

MEASURING ATTITUDES RELEVANT TO ORGANIZED
MASS KILLING IN ORDINARY POPULATIONS

by

NINA GREENE

A THESIS

Presented to the Department of Psychology
and the Robert D. Clark Honors College
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Arts

Winter 2018

An Abstract of the Thesis of

Nina Greene for the degree of Bachelor of Arts
in the Department of Psychology to be taken Winter 2018

Title: Measuring attitudes relevant to organized mass killing in ordinary populations

Approved: _____

Professor Gerard Saucier

Sociopolitical violence is a horrific and pervasive problem in our world today. On the far end of the spectrum of sociopolitical violence lies democide. Democide is not random and its perpetrators share common thinking patterns. Saucier and Akers (2018) identified 20 themes that appeared in texts by democide-instigating leaders from a diverse range of regions. With knowledge of how democidalists tend to express themselves, researchers created, applied, and assessed the usefulness of an empirically based questionnaire that measures the degree to which the democidal mindset has developed, which may occur among leaders and members of the general population. Two hundred and sixty participants living in the United States and 257 participants living in India (N= 517) self-reported their answers to statements on the Democidal Mindset Questionnaire. In both countries, participants who endorsed one theme within the democidal mindset tended to also endorse the other themes, indicating one theme's potential to predict the other themes. This questionnaire is the first empirical tool to assess democidal thinking. The long-term hope is to not only assess large groups for democidal rhetoric/thinking. Practitioners may use this tool to more accurately assess specific leaders/perpetrators and to improve their ability to respond. Future research should examine to what degree predictive validity can be added to the questionnaire's content-validity basis.

Acknowledgements

This research is a collaboration by Gerard Saucier, Laura Akers, Ashleigh Landau, and Nina Greene. We developed, applied, and assessed the usefulness of an empirically based questionnaire that measures democidal thinking. I played a unique role in the development of the questionnaire items, the recruitment of participants, and especially the statistical analyses described in this thesis. The development of the Democidal Mindset Questionnaire (DMQ) relied on previous foundational research by Dr. Gerard Saucier and Dr. Laura Akers, including their paper Democidal Thinking: Patterns in the Mindset Behind Organized Mass Killing (2018).

I would like to thank Dr. Gerard Saucier, Dr. Laura Akers, and Doctoral Student Ashleigh Landau for welcoming me into their research project, treating me as a peer, and for the time and care they put into supporting me through this process, and to Professor David Frank for serving on my Thesis Committee. I would also like to thank the Genocide Prevention Initiative and the Robert D. Clark Honors College for generously funding this undergraduate research.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Purpose	2
Selection of Cases and Documents	4
Key Themes Characterizing the Democidal Mindset	5
Developing a Model of the Democidal Mindset	11
Applications to Democide Prevention	15
Method	16
Overview	16
Participants	16
Procedure	18
Materials	18
Data Preparation and Analysis	19
Results	20
Discussion	31
Limitations and Future Directions	33
Conclusion	36
Appendix A: Statement of Informed Consent - World Attitudes Survey_India	49
Appendix B: Statement of Informed Consent - World Attitudes Survey_USA	51
Appendix C: World Attitudes Survey	53
Appendix D: Poll Items	65
Appendix E: Demographic Items	66
Appendix F: Debriefing Statement - World Attitudes Survey	69
Bibliography	70

List of Tables

Table 1: Distribution of 20 Themes Detected in Statements from 20 Diverse Cases of Democide	37
Table 2: Theme Name Key	38
Table 3: Reliability Analysis Round 1	39
Table 4: Reliability Analysis Round 2	40
Table 5: Reliability Analysis Round 3	41
Table 6: Reliability Analyses 1 to 2	41
Table 7: Reliability Analyses 2 to 3	43
Table 8: Correlations for United States of America	44
Table 9: Correlations for India	45
Table 10: Means for Religion in India A	46
Table 11: Means for Religion in India B	47

List of Boxes

Box 1: Examples of Items Stated in Reverse Form	48
---	----

Introduction

Sociopolitical violence is a horrific and pervasive problem in our world today. On the far end of the spectrum of sociopolitical violence lies democide. A democide is a genocide, politicide, or any violent political or ethnic suppression that is organized, sanctioned, or run by the government. Rummel (1994) estimates that in the 20th century, democide has caused about 167 to 188 million deaths. Any cause of mass violence merits study, such that we can better understand early warning signs and develop diagnostic tools to prevent it in the future.

