ideational argument, clearly passed the test. Because it was the Leftist party government making the participation decision at the time in both the UK and ROK cases, the objective individualist argument based on electoral incentives passed the first round of critical test. Other competing arguments enjoyed mixed evidence.
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Again, in the second round of critical test, I only found support for my two-level ideational argument and failed to find support for the alternatives. Specifically, because I found the logic of habit/logic of practice in operation for the ROK and UK Defense Ministers, while I found other types of cognitive process for the other government actors, this cross-national empirical evidence gave decisive support for my two-level ideational argument, while disconfirming the expectations of other objectivist and single-level explanations. Nevertheless, I addressed the alternative explanations on why one might actually observe the logic of habit, but also failed to find support for these alternatives.

In the observational chapter focused on the UK and ROK cases, I also employed the within-individual cross-issues research design to explore the causal implications of my two-level ideational argument. It remains difficult to experimentally test for the causal effects of various ideational factors, as it is challenging to manipulate them in the first place. I address this limitation by fixing the same government actor of interest and examining the textual dimensions of the statements across different issue areas that presumably have different degrees of two-level contestation in action knowledge.

The findings of this within-individual across-issues research design show that same individuals talk about different foreign policy issues in significantly different ways. The strongest evidence comes from the UK findings, because the same government decision-maker shows different text-based measures across different issue areas in the same setting, on the same day. These findings address the alternative individual level explanation on the types of cognitive process that is based on domain-general factors. The cross-national empirical evidence of this observational chapter complements the cross-national survey experimental evidence for the two-level ideational argument on the US allies’ joining behaviors.
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In the last empirical chapter 5, I conduct external validity tests of my two-level ideational argument by examining the decision-making cases outside of the two main UK and ROK cases. These additional cases ensure against any biases stemming from the focus on the two main cases and allow for more confidence in the generalizability of the findings of the critical empirical tests adjudicating the competing theoretical explanations. In this last stage of my cross-national, multi-methods research design, I examined two paired comparisons. The first pair, Australia-Canada, match my original UK-ROK pair in terms of the degrees of institutional level contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge. Like the UK, Canada had institutional level contestation in action knowledge in March 2003. Like the ROK, Australia has had institutional level non-contestation in action knowledge towards participation in US-led operations, even when there is a lack of international institutional authorization to use armed force.

I also examine the untested theoretical case where there is institutional level non-contestation in the pre-existing action knowledge towards non-participation in US-led operations that lack any international institutional mandate. I look at New Zealand-Philippines pair and test if the two-level ideational argument explains their non-participation decisions in March 2003.

With the increase in the number of decision-making cases to examine, the competing theoretical explanations did not easily pass the first critical test. In contrast, my two-level ideational argument, focused on the degree of two-level contestation in the relevant action knowledge, not only explains the US allies’ binary participation and non-participation decisions but also accounts for the presence and absence of diplomatic understandings and moral support for the US-led coalitional operation against Iraq in March 2003. For instance, the New Zealand’s non-participation was different from Canada and the Philippines’ non-participation decisions, in that the New Zealand government decision-makers did not offer any moral support for the US-
Conclusion

led military action against Iraq. Thus, only my two-level ideational argument passed the first critical test.

In the second critical test, the subjective individualist argument, in addition to my two-level ideational argument, passed the test in that the individual level strength and consistency in beliefs explained why the government decision-makers of Australia and New Zealand exhibited the logic of habit. However, I bring in the previous findings of the UK and ROK cases to remind that this alternative explanation on the logic of habit is insufficient in accounting for the observed variations, even among those government actors who belong to the extreme columns of individual level non-contestation in action knowledge. Specifically, this subjectivist argument by itself could not explain why the UK Prime Minister and the UK Defense Minister show different types of process, and most decisively, why the ROK President Roh Moo-hyun went against his own beliefs and committed non-combat troops to the US-led operation in Iraq at the time.

Overall, I conclude that the logic of habit is in operation, even in the non-default, high-stakes decision-making case of alliance bargaining over the foreign security policy stance against a third-party. Although it is expected that national leaders be actively playing the two-level game, participation and nonparticipation choices for certain individual decision-makers are made through the non-deliberative and non-utilitarian logic of habit. Moreover, the patterns of different logics of action are best explained by the two-level ideational argument derived from the sociological theory of choice. I argue that the pre-existing action knowledge, held jointly at the individual and institutional levels, is an indispensable explanatory variable of choices and actions.
II. Policy Implications

The practical policy implication of this dissertation study is two-fold. To begin with, for the particular context of US-led operations that lack any international institutional authorization to use armed force, this dissertation provides a novel argument on which allies would most consistently and reliably participate, and which allies would most consistently and reliably stay out. Allied governments with institutional level non-contestation in action knowledge at the foreign affairs and national defense departments would either reliably participate or consistently stay out. This is because, given the institutional level non-contestation in action knowledge, the Foreign and Defense Ministers would then either voluntarily or involuntarily adopt the participation and non-participation decisions and advise as such to the chief executive.

With the same policy advice coming from the relevant department heads, the chief executive’s own institutional level would then be ‘non-contested’ in the action knowledge. Again, the chief executive would either voluntarily or involuntarily adopt the policy action, commonly endorsed by the relevant members of the national security team. For example, countries such as Australia and South Korea are expected to reliably join US-led operations, with or without the international institutional authorization to use armed force, while countries like the Philippines and New Zealand are expected to consistently stay out of US-led operations, especially when there is a lack of UN mandate.

For those US allies with institutional level contestation in action knowledge, the individual leader level degree of contestation in the relevant action knowledge would matter much more. If the elected leader at the time holds non-contested action knowledge in either direction of participation or non-participation, then the final government decision outcome will
likely follow this direction. However, if the elected leader at the time also holds individual level contestation in action knowledge, then the final choice outcome will be most indeterminate.

Still, as was the cases of the Philippines and New Zealand, the degree of institutional level contestation in action knowledge, in this particular context of US-led operations without the UN mandate, can change over time. Action knowledge is not fixed. Especially with institutional level changes in the relevant action knowledge, action knowledge provided by the aggregate group can change over time. Since the early 2000s, both the Philippines and New Zealand have reversed course and increased bilateral security cooperation with the United States. Researchers and analysts could track the changes in the degrees of contestation in the action knowledge by examining both the practices and officially stated beliefs and strategies in official documents.

Next, this dissertation speaks to other timely issue areas of alliance management, such as burden-sharing, interoperability, and coalitional trade sanctions. In the ROK case, the burden-sharing and US base relocation issue came up during the Defense Minister Cho Young-kil’s tenure. In the within-individual across-issues set-up, I did not find any change in the textual dimensions in Mr. Cho’s statements. If there were strong beliefs in the effectiveness of bilateralism in achieving and ensuring national security objectives, then allied governments would more readily agree on burden-sharing and interoperability. Indeed, Becker and Malesky (2017) find that NATO allies exhibiting more Atlanticist strategic cultures allocate a greater share of their defense resources to Alliance priorities than those exhibiting Europeanist strategic cultures.

When other actors are involved in the decision-making problem, then it may be more complicated. When the Trump administration requested allied governments to ban the use of products of the Chinese telecommunication company Huawei, there was a variation in the
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responses of allied governments, and they did not necessarily map onto the US allies’ joining behaviors. There may be two reasons for this difference. First, the policy domain is in international trade, not international security. The pre-existing ideas regarding international trade may be different from those with regard to national security strategy. Second, the other actor involved in the decision-making problem is the People’s Republic of China. Depending on the specifically economy-related understandings of China, the degree of two-level contestation in action knowledge may be different in this case of coalitional trade sanctions requested by the United States. As such, the sociological theory of choice underscores the explanatory power of the domain-specific action knowledge, and the degree of two-level contestation in that action knowledge.