Previous research suggests that democide is not random. Democide perpetrators share common thinking patterns (Suedfeld, 2001; Landau, 2015; Saucier & Akers, 2018). Democide is not endemic to a select group of nations or societies, but is a pancultural phenomenon (Saucier & Akers, 2018, p. 7). With knowledge of how democidalists think and tend to express themselves, the ultimate goal of this research is to “create a preventive ‘early warning system’ (as per Stanton, 2005) in which rhetoric in various sources would be monitored for the degree to which the democidal mindset has developed” (Saucier & Akers, 2018, p. 3). Researchers and practitioners would use the themes and time sequences — that are present in democides across cultures and time periods — to predict and prevent future democides.

Government officials monitoring for risk factors and signs of democide currently have little research to go on, and few tools to help them assess the situation. Policy experts have increasing interest in identifying the “triggers and accelerators of genocide and atrocities” (Finkel, 2014, p. 34). For example, Joyce Leader who was

second-in-command at the U.S. embassy in Kigali, Rwanda during the genocide in Rwanda, says:

Internal conflicts with their pervasiveness and destructiveness are the most virulent, costly, and serious threats to peace in our time. One of the biggest current challenges to the international community is to be alert to potential internal conflict in time to respond and prevent it. *For this we need diagnostic and analytical tools for early warning and policy assessment* (2001, p. 75).

She goes on to say that had diagnostic tools existed during the Rwanda genocide, the U.S. embassy would have been able to more accurately assess the situation as it was unfolding, improving their ability to respond (2001, p. 75).

The focus of our research is on a psychological ‘mindset’ account of sociopolitical violence, “with mindset defined pragmatically as aspects of thinking patterns that are accessible in rhetoric, in public communications or official statements, an observable mental posture, stance or array of viewpoints” (Saucier & Akers, 2018, p. 5). Saucier and Akers (2018) identified 20 themes or thinking patterns that appeared in texts written or spoken by democide-instigating leaders. After their initial content analysis, using their identified texts and themes, we together developed, applied and assessed the usefulness of one such diagnostic and analytical tool.

Purpose

Our aims for the study included in this thesis were two-fold:

1. To pilot our “World Attitudes Survey”. The data gathered from this study was used to aid in the development and refinement of a model that accurately and reliably measures democidal thinking. The scales and items within our questionnaire were fine-tuned. The data gathered also enabled an examination of how various aspects of democidal thinking relate to major lines of variation in worldview, religious and political attitudes.

2. To ensure the Democidal Mindset Questionnaire is a model that works outside of the United States and is not culture-bound (by including a parallel overseas sample), so that the model is generalizable.

Selection of Cases and Documents

In order to make generalizations about the democidal mindset, Saucier and Akers (2018) examined materials from a diverse range of regions, religions, and political systems. Materials from multiple subtypes of democide were examined, including cases of politicide, colonial-settler violence, and economic exploitation of labor that resulted in mass deaths. To ensure diversity of sampling, Saucier and Akers (2018) “divided the world into regions, seeking to identify at least one case from each region. In order to ensure there was sufficient contemporary relevance, [they] limited cases to the most recent 225 years (i.e., since the French Revolution). To qualify, a case also had to have sufficient written documentary evidence (i.e., original statements) that would clearly indicate its mindset” (Saucier & Akers, 2018, p. 8). Seven cases from Asia, four each from Europe and the Americas, three from Africa, and two from the islands south of Asia were included (Saucier & Akers, 2018, p. 9). Four communist cases were included, balanced by several overtly anti-communist cases (Saucier & Akers, 2018, p. 9). Saucier and Akers (2018) drew documentary evidence mainly from books and sometimes from other printed materials, including pamphlets and periodical articles. Texts written or spoken by democide-instigating leaders were focused on (Saucier & Akers, 2018, p.10). They also examined policy statements and biographies of those leaders, giving these texts a lower priority (Saucier & Akers, 2018, p. 10).

Their goal was to find indications of mindset regarding deadly violence as related to achievement of sociopolitical power (Saucier & Akers, 2018, p. 10). Their search was open-ended, “with no axe to grind regarding which themes would emerge or which previous theories would be supported or not” (Saucier & Akers, 2018, p. 11).