III. Limitations and Future Directions

The limitation of this study is that it is the first empirical test of the newly developed theoretical arguments. This should not be the last test. Replicability would build on the validity and reliability of the findings of this study, and so amassing replicability would be a priority. This dissertation study is also limited to US alliances in a single international time period. We do not know if the argument can be extended to non-US alliances, or to different time periods. While the theory predicts that this should be the case, that the argument can explain the actions and choices of non-US alliance partners in other time periods, I do not have empirical evidence. I would need to apply the theory to other time periods and to other non-US alliances to further test for the generalizability of the theory.

The varieties of measures of the different logics of action offered in this dissertation are indirect measures. Other direct measures could involve more direct self-reports, brain scans, and
physiological indicators. Developments of these measures, and the convergence across measures, would help establish the validity and reliability of the measurement standards of the types of cognitive process initially offered in this dissertation study, and encourage interdisciplinary work across the social and cognitive sciences. The text classification scheme that I inductively and iteratively developed in this dissertation could also use machine learning methods to produce automated text scores that represent the different logics of action. This would significantly enhance intra- and inter-coder reliability indices.

In addition to these improvements, I would hope to tackle the international economic domain, as it is predominated by theories that presume the classical expected utility theory of choice. If the general level sociological theory of choice outperforms these existing explanations based on the expected utility theory, then the explanatory value of the two-level ideational theory would be markedly demonstrated. The theory could also be applied to other important areas of inquiry, such as regime or political order changes at both the domestic and international institutional levels. In this respect, external validity tests of the sociological theory of choice across various domains and various levels of analysis would be helpful and exciting. Finally, I would hope to explore the relationship between cognition and emotion, and their effects on international conflicts in both security and non-security domains.
## Appendix A

### A. Appendix for Chapter 3

#### A.1. Sample Statistics

Table A.1. UK Comparison of Demographic Characteristics of SSI Sample and Nationally Representative Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SSI’s UK Sample Category Label</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>UK Nationally Representative Sample Category Label</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>25.39</td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>6.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>23.27</td>
<td>30-44</td>
<td>20.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>19.37</td>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>19.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 55</td>
<td>17.44</td>
<td>Over 60</td>
<td>22.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46.07</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53.93</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>Less than A level</td>
<td>22.76</td>
<td>Level 1; No qualifications</td>
<td>35.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A level or equivalent</td>
<td>30.79</td>
<td>Level 2; Apprenticeship; Other qualifications</td>
<td>24.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(training certificate, apprenticeship)</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>Level 3; Higher diploma</td>
<td>12.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HNC/HND, Univ/poly diploma or equivalent</td>
<td>25.53</td>
<td>Level 4 and above (BA, BSc, MA, PhD)</td>
<td>27.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First degree (BA, BSc)</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postgraduate degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(MA, PhD, PGCE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>London</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>14.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>8.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>9.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North East</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>North East</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North West</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>North West</td>
<td>12.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South East</td>
<td>15.80</td>
<td>South East</td>
<td>15.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South West</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>South West</td>
<td>9.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>10.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yorkshire &amp; The Humber</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>Yorkshire &amp; The Humber</td>
<td>9.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Ideology</strong></td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>31.12</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>32.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>29.71</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>29.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>39.17</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>26.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sources of the UK Nationally Representative Sample Statistics:

- Age, Gender, Education, and Location: UK Office for National Statistics’ 2011 Census Data (Variables KS102EW - Age structure, QS104EW - Sex, QS501EW - Highest level of qualification, and KS101EW - Usual resident population, respectively)

- Political Ideology: British Election Study 2017 Face-To-Face Survey. The BES questionnaire asked a one-dimensional political ideology question from a scale of 0 (left) to 10 (right). I grouped 0-4 as ‘Left,’ 5 is ‘Moderate,’ and 6-10 are ‘Right.’ The percent from the BES survey does not add up to 100% because respondents could choose either ‘refuse’ or ‘don’t know.’
## Table A.2. ROK Comparison of Demographic Characteristics of Embrain Sample and Nationally Representative Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Embrain’s ROK Sample Category Label</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>ROK Nationally Representative Sample Category Label</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>19-24</td>
<td>14.41</td>
<td>19-24</td>
<td>7.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>16.92</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>12.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>20.70</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>15.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>32.89</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>16.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>15.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td>14.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>54.48</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45.52</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>Below high school</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>Below high school</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High school or equivalent</td>
<td>17.08</td>
<td>High school or equivalent</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 year college degree</td>
<td>15.64</td>
<td>2 year college degree</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 year college degree</td>
<td>54.42</td>
<td>4 year college and up</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Seoul</td>
<td>22.04</td>
<td>Seoul</td>
<td>18.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gyeonggi</td>
<td>29.83</td>
<td>Gyeonggi</td>
<td>25.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gangwon</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>Gangwon</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Chungcheong</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>North Chungcheong</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Chungcheong</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>South Chungcheong</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Gyeongsang</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>North Gyeongsang</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Gyeongsang</td>
<td>17.31</td>
<td>South Gyeongsang</td>
<td>6.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Jeolla</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>North Jeolla</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Jeolla</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>South Jeolla</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeju</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>Jeju</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Ideology</strong></td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>28.83</td>
<td>Left</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>42.07</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>Right</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Sources of the ROK Population/Nationally Representative Sample Statistics:

- Age, Gender, and Location: ROK Ministry of the Interior and Safety’s Monthly Statistics (July 2018)

- Education: Statistics Korea’s (part of ROK Ministry of Strategy and Finance) Population Distribution by Education/Year 2015

- Political Ideology: 2017 Korea Social Integration Survey (a nationally representative survey) administered by the Korea Institute of Public Administration. Because the survey questionnaire had five answer choices (from very liberal to very conservative), I divided the one-dimensional political ideology scale on the Embrain survey into five: 0-20; 21-40; 41-60; 61-80; 81-100, where 0-40 are grouped into ‘Left,’ 41-60 are ‘Moderate,’ and 61-100 are ‘Right.’
A.2. Treatments: Political Elite Discourse Conditions

Scenario A (Chemical Weapons Scenario)

Control condition
No information is given.

Leftist United, Rightist United Condition
Both Conservative and Labour MPs are united on the issue. Conservatives and Labour believe that a tough response to the use of chemical weapons is necessary, argue that the operation serves British national interest, and support the United States.

Leftist Divided, Rightist United Condition
Conservative MPs are united on the issue. Conservatives support the United States and believe that a tough response to the use of chemical weapons is necessary. However, Labour is divided on the issue. While some Labour MPs question the credibility of US intelligence findings and argue that the UK can say no, other Labour MPs argue that the operation serves British national interest and support the United States.

Leftist United, Rightist Divided (DU) condition
Labour MPs are united on the issue. Labour supports the United States and believes that a tough response to the use of chemical weapons is necessary. However, Conservatives are divided on the issue. While some Conservative MPs question the credibility of US intelligence findings and argue that the UK can say no, other Conservative MPs argue that the operation serves British national interest and support the United States.

Leftist Divided, Rightist Divided (DD) condition
Both Conservative and Labour MPs are divided on the issue. While some Conservative and Labour MPs question the credibility of US intelligence findings and argue that the UK can say no, other Conservative and Labour MPs believe that a tough response to the use of chemical weapons is necessary, argue that the operation serves British national interest, and support the United States.
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**Scenario B (Training Troops Scenario)**

**Control condition**
No information is given.

**Leftist United, Rightist United Condition**
Both Conservative and Labour MPs are united on the issue. Conservatives and Labour believe that military coordination in the region is necessary, find the non-combat role of the British troops as adequate, and support US global priorities.