Key Themes Characterizing the Democidal Mindset

Table 1 lists 20 themes that occurred in at least half of the 20 cases, ordered by relative frequency of occurrence across all cases. Ten themes were identified as central and primary based on their occurrence in at least 2/3 of the cases, which appear in the top section of Table 1 (Saucier & Akers, 2018). Ten secondary themes were identified in at least half of the cases, which appear in the bottom section of Table 1 (Saucier & Akers, 2018).

The 20 themes share some evident commonalities in content. Saucier and Akers (2018, p. 16) proposed seven broader “superthemes”, to take into account their similarities and create a “more parsimonious set.”

1. Reductive Group-Essentialism

Saucier and Akers combined “racialism” with “dispositionalism/essentialism”, “since both involve attributing hard-wired tendencies to people based on a social category to which they are assigned” (2018, p. 16). This worldview sets a foundation for collective blame (Lickel et al., 2006).

- *Dispositionalism/essentialism*

“An essence is the hidden something that makes a living thing what it is” (Chirot & McCauley, 2010, p. 83). It is “character, personality, identity, soul or spirit” (Chirot & McCauley, 2010, p. 83). Humans divide the living world into essences, assigning both themselves and groups essences (Chirot & McCauley, 2010, p. 83-84). Chirot and McCauley (2010) include this theme — which they title “Essentializing Others” — in their analysis of the psychological foundations of genocidal killing (p. 68). They explain: “Reference to the enemy in terms of disgusting animality or dangerous infection is an obvious marker of dehumanization. But the idea of essence makes this kind of reference more than metaphoric. Essentializing the out-group means that there is something bad about all of them, every one of them, and that badness goes deeper than the images used to describe them... Essentializing turns the enemy into a single dangerous and irredeemable character” (Chirot & McCauley, 2010, p. 84). Chirot and McCauley (2010) also explain that the in-group is essentialized (p. 86). They “suspect that

essentializing the enemy is linked strongly and perhaps even necessarily with essentializing the in-group. It is in that sense... that the hate felt toward the out-group is so closely related to the love felt for the in-group. The result of this double essentializing is a battle of good and evil, of two incompatible essences in which love of the good means necessarily hate for the threatening out-group” (Chirof & McCauley, 2010, p. 86).

- *Racialism in some form*

“Racialism” involves attributing hard-wired tendencies to people based on a social category to which they are assigned.

2. Moral Exclusionary Evaluations

Saucier and Akers combined “uncivilized or uncivilizable” with “dehumanization”, because “both tend to engage in moral-exclusionary evaluations of peoples” (2018, p. 17).

- *Dehumanization*

“Dehumanizing discourses and conceptions have been identified in almost all major mass atrocities” (Leader Maynard & Benesch, 2016, p. 80). The perpetrators devalue the humanity of their victims, who “are described in a variety of ways that deny or diminish their humanity, reducing the moral significance of their future deaths, or the duties owed to them by potential perpetrators” (Leader Maynard & Benesch, 2016, p. 80). Dehumanization can defeat normative concerns about violence by allowing perpetrators to believe that their victims lack moral protections (Leader Maynard & Benesch, 2016, p. 80). The perpetrators often refer to their victims as “animals, diseased, or exceptionally filthy” (Weitz, 2003, p. 20). Paul Rozin and his associates (2000) have found that body products and animals associated with death or offal elicit disgust. “Animals that elicit disgust notably include pigs, rats, maggots, cockroaches, and other vermin, though sometimes horror of the enemy is emphasized by also portraying him as monstrous” (Chirof & McCauley, 2010, p. 80).

- *Uncivilized or uncivilizable*

The perpetrators view their out-group as incapable of achieving any level of civilization.

- *Crush, smash, exterminate, eliminate*

Saucier and Akers treat this theme as falling partially within the “Moral Exclusion” supertheme, “because it tends to presuppose an evaluation of certain victims as having lives that do no matter, thus excluded from the universe of morally relevant targets” (2018, p. 17).

- *Tactics/excuses for violence*

“Although some aspects of the ‘tactics/excuses for violence’ theme draw on a simple violence-favoring attitude, other aspects imply moral exclusion. Victim-blaming, and utilizing euphemisms that mask or sanitize the injurious outcomes that out-group members experience, have this character, moral disengagement that silences or deflects blame” (Saucier & Akers, 2018, p. 18).

3. Contamination-Purification

“Under this supertheme an out-group is portrayed not merely as an antagonist and obstacle, but as a kind of impurity or contamination that must be eliminated from the body or physical situation” (Saucier & Akers, 2018, p. 18).