**Leftist Divided, Rightist United Condition**
Conservative MPs are united on the issue. Conservatives believe that military coordination in the region is necessary and support US global priorities. However, Labour is divided on the issue. While some Labour MPs question the effectiveness of military coordination and argue that the UK can disagree, other Labour MPs find the non-combat role of the British troops as adequate and support US global priorities.

**Leftist United, Rightist Divided (DU) condition**
Labour MPs are united on the issue. Labour believes that military coordination in the region is necessary and supports US global priorities. However, Conservatives are divided on the issue. While some Conservative MPs question the effectiveness of military coordination and argue that the UK can disagree, other Labour MPs find the non-combat role of the British troops as adequate and support US global priorities.

**Leftist Divided, Rightist Divided (DD) condition**
Both Conservative and Labour MPs are divided on the issue. While some Conservative and Labour MPs question the effectiveness of military coordination and argue that the UK can disagree, other Conservative and Labour MPs believe that military coordination in the region is necessary, find the non-combat role of the British troops as adequate, and support US global priorities.
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A.3. Codebook for Text Classification of Open-ended Responses in Survey Experiments

The texts that we are trying to classify are open-ended answers, provided by survey respondents in the United Kingdom and in the Republic of Korea, to the following question:

“Now we’d like to know more in depth what you were thinking when you chose to agree/disagree with the government’s decision to deploy troops. Please write everything that had gone through your mind.”

Please follow the guidelines below to classify the open-ended answers into one of the five types of cognitive processes.

1. Determine the preferred policy position from the text. Does the respondent want to deploy troops, or not? Note this preferred policy position (support deployment or not) in the first column in the spreadsheet.

2. Write the opposite, non-preferred policy position in the second column. We are looking at this in a systematic binary way. If the preferred policy position was to deploy troops, then the non-preferred position is NOT deploying troops, and vice versa.

3. Now, go back to the text again. Pay special attention to the following two dimensions within the text:

   1) The presence, or absence, of non-preferred policy;

   2) The balance, or imbalance, of substantial reasons.

   The third column marks the presence or absence of non-preferred policy. Mark ‘Yes’ if the non-preferred policy is either directly or indirectly mentioned in the text. Direct mention of the non-preferred policy should be straightforward (e.g. the use of force will not solve anything, military force as a last resort, etc.); in these cases, the non-preferred policy will be explicit.

   However, there may be implicit indications of the non-preferred policy too. Implicit indications tend to be comparative, or superlative, using “more,” “most,” “first,” “best,” etc. (e.g. sanctions first, diplomacy is more effective, etc.), wherein the non-preferred policy of troop deployment is implicitly compared, without any explicit verbalization. If there is neither direct nor indirect mention of the non-preferred policy, then mark ‘No’ if this third column.

4. The fourth column marks the balance, or imbalance, of substantial reasons. Here, the second dimension—balance or imbalance of substantial reasons—depends on the number of policy actions mentioned. If there is absolutely no mention of the non-preferred policy
(or generally, if there is one policy mentioned), then the balance of reasons should be focused on the pros and cons for the one policy mentioned in the text. Are there any cons mentioned in the text? Any hesitations and doubts would count as balance of reasons. If there are only pros, or only cons, then this counts as imbalance of reasons.

If both preferred and non-preferred policy actions are mentioned either directly or indirectly, then the balance of reasons should involve any of the following possibilities: pros for both policy actions, cons for both policy actions, or both pros and cons for both policy actions. If there are only pros for the preferred policy and cons for the non-preferred policy, then this counts as imbalance of reasons. If one policy action is briefly mentioned, and there are only pros/cons for the other policy action, then this also counts as imbalance of reasons. Mark ‘Yes’ if there is balance of reasons, and mark ‘No’ if there is imbalance of reasons in this fourth column.

5. Using the Excel formula, then, if the data in the third and fourth columns are both ‘No,’ then the output is (1). If the third is ‘Yes’ and the fourth is ‘No,’ then the output is (2). If the third is ‘No’ and the fourth is ‘Yes,’ then the output is (3). Finally, if the data in both third and fourth columns are ‘Yes,’ then the output is (4). In the Figure below, the first dimension/third column (presence or absence of non-preferred policy) is in the rows, and the second dimension/fourth column (balance or imbalance of substantial reasons) is in the columns. Resulting quadrants are four types of cognitive processes.

**Figure A.1. Classification of the Four Types of Cognitive Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presence of Non-Preferred Policy</th>
<th>Balance of Substantial Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Take-for-granted</td>
<td>Non-preferred policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Motivated</td>
<td>(4) Non-motivated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Socially Constrained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Taken-for-granted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score 0: No Justification**

There is one more type of cognitive process of interest. There are texts that clearly show a preferred policy (either troop deployment or non-deployment) without providing any real justification or explanation. These usually claim that the preferred policy is “right,” “important,” “necessary,” or “justified,” without explaining why it is so. Sometimes, they say, “of course,” “obviously,” “why not?” In other cases, the texts just regurgitate their preferred policy in different words, without any justification. Sometimes, they simply state, “agree,” “disagree,” “yes,” “no” without any explanation. In essence, these texts do not provide any substantial reasons why one certain policy is preferred.

**Examples:** We have to/ It’s justified/ There is obviously a reason for it/ Right decision/ It is wrong
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**Score 1: One-sided Process**
This is cell (1). First, there is absolutely no (explicit or implicit) mention/ indication of non-preferred policy. As well, there is no balance of substantial reasons. Specifically, there is absolutely no mention of the negative aspects, hesitations, or doubts about the preferred policy. We also count simple statements, such as “good,” “great,” as simple justifications, and assign a score of 1.

*Examples: We need defence/ To show strength/ Peaceful methods are effective*

**Score 2: Motivated Process**
This is cell (2). First, there is a clear (explicit or implicit) mention of the non-preferred policy. Yet, there is no balance of substantial reasons across the policy actions. Usually, there are pros for preferred policy and cons for non-preferred policy. Sometimes, only pros for the preferred policy, or, only cons for the non-preferred policy are highlighted—we code such instances as motivated reasoning, with a score of 2.

*Examples: Stop causing more terror. Just find some peace./ It has to be condemned - not merely verbally, but by action/ More diplomacy needed first/ Violence stirs more trouble*

**Score 3: Socially Constrained Process**
This is cell (3). First, there is absolutely no (explicit or implicit) mention of the non-preferred policy. Given that there is only one preferred policy mentioned, there is a balance in substantial reasons; there is clear evidence of both pros and cons, hesitations, and doubts about the preferred policy.

*Examples: Good and bad reasons for deploying troops/ It could end good or bad/ Not sure what it would achieve/ What good will it actually do/

**Score 4: Non-motivated Process**
This is cell (4). First, there is a clear (explicit or implicit) mention of the non-preferred policy. As well, there is a balance in substantial reasons across the policy actions; there are pros for both policies, cons for both policies, or pros and cons for both policies. We also code “undecided,” “need further information to make a decision,” “depends on situation” as non-motivated reasoning with a score of 4.

*Examples: These decisions are tough hard to come down completely on one side/ Would prefer diplomacy, but force may have been appropriate/ Difficult one for me to answer*

**Additional Notes:** I merge the categories of (0) and (1) together to classify taken-for-granted process.
B. Appendix for Chapter 4

B.1. Author Interviews

1. Author Interview with Mr. Yoon Young-kwan (ROK Foreign Affairs Minister 2003-2004) on August 21, 2014

*Method: Face-to-face interview, semi-structured interview, not recorded, made notes during the interview, and added notes after the interview. I translated the interview conducted in Korean.