- *Purity/cleansing language*
- *Body or disease metaphor*

Victims-to-be are compared to “toxins, microbes, or cancer, suggesting that they are polluting, despoiling, or debilitating the entire in-group — leading to particularly prominent recurring demands to ‘purify’ groups or societies from the supposedly toxifying elements” (Leader Maynard & Benesch, 2016, p. 80). “The most natural interpretation of contagion phenomena is that objects have essences, and that essences are transferred by contact” (Chiot & McCauley, 2010, p. 80). “The out-group’s essence must be kept from contaminating the in-group’s essence. Indeed, the very ideas of pollution and contamination require the idea of essence, the unseen spirit or nature that is endangered by contact or infection” (Chiot & McCauley, 2010, p. 86).

- *Crush, smash, exterminate, eliminate*

This theme is partially related to the “Contamination-Purification” supertheme because it “gives strong implication of purification” (Saucier & Akers, 2018, p. 18).

4. In-Group Unity

“In-Group Unity” is “a fundamental unity of the in-group whether deriving from an ancestral past or set out as a requisite for the future” (Saucier & Akers, 2018, p. 18).

- *Group or national unity*

- *Nationalism/ethnonationalism*

5. Paranoid Style

Hofstadter (1964) first introduced the label “paranoid style,” which is associated with theories of vast and sinister conspiracies that are about to undermine or destroy a whole way of life. It includes “a preoccupation with power relations, exaggerated fantasies of superior forces and conspiracies in the external environment, and an angry and antagonistic relation to the world within which enemies and constant battles are fundamental” (Saucier & Akers, 2018, p. 19).

- *Traitor talk (treason, treachery, etc.)*
- *Conspiracy*
- *Subversion*
- *Internal enemies*
- *Xenophobia or foreign influence*

Xenophobia shares features with paranoid style because it assumes foreigners are enemies.

- *Threat of annihilation of our people*

The belief that the out-group is a military threat to the in-group is so frequently an exaggerated fantasy of an omnipotent out-group, that it can be partially included within “Paranoid Style.”

6. Dualistic Belief

This supertheme links “dichotomous thinking” with two themes that presuppose dualistic beliefs.

- *Dualistic/dichotomous thinking*

Leader Maynard and Benesch (2016) detail a relevant analysis of dualistic thinking, in their paper titled “Dangerous Speech and Dangerous Ideology”, under a similar theme titled “The Destruction of Alternatives” (p. 83). They explain: “Decision-making always occurs within a delimited field of possibilities: human beings do not consciously consider every one of the infinite options in any situation, but focus decision making on those choices that appear salient. This ‘menu’ of alternatives can be significantly expanded or contracted by ideology and speech. Eliminating the perceived viability of alternatives to violence is therefore just as critical as are assertions of the

desirability or permissibility of violent options themselves” (Leader Maynard & Benesch, 2016, p. 83). As detailed by Saucier and Akers (2018, p. 20): “Beck’s (1999) propositions about the role of dichotomous thinking in genocide are obviously pertinent; such dualistic thinking tends to be present when polarization is reinforced by an implied hostility toward moderates or moderation.”

- *Something held sacred*

The in-group treats something as an absolute good and uses it as a rationale for their actions.

- *Threat of annihilation of our people*

It assumes the out-group has an absolutely evil intention. Leader Maynard and Benesch (2016) cite a similar theme in their analysis of the psychological foundations of genocidal killing, which they title “Guilt Attribution” (p. 81). Specifically, they explain: “A speaker asserts that the in-group faces serious and often mortal threats from the victims-to-be, which makes violence seem defensive, and therefore proper and necessary. Tales of future wrongdoing can be even more powerful than tales of past crimes, since the future is frightening” (Leader Maynard & Benesch, 2016, p. 81). Further: “Whether through the passionate assertion of enemy machinations to destroy the in-group, or the more ambivalent circulation of rumors, anecdotal incidents, and vague accusations, perpetrators can successfully propagate beliefs that the threat is real. Such beliefs can sometimes capitalize on genuine threats or at least reasonable insecurities — they need not be complete madness” (Leader Maynard & Benesch, 2016, p. 82). As Martin Shaw explains, the perpetrators construct their victims as enemies, “not only in a social or political but also in a military sense, to be destroyed” (2015, p. 86).

7. Perceived Violations of Respect

The in-group believes that the out-group has violated or threatened something the in-group perceives to possess, “creating a sense of grievance and desire for vengeance” (Saucier & Akers, 2018, p. 20).

- *Attachment/entitlement to land*

The in-group asserts its attachment or entitlement to a particular territory, believing only they can use it properly and the out-group taking it would be a moral violation (stealing).

- *Revenge or retaliation language*

A uniting conceptual framework is this: “All themes represent distortive *oversimplifying beliefs that facilitate the inculcating of an out-group*, and not just the out-group loosely or abstractly but *with every member of that out-group thereby inculcated*. That is, we see a group portrayed as threatening, impure, absolutely bad, and less than human, all in the context of a worldview that not only essentializes groups but treats group-membership as the essence of any individual” (Saucier & Akers, 2018, p. 22). Overall, the cognitive tendency is “to oversimplify, failing to tolerate uncertainty, nuance, exceptions to a rule, or alternative explanations” (Saucier & Akers, 2018, p. 24).

Saucier and Akers (2018, p. 22) propose that democide will not occur unless a substantial number of these themes are represented in a leader’s rhetoric. A reasonable starting point may be: the higher the frequency and intensity of these themes, the greater the probability of democide.

Saucier and Akers (2018) discuss a possible objection to their identified themes. The themes may be largely characteristic of humans in general, leaders in general, or crisis situations where subcultures are in conflict (Saucier & Akers, 2018, p. 14). Researchers wanted to know whether the themes appeared in texts generated by leaders who, in a crisis situation, did not resort to democide. Researchers examined four geographically diverse cases of leaders governing in situations where democide could have occurred, but did not. Saucier and Akers (2018, p. 15) found extremely little in the way of a democidal mindset and instead found rhetorical restraint and counter-measures to avoid mass violence.

Developing a Model of the Democidal Mindset

My thesis developed an empirically based questionnaire that measures patterns of thinking that relate to various forms of large-scale sociopolitical violence against populations. Such democidal thinking may occur among leaders (i.e., elites with power to encourage or order violence) as well as members of the general population. My thesis focused on the latter. An accompanying tool that assesses leaders is also being developed, but that tool is not part of this study.

Those with political power (leaders, elites) are a more obvious target for such diagnostic tools than members of the general population. Members of the general population typically don't start or organize democides, even if they do, in many cases, contribute to or participate in them. However, examining belief-systems and ideologies in general populations is useful for detecting and preventing democide for two reasons.

Studying general populations enabled researchers to accumulate sufficiently large sample sizes and to detect precisely useful organizing (factor) structure among the variables. A second reason to study general populations is that existing audience ideology determines the extent to which an audience is susceptible to democidal rhetoric (Leader Maynard & Benesch, 2016, p. 78). Leader Maynard and Benesch found: "Even the most inflammatory or powerful justification of violence may have little chance of leading to atrocities if uttered in a context where it cannot be disseminated, *where the audience strongly disapproves of violence*, or where the speaker has no influence or authority" [italics mine] (2016, p. 77). With knowledge of ideologies in general populations, practitioners may determine what populations are most likely to elect a leader who disseminates democidal rhetoric or to acquiesce in one

who was not elected. Chirot and McCauley found that existing grievances and hostilities between groups quickly increase the potential for mass killing when the political acts of the authorities, who are eager to initiate violence, break down social arrangements and psychological inhibitions (2010, p. 94). Low existing grievances and hostilities between groups may be a protective factor that lowers the potential for mass killing should the authorities disseminate inflammatory justifications of violence.

The largest part of literature on genocide and mass murder focuses on the motivation of leaders, or the victims. It is far more difficult to find a good analysis of civilians who did the actual killing (Chirot & McCauley, 2010, p. 91). While participants in our study likely have not contributed to a democide, the Democidal Mindset Questionnaire does provide an empirical tool to analyze civilian ideology. In the future, practitioners may use the Democidal Mindset Questionnaire to survey the general populations of countries at risk of devolving into democide.

The Democidal Mindset Questionnaire consists of 210 items, each one of which is a statement to which individuals may self-report their answers. Some of the items are stated in reverse form, and thus reflect generally anti-democidal content. Box 1 provides 10 examples of these positive-keyed items. The main purpose of these positive-keyed items is to remove major effects of agreeing vs. disagreeing (regardless of content) tendency, also known as “acquiescence.”

Included in the Democidal Mindset Questionnaire is a measure of five “isms” dimensions (Saucier, 2013), which captures major lines of variation in worldview, political and religious beliefs. Beyond the scope of my thesis, the broader project aims

to determine how elements of democidal thinking are related to these major lines of variation in attitudes. My thesis did not analyze “isms” dimensions.