1. What do you think the role of public opinion is in the security policy decision-making process? Do you think public opinion is desirable? Necessary?

Mr. Yoon: The public may not be as prudent as the policymakers wish them to be. However, public support is necessary, because without it political leaders lose legitimacy and cannot come back to office.

2. How did the Roh administration officials collect information on public opinion? Newspaper editorials, polls, protests? Does the administration take own polls?

Mr. Yoon: The Roh administration relied on major newspaper reports of the public opinion poll results. The administration also took notice of newspaper columns and editorials as well as mass protest frequencies and size. The administration did not take its own polls.

3. Whose opinion matters the most? The majority of the mass public? Your constituency? The elites? Interest groups? Or active minority? What kind/type of public opinion is most constraining?

Mr. Yoon: For the President, his very own support groups’ opinion was most constraining. The Blue House staff members, who are in charge of managing President Roh’s support groups, collected information on these groups’ preferences, which was not to send any type of troops to Iraq. They voiced up for independence and autonomy from the US, especially given that the operation did not get the UN Security Council’s approval.

4.a. At the time of making the decision to send noncombat troops to Iraq in end of 2003, did the administration know that the majority of the public was against the decision?
Mr. Yoon: Our understanding was that public opinion was pretty evenly divided to half and half. A significant majority was against the policy, but the other half was in support of sending troops to Iraq.

i. If the administration was aware of significant public opposition, then why did the administration go against the preference of the majority of the public?

Mr. Yoon: There were essentially two reasons why the President chose to deploy troops to Iraq. The first was to peacefully resolve the North Korean nuclear issue. At the time, strengthening the ROK-US cooperation was the key to peaceful resolution to the North Korean nuclear issue. The second reason was to honor the ROK-US alliance.

ii. If the level of negative security implications from adopting the policy preferred by the majority of the public were not so high, then would the administration still have digressed from majority opinion?
For instance, if it was a non-US country (e.g. France, Turkey) that asked for troop contributions in Iraq, would South Korea have still made the same decision?

Mr. Yoon: No.

iii. If it was still the US asking for troop contributions, but North Korea had no nuclear problems. Say that North Korea perpetually destroyed its nuclear potential/capabilities in the 1990s and North Korea was not stoking up any trouble. Would South Korea have sent noncombat troops to Iraq?

Mr. Yoon: I do see a possibility of not sending troops in this case.

4.b. At the time of making the decision to send noncombat troops to Iraq in end of 2003, did the administration know that the majority of the public was supportive of the decision?
If yes, then does this mean that the administration officials reached this decision, due to electoral incentives?

Mr. Yoon: Even if about half of the mass public were in support of sending noncombat troops to Iraq, this decision was not made for electoral reasons. The motivation behind this decision was based on our security logic.

5. What indicators do the administration use to gauge the level of negative/positive security implications from adopting a security policy?

Mr. Yoon: The President mainly relies on the Foreign Minister and the Defense Minister to understand the security implications of foreign policy.
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i. What is the threshold of “highly” negative security implications?

Mr. Yoon: I remember President Roh being highly conscious of US considerations to strike the nuclear facilities in Yongbyun, North Korea in 1994, when William Perry was the Secretary of Defense. The threshold of “highly” negative security implications is the possibility of military activities on the Korean Peninsula.

ii. At the time of making the decision to send noncombat troops to Iraq in end of 2003, did all officials in the administration agree on this level of security implications and share a similar standard on this threshold? If not, whose perception/standard did the administration follow in the end?

Mr. Yoon: There was a divide within the Roh administration. While the relevant government ministries (i.e. Foreign Ministry & Defense Ministry) advised the President to send noncombat troops to Iraq, the Blue House staff who manages Roh’s support groups was not supportive of such policy. These staff members encouraged an independent and autonomous foreign policy decision. In the end, though, the President chose to dispatch troops to Iraq for the two aforementioned key reasons.
II. Author Interview with Mr. Cho Young-kil (ROK Minister of National Defense 2003-2004) on October 17, 2014

*Method: Face-to-face interview, semi-structured interview, not recorded, made notes during the interview, and added notes after the interview. I translated the interview conducted in Korean.

1. What do you think the role of public opinion is in the security policy decision-making process? Do you think public opinion is desirable? Necessary?

Mr. Cho: The role of public opinion in national security decisions may be different across advanced democracies, because the level of the public and culture is different. In Korea, people are not individualistic, realistic, or rational. Rather, they are emotional, moralistic, and neo-Confucian. The standard measure of observation and judgment is different. Public opinion changes frequently, depending on who leads on. Most of the time, regular citizens are in odds with our national security policy. However, when issues are over national survival and security, we need to make decisions in cold, stoic manner. (public opinion is both unnecessary and undesirable).

2. How does administration officials collect information on public opinion? Newspaper editorials, polls, protests? Does the administration take own polls?

Mr. Cho: We looked at the polls published in the newspapers. We didn't take our own polls.

3. Whose opinion matters the most? The majority of the mass public? Your constituency? The elites? Interest groups? Or active minority? What kind/type of public opinion is most constraining?

Mr. Cho: In our case, public opinion was not the dominant factor (Mr. Cho used critical words to describe Korea’s public opinion. He argued that the government should not care so much about, or be involved with, public opinion).

4.a. At the time of making the decision __A__ in year __Y__, did the administration know that the majority of the public was against the decision?

i. If yes, then why did the administration go against the preference of the majority of the public?

Mr. Cho: National interest. It was for national security. Our alliance with the US contributes significantly to our security. ROK-US alliance is not as sturdy as you think. It is really just a political rhetoric. It is only maintained due to needs and interests. It is a
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very fragile relationship. This nation-to-nation relationship can break, due to a small thing.

I had two things in mind: 1) ROK-US military alliance, 2) the safety of our soldiers.

ii. If the level of negative security implications from adopting the policy preferred by the majority of the public were not so high, then would the administration still have digressed from majority opinion? [As I am asking a counterfactual question, I expect the answers to be in the opposite direction; i.e. the administration may not have digressed from majority opinion] I asked: What if it was NOT the U.S. asking for troop contributions?

Mr. Cho: No, we wouldn’t have gone.

5. What indicators do the administration use to gauge the level of negative/positive security implications from adopting a security policy?

i. What is the threshold of “highly” negative security implications?

Mr. Cho: Although this wasn’t the main factor, there were changes in the U.S. military based in Korea. 1/3 of the troops were taken away, and 2/3 were left in Korea. Some of the helicopters were taken away. This change is not the point though. Our whole alliance relationship was at hand.

ii. What about the possibility of U.S. strikes in North Korea? Did you consider this possibility when making the decision?

Mr. Cho: It’s true that the U.S. seriously thought of this option in 1994, during the time of 1st North Korean nuclear issue. However, President Kim Young Sam sternly said “No”, and the U.S. can’t independently make such decisions. And so, I haven’t even imagined the possibility of Americans striking North Korea.

iii. At the time of making the decision __A__ in year __Y__, did all officials in the administration agree on this level of security implications and share a similar standard on this threshold? If not, whose perception/standard did the administration follow in the end?

Mr. Cho: President Roh had reservations, because his staff, party, and support groups were against this policy. However, because the Foreign Minister, I, and all of the National Security Council members, advised that deployment was absolutely essential, President Roh listened to us in the end. Even the President had no choice. He could not look at things as if he were still an active member of the movement. It was his role to make decisions that ensure national security.
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In the National Assembly, 20 or so members were not eating – to stand against this decision. We stood off past midnight. Even past midnight, I persuaded these members that this was absolutely critical to our national interest. It was an extremely difficult process.
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C. Appendix for Chapter 5

C.1. Author Interviews

I. Author interview with Mr. Bill Graham (Canada’s Minister of Foreign Affairs 2002-2004 & Minister of National Defence 2004-2006) on November 6, 2014

*Method: Phone interview, semi-structured interview, recorded and transcribed below.

1. What do you think the role of public opinion is in the security policy decision-making process? Do you think public opinion is desirable? Necessary?

Special notes: I didn’t get to ask this question specifically, because we started off half an hour later than the scheduled time. I started with Question 2, then moved on to 3-5. By the end of Question 4, Mr. Graham had to run to a meeting and to his question of any last questions, I could only catch him with Question 5, and did not make it back to Question 1. However, during the whole interview, it is evident that Mr. Graham thinks public opinion is important (desirable). Generally, it is not necessary, but in special cases and timing (esp. in Quebec), it is absolutely constraining (and necessary).

2. How did the Cabinet members collect information on public opinion? Newspaper editorials, polls, protests? Does the Cabinet take its own polls?

Mr. Graham: I’m not too sure. I wouldn’t have followed polling, personally, but in today’s world, all government departments take polls now. And the party pollsters do this on a regular basis – to see where the party supporters stand. But also, the members of parliament are expected to know what their constituencies are feeling.

Every week, there’s a caucus – 2 hours long – where all the members of the Parliament get with the Prime Minister, and people stand up and talk about what they are hearing from their constituents. It would come up regularly in these Wednesday meetings. That was a very important way to collect public opinion. In pre-extensive polling times, the Prime Minister knew public opinion through the members of the Parliament. MPs of Vancouver, of Quebec, would say “We think that! We think this!” That’s a very important way for the Prime Minister and Cabinet ministers to judge the political mood of the country – that’s our ears on the grounds. Some MPs are frustrated now because the government does their own polling.

Individual members are important in a Parliamentary system. Cabinet members in our system are also elected members – and I bloody well knew what my constituents were thinking, and in the airport, I could not walk through without getting shouted out that we should not go to war. I did a travel around the country to see the foreign policy [clout?], the only thing everybody wanted to talk about was Iraq when I had to talk about many
other things. It was in Quebec, in Montreal, on a Friday afternoon, when I was told that only 20-30 students would turn out, but 450 students came, and said don’t you dare go to Iraq. So don’t worry, I knew what people were thinking. We also had a hotline in the Foreign Affairs department. I would go down there some nights and sit there, and answer some calls from Vancouver, Artic, Quebec…

3. Whose opinion matters the most? The majority of the mass public? Your constituency? The elites? Interest groups? Or active minority? What kind/type of public opinion is most constraining?

Mr. Graham: It would depend a lot on who you talk to. The conservative newspapers, the National Post for example, was in favor of joining. Quebec was 90% against. Alberta was 60% in favor. British Columbia would have been against, substantially. It’s different in different parts of the country. Preponderance of the country… I would say, more like 70:30 were against. But the business community was in favor, the military was in favor, and Toronto, in my city, the man on the street was against, but many elites and business community – where our relationship with U.S. is particularly important – were strongly in favor.

But there’s a factor here. Quebec would have been very very strongly against. We were just about to have an election in Quebec. If we were gone to war, we would have had a separatist government voted in power, and by the time of the referendum – we would have been separated. That would be very constraining for any government.

Also, in parliamentary system, government needs the parliamentary majority, and that was our case then and one opinion matters the most. That was the Prime Minister’s opinion. His opinion is most important. But the relevant ministers are important – I spent a lot of time talking to Mr. Chretien – he would phone me all the time. He talked about, President Bush’s said this, do you think it’s a good idea? etc. To some extent, the opinion of the opposition leader is important too.

Part of the problem was – our relationship with the US. Opinion in Washington is important. What Congress thinks. What’s the impact of our decision? France is also a very close ally of Canada, and France is saying “No, this is a crazy idea”. And the Germans said this is crazy. And the Brits – Blair is going with it. These other key allies – their opinions meant a lot too. Our own domestic public opinion is important, but international law constraints etc. and our allies, our traditional commitment to the UN was important. Another part of the problem was that the U.S. – they were unable to prove their case. Bush would come give briefings, but we were told to be extremely cautious in the way we treat the data from the U.S. and our own Ambassadors were confirming that.
4. At the time of making the decision not to send combat troops to Iraq in March 2003, did the Canadian government know that the majority of the public was supportive of this decision? Is this the primary reason why the government decided not to participate in the Iraq War?

Mr. Graham: Public Opinion is one factor, not necessarily the predominant factor. It is one of the many – but also very important one – that issue of Quebec was particularly important. But we spent.. we built the UN. Since Lester Pearson, who won the Nobel Prize. We were strongly behind the International Criminal Court, the landmines convention.. You have to go through the history of Canadian foreign policy, but UN Security Council approval was critical. Chretien made it very clear that UN approval was very important.

i. This is a hypothetical scenario, but say that the majority of the public preferred Canada’s joining of the Coalition of the Willing, even without the UN Security Council’s approval. Do you think the government would have been freer to go ahead and join the Coalition of the Willing, even without the UNSC approval?

Mr. Graham: No, Canadians were looking to the UN. The UN actions and inactions have shaped the Canadian public opinion on this issue. Many Canadians identify with the UN – because many important figures were involved with the UN. And the position of the Bush government was bellicose and warlike. It was totally counter to most Canadian traditions in international law. It was unilateralist, and war thumping, and the Canadian public didn’t believe it. If it was Barack Obama, it would have been a different story – because Canadians love Barack Obama.

5. What indicators do the administration use to gauge the level of negative/positive security implications from adopting a security policy?

Mr. Graham: We use every single source of information available, together. Other ministers will tell me, “his security people are telling me this and that”. The French are telling me too. Security indicators are divided into signals people and human security advisors. The signals people are like NASA, collecting large data, telephone conversations, rely satellite information. Then there are ambassadors, gathering info at a cocktail party. Everything gets fed in. Back then, American intelligence was politically dictated – we now know that’s true. Now they say the biggest casualty of the Iraq War is the credibility of our intelligence services.

i. What is the threshold of “highly” negative security implications?

Mr. Graham: If the facts were correct, if Saddam had weapons – if we believe that there were chemical weapons, biological or nuclear weapons that he could use, then there is threat there. If there is global danger there and something has to be done, then our
government would have gone even without the UN approval. But you see, if the facts were correct, then the French and Germans would have been there and it wouldn’t be a problem in the UN. Oh, but who knows what the Russians would do. But if the facts were correct, maybe even the Russians would have agreed.

So even if the public were against it, we are going. There were two UN resolutions already – and some were saying that we do not need a subsequent resolution. But even then, the public opinion would have been different. It all would have been different! World is a complicated place.

ii. At the time of making the decision ___A___ in year ___Y___, did all Cabinet members agree on this level of security implications and share a similar standard on this threshold? If not, whose perception/standard did the Cabinet follow in the end?

Mr. Graham: Yes, all of the above. The Prime Minister, the Defence Minister, intelligence people, and our Ambassadors were saying the same thing. We did not believe in the U.S. evidence.
II. Author interview with Mr. John McCallum (Canada’s Minister of National Defence 2002-2003) on November 4, 2014

*Method: Face-to-face interview, semi-structured interview, recorded and transcribed below.