Since democide and democidal thinking occur worldwide, steps were taken to ensure that our model has some cross-cultural applicability. It is best if cross-cultural data is taken into account at a relatively early stage in development and validation of a measure. One good test is to collect data in India as well as the United States, since these societies differ substantially on relevant variables like collectivism-individualism and religion.

Another reason for including India in our data collection was India has a historical example of a democide started by the general population. In most instances of mass killing, leaders organize and order the mass murders. A rare example of a mass killing that seemed to lack central leadership occurred in 1946-47 when British India was partitioned. Local leaders among Muslims, Sikhs, and Hindus actively encouraged ethnic cleansing and armed gangs of assassins to spread fear in communities other than their own (Brass, 2003, p. 54). The democide killed anywhere from 200,000 to 360,000 people (Brass, 2003, p. 54). Brass (2003) details the democide:

The massacres were far from spontaneous, even though the top leaders of the emergent Pakistani and Indian states did not order these killings... Once the killings had begun, the masses of affected people were swept up in the massacres, and in many instances men murdered their own families, especially women and children, in order to avoid the dishonor of having them defiled or forcibly converted by killers of other religious groups. What motivated the local leaders, however was primarily their belief that it would be easier to maintain control over their communities and territories if other groups were disposed of (p. 54).

Including India in our study provides diversity not only across geographical regions and religions, but also balances the selected historical cases by including a country that has

had a case in which the general population was involved. Given that the general population organizing and perpetrating democide is atypical and has not occurred in all countries with histories of democide, including a country with a known case of the general population being involved as such balances our conclusions in a diverse selection of historical cases.

Applications to Democide Prevention

The ultimate goal of this research is to develop and test a tool that can be used to prevent democides. Previous scholars have analyzed stages of democide from a theoretical lens, but for the most part, their conclusions have not been empirically based. This questionnaire is one of the first, if not *the* first, empirical tools to assess democidal thinking, an early warning sign of democide itself. The long-term hope is not only to assess large groups for democidal rhetoric/thinking, but also to use this tool to assess specific leaders/perpetrators. The ability to measure the thinking patterns of the people involved in these complex situations should better inform practitioners' insight and decision-making process. Ideally, if dangerous levels of democidal rhetoric are recorded, government or NGO action should be taken.

The questionnaire version included in my thesis — that measures the democidal mindset within the general population — also has an application to democide prevention. Practitioners who have access to measures of democidal thinking within the general population would know whether the country had a risk or protective factor in place, should leaders try to initiate violence. For example, if practitioners know that a country's baseline democidal mindset (within the general population) is high then practitioners would predict that the audience would be more susceptible to inflammatory speech and justifications for violence. The audience also would be more at risk for electing a leader who disseminates democidal rhetoric or for acquiescing in one who was not elected.

Method

Overview

Two hundred and sixty participants living in the United States and 257 participants living in India (N= 517) were recruited to self-report their answers to 210 items on our questionnaire. Participants were recruited through Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk), a commonly used online data-collection program that allows people across the world to earn money for participating in studies. Participants clicked on our survey link and were taken to our questionnaire in Qualtrics. Data was collected and recorded using the Qualtrics platform. The total length of participation was one online session, during which participants spent approximately 30 minutes completing our questionnaire. Identifying markers were not collected from participants. Researchers were interested in the group, country-wide patterns with respect to these components of democidal thinking, and not interested in any individual's scores on the questionnaire. No follow-up with participants was planned.

Participants

Participant Population:

Two hundred and sixty 260 participants living in the United States (53% female, average age = 39) and 257 participants living in India (27% female, average age = 32) (N= 517) were recruited in order to perform a cross-cultural analysis. Since participants were paid, these figures were calculated based on our available funds, as well as what would give our study adequate statistical power for detecting structure; a priority was on ensuring that each sample exceeded a minimum of 200 participants. In the United

States, 76% of participants were Caucasian, 11% were Black or African-American, 6% were Hispanic, 5% were Asian, 2% were Native American, and 1% were Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander. In India, 79% of participants were Hindu, 12% were Christian, 5% were Muslim, 1% were Sikh, and 1% were Jain.