1. What do you think the role of public opinion is in the security policy decision-making process? Do you think public opinion is desirable? Necessary? [this gets at leader beliefs]

Mr. McCallum: It is important, not the only factor, but an important factor. (Mr. McCallum did not explicitly say so, but later in the conversation, it is apparent that he thinks public opinion is not necessary).

2. How did the Cabinet members collect information on public opinion? Newspaper editorials, polls, protests? Does the Cabinet take its own polls?

Mr. McCallum: Systematic collecting? I don’t think so. Maybe the Prime Minister had opinion collecting sources that I didn’t know about, but I’m not aware that we had a special group or effort to monitor this issue in particular.

But I did look at newspapers on these polls. We were aware of that, but that was not necessarily our primary reason why we decided, what we decided. It was a factor, and we had some idea, but I didn’t have an intimate idea of the public opinion at the time. But it could be that the people around the Prime Minister knew things that I didn’t know. Prime Ministers have more resources under their control.

3. Whose opinion matters the most? The majority of the mass public? Your constituency? The elites? Interest groups? Or active minority? What kind/type of public opinion is most constraining?

Mr. McCallum: Jean Chretien typically would give a lot of latitude to the ministers to make decisions, but in small number of issues, he makes the decision. And the decision on the Iraq war, was basically his decision – not mine as the Defence Minister, and not the Cabinet’s. At the end of the day, it was his decision (it seemed like Mr. McCallum wanted to say that Mr. Chretien’s opinion mattered the most in this case).

But there was not much of a debate. Almost everybody in the liberal caucus was in favor of that decision. It was Chretien’s decision at the end of the day. He would consult with us and obviously the Cabinet has to agree, and majority in the Parliament is needed, but if you already have a majority in the Parliament, then in practice, it’s the Prime Minister who calls the shot. It wasn’t difficult, because there was a strong consensus not to go.
Some of my constituents were really strongly opposed to sending troops. I have a very multicultural riding. For example, Pakistani Canadians were really strongly opposed to us sending troops. So the level of opposition was much higher in my own district. But that was not the factor. I was philosophically opposed to it. It was generally a good thing that my riding was behind it. But it was not the driving force behind my position.

4. At the time of making the decision not to send combat troops to Iraq in March 2003, did the Canadian government know that the majority of the public was supportive of this decision? Is this the primary reason why the government decided not to participate in the Iraq War?

I asked: if public opposition was not the primary factor, then what was it?

Mr. McCallum: Didn’t think it was right – to invade another country without UN approval, and round up others without the international mission to do this. Canada was a country very much in favor of multilateral rules of the game, and international law, and this was not something authorized by international law. With the UN approval, then it is much more likely that we have gone. We were one of founding members of NATO and UN, since the end of WWII. This feeling as a middle power – and not a major power – makes us do things in this way, rather than have one country unilaterally calling all the shots. Maybe the fact that we are the next-door neighbor to world’s most major superpower may have made us more sensitive.

We also didn’t get along with George Bush – the fact that he was spearheading this was a factor. Obama could have made a difference. In reality, you know, it does make a difference – if it is someone you can trust and relate to. In real life, it is easier to go along with that person who you prefer. And we were not 100% sure whether weapons of mass destruction existed or not. We saw these presentations – but these were so circumstantial and lacked credibility.

You see, we didn’t have to send over one soldier to join. Our navy was already there in the Gulf, 2000 sailors, for the mission in Afghanistan. We only had to say we were helping you, and the U.S. would have been delighted. It was not very costly for us to do it, but we didn’t. We didn’t like unilateralism. There was no legal basis. We didn’t think Saddam had weapons of mass destruction. We didn’t like George Bush. All these things -- didn’t want to go. And public opinion. You put public opinion first, as the primary factor, but I would put it in a mix of all these things.

i. This is a hypothetical scenario, but say that the majority of the public preferred Canada’s joining of the Coalition of the Willing, even without the UN Security Council’s approval. Do you think the government would have been freer to go ahead and join the Coalition of the Willing, even without the UNSC approval?
Mr. McCallum: I would have gone against it (gone against public opinion). But it's hypothetical of course. It didn’t arise, but it was because it’s something that I believed in. It’s not all about elections. You do want to be reelected, but you have certain philosophical…, or beliefs. And you don’t necessarily go with your constituents. It’s not necessarily a do or a die thing. If you always do things that your constituents don’t want – then that’s a problem. And for me, that’s not my number one consideration.

Chretien too. On occasions, Chretien definitely went against what the majority of what the caucus was saying at the time – not this particular Iraq War case, because the liberal caucus was like unanimous, but in 1997, the liberal caucus didn’t want an election – but he thought it was a good time for an election so he called for an election. After the referendum in Quebec – you know the clarity act? – it sets rules to make it more difficult for separatism – and he pushed that through, even if a lot of liberal caucus didn’t want it. Usually, if you have a strong leader who has the respect of the caucus, then he will be able to do things like that. Again, not everyday, but time to time. If the majority of caucus wanted to go to Iraq, but Chretien didn’t want to go – then he could have not gone too.

5. What indicators do the administration use to gauge the level of negative/positive security implications from adopting a security policy?

Mr. McCallum: We all listen to the presentations – Foreign Minister, National Defence, and the Prime Minister. The CIA had the evidence in Iraq. Canada did not have much inside Iraq at that time – we were dependent on the U.S. for such evidence. There was not much independence in intelligence, and so we had to come to judgment on credibility.

i. What is the threshold of “highly” negative security implications?

Mr. McCallum: If the weapons of mass destruction were really there, it’s more likely that we have joined. But because we did not really believe that – we did not to join. It was in their interest to maximize the evidence. It was in the interest of U.S. to contend that. I was in NATO meetings, U.K., France, Germany etc. were all watching these presentations and I don’t think they had much credibility with the audience in general.

ii. At the time of making the decision __A__ in year __Y__, did all Cabinet members agree on this level of security implications and share a similar standard on this threshold? If not, whose perception/standard did the Cabinet follow in the end?

Mr. McCallum: We asked the generals and civil servants for their advice, but at the end of the day, we would make our own judgments (Foreign Minister, National Defence Minister, and Prime Minister) and my impression was that the three of us didn’t believe it.
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III. Author interview with Mr. Alexander Downer (Australia’s Minister for Foreign Affairs 1996-2007) on October 8, 2014

*Method: Phone interview, semi-structured interview, recorded and transcribed below.

1. What do you think the role of public opinion is in the security policy decision-making process? Do you think public opinion is desirable? Necessary?

Mr. Downer: Do we care about public opinion? It is one of the factors, but not the only one. Public can change their mind. They rally to the flag, but if you loose the war, they throw you out.

I don’t think the public makes decisions about who they vote for, typically, on the basis of foreign policy. They are more influenced by domestic economic policy. Foreign policy doesn’t play much of a part in Australian election – one party may have raised it to attack the other party, but the public doesn’t feel qualified to judge some of those issues (public support is unnecessary). However, the government can try to persuade the public (public support is desirable).

2. How does administration officials collect information on public opinion? Newspaper editorials, polls, protests? Does the administration take own polls?

Mr. Downer: We looked at the periodic opinion polls published in the newspapers. Australian national newspapers mainly poll who you would vote for in the next election, but they do poll individual, controversial issues like the Iraq War. We looked at that poll, and other pollsters were published time to time. We looked at those and were aware of those polls. We did not take our own polls at the time.

Unlike the Korean system, all of the ministers, including the foreign minister, have a constituency. We have direct contact with the public, while you spend the weekend in your constituents. Polls don’t tell you how strongly you feel about something so polls are not a simple thing. You do need to talk to people, face to face, to supplement what you read in polls.