The principal reason for including these two populations, is that they provided a distinct cultural comparison (east v. west, India vs. the United States). Second, both countries' populations were readily available to sample on Mechanical Turk. Third, English is a national language in the United States as well as in India, so there was no need to translate items or measures. The majority of people in India are taught to be fluent in three languages, English, Hindi and the regional language, and proficiency in English is a prerequisite for being a participant on MTurk.

To be an MTurk Worker (i.e. people who complete surveys through MTurk), one is required to be 18 years of age or older. For this reason, all our participants were 18 years of age or older.

Recruitment:

MTurk Workers had the opportunity to read the description of our study, read the informed consent document, review the compensation given and the duration of the study, before deciding to participate.

The only selection criterion utilized was "location." MTurk has seven preset "qualifications" that can be enabled, one of which is "location." By enabling the "location" setting, MTurk automatically filtered out those who did not fit our location criteria.

Compensation:

Participants living in the United States were paid \$10 each and participants living in India were paid \$6 each (a functionally equivalent amount in India when converted). These amounts were decided on because of the premise that people are more inclined to participate when they are paid a sum represented in two or more figures; for example, an individual would be more inclined to participate if he/she was offered \$10 over \$9. Therefore, a payment of \$10 in the United States should appeal to participants. In India, the \$6 was converted to about 408 rupees, therefore eliminating our problem of needing a two-figure amount. Mechanical Turk directly compensated participants after they completed our study.

Procedure

1. Participants first completed the “Statement of Informed Consent – World Attitudes Survey.”
2. Participants then completed the “World Attitudes Survey”, answering 210 items by rating how much they agreed with the given statement. Responses were recorded using a 5-point Likert Scale. For each item, an additional response option was “Prefer not to answer”.
3. Participants then completed two additional items: one from the World Values Survey Association (1981-2014) and one from Pew Research Center (2002).
4. Participants were then asked for their demographic information.
5. Participants read a debriefing form, “Debriefing Statement – World Attitudes Survey”. Participants were able to download and save the debriefing form for their own records.

Materials

1. “World Attitudes Survey”: a 210 item questionnaire in which participants rated each item by how much they agree with the given statement, using a 5-point Likert Scale. This study served as our first test

run of this questionnaire. Roughly 150 of these items were drawn from quotations by and about leaders and elites associated with outbreaks of democide around the world. Of the 150 democide-relevant items, a couple dozen items have opposite content. The main purpose of these is to enable some control for individual differences in use of the response scale – removing major effects of agreeing vs. disagreeing (regardless of content) tendency, also known as “acquiescence.” The other roughly 60 items are designed to measure five dimensions (variables) of “isms” (as per Saucier, 2013). Order of presentation of items was be random, with each participant seeing the items in a unique order. Responses were recorded on a 5-point Likert Scale.

2. Two additional items will be included at the end of the “World Attitudes Survey”. These two items are survey items from the World Values Survey Association (WVS) (1981-2014) and the Pew Research Center (PEW) (2002).
3. Demographic items – These items are broad demographic questions and did not give us any identifying markers.

Data Preparation and Analysis

The data was analyzed quantitatively, using a variety of statistical tools. Basic psychometric analyses were used:

- Reliability of 20 initial democidal-thinking scales (in both samples)
- Whether these items empirically group onto expected scales (in both samples)
- Whether the retained scales empirically converge (seem to be meaning one versus many underlying variables) (in both samples)
- Whether correlation among some pairs of scales are too high to keep them separate (in both samples)
- Correlations between the WVS (2012) and the PEW (2002) items and items or scales from our “World Attitudes Survey,” to examine capacity to predict across these two types of survey platforms (a first examination of predictive validity)
- How the scales overall might be shortened, when the data indicates that is feasible, using a structured approach fully specified in advance

Results

Reliability Analyses

Before running the reliability analyses, items intended to measure opposite content were reflected (i.e. had their scores reversed). Responses were recorded using a 5-point Likert Scale. If a participant selected “Strongly agree” (equivalent to a “4” on the Likert Scale) to an opposite content item — e.g., “Vengefulness is an undesirable characteristic.” — then their score was reversed to be “Do not agree at all” (equivalent to a “0” on the Likert Scale). Likewise, a score of “3 - Mostly agree” became a score of “1 - Agree only slightly.” This way, participants’ scores for the opposite content items were aligned with their scores for the other items. Thus, both the opposite content items and the regular items could be analyzed in a reliability analysis together.