3. Whose opinion matters the most? The majority of the mass public? Your constituency? The elites? Interest groups? Or active minority? What kind/type of public opinion is most constraining?

Mr. Downer: Public opinion was divided really. It was slightly against, but we nevertheless went ahead. My own constituents were mixed. Honestly, it was 50:50, but they didn’t really know. Judging whether people really care about the issue or not, to the point where they care too much to vote against you, is important (this type of public opinion is most constraining).
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4.a. At the time of making the decision __A__ in year __Y__, did the administration know that the majority of the public was against the decision?

i. If yes, then why did the administration go against the preference of the majority of the public? What was the motivation to go in with the Coalition of the Willing?

Mr. Downer: The government thought it was the right thing to do. Public had some reservations about it. The government judged that by the next election, we have plenty of time to change public opinion, and that this is a right thing to do. War would be over by then. We thought that they wouldn’t be focused on it. You have to do what you have to do. We weren’t populists. Go ahead and explain it to the public as time went on.

ii. Do you think timing of the elections mattered? What if elections were in June 2003, instead of late 2004?

Mr. Downer: Not necessarily true. We thought it was the right thing to do to support the Americans. My judgment is, no, it wouldn’t affect the election – we won’t loose because of this issue. When the election finally did come in 2004, the weapons of mass destruction have never been found. There were certain amount of outrage over the war and the whole issue of Iraq, but it didn’t seem to frustrate the voters, as the government was reelected with a majority.

5. What indicators do the administration use to gauge the level of negative/positive security implications from adopting a security policy?

i. What is the threshold of “highly” negative security implications?

Mr. Downer: Through shared intelligence with Americans – New Zealand, Canada, UK, and America – we had a lot of intelligence on this issue, and from the information available to us, we judged that Americans are correct. World would be a much safer place and that it’s a good thing if we went. Americans wanted some allies for some cover, and we were happy to do that. We didn’t mind. It wasn’t a problem for us.

ii. At the time of making the decision __A__ in year __Y__, did all officials in the administration agree on this level of security implications and share a similar standard on this threshold? If not, whose perception/standard did the administration follow in the end?

Mr. Downer: Not all of the ministers didn’t know this information. It was the Prime Minister, Defence Minister, Foreign Minister, and the Treasurer. We have a system of collective decision-making. The Prime Minister alone doesn’t make this decision. A majority of the ministers have to be in favor of them.
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IV. Author interview with Mr. Robert Hill (Australia’s Minister for Defence 2001-2006) on February 4, 2015

*Method: Phone interview, semi-structured interview, recorded and transcribed below.

1. How did the Administration/Cabinet members collect information on mass public opinion regarding ____country____’s participation in the Iraq War? Media reports of polls, newspaper editorials, protests? Did the Administration/Cabinet take its own polls?

Mr. Hill: I wasn’t polling public opinion about the… the government did poll public opinion some time to time on a whole range of current issues but I wasn't directly involved in that …

2. Whose opinion matters the most in the foreign security policy decision-making process? The majority of the mass public? Your constituency? The elites? Interest groups? Or active minority? What kind/type of public opinion is most constraining?

Mr. Hill: Obviously, all politicians read about polls and the public press, but the opinion polls, at the beginning of the Iraq War, was after the Afghanistan War, and obviously there was lot of public reporting on the community attitudes towards Australia’s military arrangements and that was interesting background but it didn't really impact the job that I was doing in relation to Iraq, which was ensuring that we were ready to meet our responsibility.

3. What do you think the role of public opinion is in the foreign security policy decision-making process? Do you think public opinion is desirable? Necessary?

Mr. Hill: It’s certainly not necessary, again all politicians would like public support for what they are doing, but that was not a critical factor in the work that I was doing.

4.a. At the time of making the decision in ____date____, did the Administration/Cabinet know that the majority of the public was against the decision?

i. If yes, then why did the Administration/Cabinet go against the preference of the majority of the public?

Mr. Hill: The decision to enter the war, to participate, to deploy military operations was the decision of the government as a whole, so that was ultimately a cabinet decision that went around the national security committee and then to the cabinet as a whole. And I was monitoring the whole debate on weapons of mass destruction and the inspection processes were taking some considerable time in the United Nations, the
attitude of the Americans to the failure to achieve a satisfactory outcome, and those were the sort of issues that I was concerned with.

ii. This is a hypothetical scenario, but say that various international agencies made it was clear that there were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. Do you think the Administration/Cabinet would have made a different decision?

Mr. Hill: At one time, Saddam Hussein had aspirations about nuclear weapons and clearly had chemical weapons and used it against his people. He had biological weapons. It was WMD debate and the UN and the issue was whether he disposed of those, and the issue was that he couldn’t unequivocally convince the international community that he had disposed of those weapons.

4.b. At the time of making the decision in ___date___, did the Administration/Cabinet know that the majority of the public was supportive of the decision?
   i. If yes, is this the primary reason behind the Administration/Cabinet’s decision?
   ii. This is a hypothetical scenario, but say that the majority of the public was against this decision and wanted to see the government to do ___alternative____. Do you think the Administration/Cabinet would have made a different decision?

5. What indicators do the Administration/Cabinet ministers use to gauge the level of negative/positive security implications from adopting a foreign security policy? Who perceives these indicators and translates them to the President/Prime Minister?
   i. What is the threshold of “highly” negative security implications?
   ii. At the time of making the decision, did all Administration/Cabinet ministers agree on this security implication? If not, whose perception/opinion did the Administration/Cabinet follow in the end?

Mr. Hill: You’re continually assessing whether there’s a threat to your national interest against a number of different scenarios, and this scenario was related to weapons of mass destruction and it wasn’t that they were going to be quickly used against Australia, and certainly not in terms of Australia’s geography, but given the history of how Australia got drawn into in every conflict there is in the Middle East the issue is that the threat was real – he would utilize the weapons of mass destruction, in a way in the region, that would draw Australia in and therefore be a threat to national interest.
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V. Author Interview with Mr. Phil Goff (New Zealand Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade 1999-2005; Minister of Defence 2005-2008) on February 12, 2015

*Method: Face-to-face interview, semi-structured interview, recorded and transcribed below.

1. How did the Administration/Cabinet members collect information on mass public opinion regarding ____country____’s participation in the Iraq War? Media reports of polls, newspaper editorials, protests? Did the Administration/Cabinet take its own polls?

Mr. Goff: We, like all political parties do poll, but I don’t think, in this instance, we relied particularly heavily on polling. This current government polls very regularly, it is funded to do so, but we didn’t poll… on that basis. We had our own polling organization that we pay for, but, we didn’t wait to see what the public opinion was before we made a response. You get a sense of public opinion through the media, you get it on the ground, through your correspondents, through your emails, and as a minister, you also have your own constituency and you get some feedback, but you always remember that the network of people that you travel with, they are not necessarily representative public opinion. But obviously there are people out there, including your own key party people – people who you work with on a daily basis – if they feel very strongly on principle about something, you’re going to have to accept that what you’re doing might or might not please them and might or might not be acceptable to them.

Essentially our stance on this, although we were always aware of public opinion, wasn’t driven by public opinion. I think the one thing you should remember about public opinion is that it’s not static. It doesn’t stay the same. So for example, straight after the awful burning alive of the Jordanian pilot, public opinion would be so angry at them and say, “we gotta do something to get these bastards”. And in six months time, public opinion would say, “well, what they did was awful, but has what we’ve done been effective in addressing the atrocities that are being committed?” So, if you are simply driven by public opinion, and you flow backwards and forwards as public opinion moves, then you won’t create a coherent Government, and it’s not our view that a Government should be driven by public opinion. It needs to be aware of it, it needs not to arrogantly even dismiss public opinion, but in the end, you’ve got to be driven by what you believe in and what you think is right, because when public opinion changes, and you’re stuck at where public opinion was at six months ago, what are you left with? You’re left with no principle, you’re not left with coherent policy-making framework.

2. Whose opinion matters the most? The majority of the mass public? Your constituency? The elites? Interest groups? Or active minority? What kind/type of public opinion is most constraining?

Mr. Goff: Well firstly, in a democracy, no parliamentarian can afford to dismiss public opinion, to ignore it. You might need to address it, you might seek to change it, and you
might seek to modify your policy to take some of what the public is feeling very strongly about. Your party activists, your party organization does count, but again, they don’t ultimately, by themselves determine what you do.

Public opinion can be active or passive. It can be a broad public view, but, not strongly felt, so it’s the intensity of feeling that you also have to take into account. You have to take into account how close it is to an election – obviously, politicians are more sensitive to public opinion the closer you are to an election. But you also take into the account, the role of the media filtering public opinion, being itself an opinion leader. So where the media is effective, you also have to take into account, but at the end, very rarely do you go against your own beliefs and your own rational analysis.

What you’re also doing is drawing from your own experience. Helen Clark and I, as university students, we were active on foreign policy issues at the time – the Vietnam War, the Pinochet dictatorship in Chile, the apartheid system in South Africa, the anti-nuclear program… So both of us had spent a lot of time thinking about and developing quite strong opinions on foreign policy. So our decisions our often are shaped by our own experience on past events and the framework of beliefs and values that we had built up.

3. In general, what do you think the role of public opinion is in foreign policy decision-making-process? Do you think public support is desirable? Necessary?

Mr. Goff: Most people in their voting behavior don’t vote on foreign policy issues. They vote on domestic, and what we call, hip-pocket [not sure if I got this language right...] issues, you know, the standard of living, the cost of living, the kids’ education, the health system, the ability to get a home, so foreign policy is not at the forefront at people’s mind all the time. It’s a factor, they’re aware of it, they might be discussing it, but I doubt that it’s as much a motivator as that of more fundamental domestic issues.

But having said that, I think Labour, possibly lost the election in 1966 on the basis of we were opposed to the Vietnam war, and at that stage, the American alliance was so important... And interestingly, in the first government that I was a member of in the 80s, we came out strongly with an anti-nuclear policy and that we are not going to have nuclear-armed ships visiting us in New Zealand and that we’re not going to rely on the protection of the nuclear umbrella. We thought that we would be on the wrong side of public opinion, because American alliance was so esoteric a policy, but public opinion swung right around to the point where, after we lost the Government, the National Government that did want to go back to a nuclear alliance felt that it was not able to do so because New Zealanders saw nuclear-free New Zealand as a badge of being a sovereign, independent country – proud of its beliefs and values, and New Zealand is – well we might have been allied to the United States for a lot of our history, don’t like to be told by the big brother what we should think and do. And the American reaction to
our nuclear-free policy probably pushed New Zealanders, people like my father who's a WWII veteran, pushed further away [public opinion is desirable, but not necessary].

4. At the time of making the decision to send noncombat (humanitarian assistance) troops to Iraq in May-June of 2003, did the Government know that a significant percentage of the public was opposed to this policy?

Mr. Goff: Yes, there was a section of the public that didn’t want to see us send anybody in uniform to Iraq, but we made the decision quite clearly on principled grounds, and you can see the hansards for those grounds, but there were still people who didn’t want to see the army people doing reconstruction. But we felt that the whole chaotic situation in Iraq was such that we couldn’t have civilians there, and you needed to have people there that could build your health clinics, your hospitals and your schools, so we sent army engineers there.

i. If so, what was the primary motivation behind implementing this decision, despite substantial opposition?

Mr. Goff: We wanted to do something positive in relation to our response to the United Nations’ call. I think that the post-invasion assistance was UN sanctioned was the key. Because it was UN mandated, and because we felt that, okay we’re not invaders, and we weren’t in favor of the invasion for the reasons that were proved to be right, but having had that invasion, we now need to do something to give Iraq a chance to get back on its feet.

ii. Do you think the timing of the elections mattered? What if elections were in June 2003, instead of late 2005?

Mr. Goff: Would we make a different decision? No, I don’t think so. At the end, an issue of deploying your troops and putting them in harm’s way where they might be killed is so fundamental, that you do it for the right reason. I have a nephew killed in Afghanistan, fighting with the Americans, and so, you know, we understand that for generations our family lost members in the first world war, in the second world war, so we understand that this is a fundamental responsibility that we need to do the right thing for the right reason, and even if that means, that you are voted out. Actually, you would not want to abandon your principles and your values, simply to do what you think the public wants you to do; they might influence how you present it, but I think, at the end, the decisions are based on the right reasons.
5. This is a hypothetical scenario: say that the UN did not clear the way for an international reconstruction effort. Would New Zealand still have gone to participate in the US-led reconstruction program?

Mr. Goff: If there was no UN mandate, we would have been less likely to go. I think Labour has always seen... we were always a multilateralist party. We are a bit more remote, we are smaller country, we have always been more multilateralist going right back to the second world war – before the second world war actually – we were prepared to take stances that were independent of Britain and of the United States. It depends on which Government is in, but the general New Zealander are feeling are more independent, and to do things that we think are right for New Zealand, and not to do what another country tells us to do. And we like to do things that have the support, even if not an official mandate, at least the support of the United Nations. And the United Nations, as I recall it at that time, has encouraged people to assist in the reconstruction, and so the UN mandate was quite important. And so without that mandate, we would have been less likely to go.

6. In general, what indicators do the Cabinet members use to evaluate the levels of “national interest”? (security implications, economic interests, etc.) perceives these indicators and translates them to the Prime Minister? The Foreign Affairs and Trade ministry? Defence Ministry? Or intelligence community?

Mr. Goff: On national interest... We get official advice, particularly from the ministry of foreign affairs. The defence ministry will advise on specifically the military things, but they won't advise on particularly the geostrategic issues. I've been minister of defence, I've been minister of foreign affairs, and Foreign Affairs is the lead agency and Foreign Affairs would have more impact than the intelligence community.

We get advice from them, we get information and advice, but we don't get decisions. We make the decisions taking into account the information. A smaller group than a Cabinet – foreign affairs and external relations select committee, foreign minister, and prime minister – so a smaller group of ministers are involved in decisions, which is then ratified by the Cabinet. It’s wrong to say that the departments create the policy, the departments advise – and most of the times, we accept their advice, but our decisions in the end are premised on our own experiences, our own values, and our own belief in principles on what the appropriate thing to do was.
Bibliography


Republic of the Philippines. Department of Foreign Affairs Homepage.


Republic of the Philippines. Senate of the Philippines, 18th Congress. Blas F. Ople.


“Saying ‘No’ to Iraq War was ‘Important’ Decision for Canada: Chretien.” CTV News, Mar. 12, 2013.


Vaughn, Bruce. 2017. “New Zealand: Background and Bilateral Relations with the United States.” Congressional research service.


“Why the Iraq war was right.” Lowy Institute, The Interpreter, Mar. 26, 2013.


Yarhi-Milo, Keren. 2014. *Knowing the Adversary: Leaders, Intelligence, and the Assessment of Intentions in International Relations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.


노무현 사료관. 노무현 대통령 연설문집 제 1 권.