Tables 3-5 show that for each scale, I computed and registered (1) the coefficient Alpha reliability, (2) any items whose removal would raise that Alpha value, (3) those items that had the most extreme means (either high or low), and (4) the variance of the inter-item correlations. Items that had a mean less than or equal to .05 away from the most extreme means (either high or low) were included. This was done because — as on any test, including those given in college classes — it is useful to include a combination of easy and difficult items (here, easy to endorse and difficult to endorse). Table 3, for example, shows that theme 0 had three low mean items in the United States, with item 37 being the lowest mean and items 72 and 132 being less than or equal to .05 above item 37.

The rule for scale revision by removing items was as follows: Remove the item if the analysis indicated its removal would improve Alpha in either sample/country,

unless that item was one of those registered as having either a very high-mean or low-mean in one or both samples (with the understanding that being highest-mean in one sample and lowest-mean in the other indicates that, overall, it is not a desirable item to keep). Ten of the alpha-lowering items were very high mean in one country and very low mean in the other country. Table 3, for example, shows that theme 4 item 125_r was both a high mean item in the United States and a low mean item in India. Having the difficulty level of endorsement vary so drastically between countries would be a bad characteristic in an item. Although items with extreme means are useful (i.e. they capture unique information), when they are high in one sample and low in another, this could just be an indicator of a poor item.

The variance of inter-item correlations (VIC) was not used as an indicator toward removing items, but simply to indicate the relative unidimensionality of the scale (low values, especially if under .01, indicate only one characteristic is being measured by the group of items, rather than multiple characteristics) for future consideration. It is better, however, if a scale had good unidimensionality or if a revision improved the unidimensionality, so effect on VIC was used as a criterion for whether to remove an item. Looking at changes to “VIC” values between (1) Tables 3 and 4, and (2) Tables 4 and 5, one may see whether a revision improved the unidimensionality of a theme. The coefficient Alpha was used to evaluate internal

consistency.¹ The items I removed tended to both improve Alpha and unidimensionality, although the procedure described did not suffice to bring either index to acceptable levels for all scales.

Tables 6 and 7 indicate whether internal consistency and unidimensionality improved between analyses 1, 2 and 3. Internal consistency improved when an Alpha value increased, after I removed the item(s). Unidimensionality improved when a VIC value decreased, after I removed the item(s). If an item met the criteria for the rule for removing items, then the item's removal had to also cause more "good" changes to happen than "bad" between analyses — specifically three or more "good" changes had to happen — in order for the item to be removed permanently. One "good" change was if an Alpha value increased or if a VIC value decreased. For example, Table 6 shows that for theme 0, Alpha increased in India (+) and decreased in the United States (-), and VIC increased in the United States (-) and decreased in India (+). In other words, after the three items (86_r, 99_r, 170_r) were removed, two "good" changes and two "bad" changes happened. Thus, these three items were not permanently removed. That one or two "bad" changes often happened alongside "good" changes, underscores that it is difficult to optimize a measure simultaneously for two populations that differ in many ways. I was only able to do such optimization here for ten of twenty themes using a straightforward reasonable rule-based procedure.

¹ McGraw-Hill's *Psychometric Theory* (1967) explains that because "measurement error is an important issue in the use of any measurement method", coefficient alpha "should be applied to all new measurement methods" (p. 210). Further, "the size of the reliability coefficient is based on both the average correlation among items (the internal consistency) and the number of items... If it proves to be very low, either the test is too short or the items have very little in common... If, for example, coefficient alpha is only .30 for a 40-item test, the experimenter should reconsider his measurement problem and begin test construction anew" (p. 210).

Below is the list of items that should be removed permanently:

Theme 0= None

Theme 1= None

Theme 2= None

Theme 3= t3q56

Theme 4= t4q158_r, t4q125_r

Theme 5= None

Theme 6= None

Theme 7= None

Theme 8= None

Theme 9= t9q76, t9q149_r

Theme 10= t10q154_r

Theme 11= t11q4_r

Theme 12= None

Theme 13= t13q66, t13q175_r

Theme 14= None

Theme 15= t15q47, t15q116_r

Theme 16= t16q51_r

Theme 17= t17q157, t17q150_r

Theme 18= None

Theme 19= t19q92_r

In the listing above, the number immediately after ‘t’ indicates the theme number for which the item was created and included. The number after ‘q’ is the sequential ordering of the item on the list. So “t3q56” means “the item numbered 56 that references theme 3”.

The overall goal of this initial structured measure-refinement procedure was to develop a set of items with good internal consistency and unidimensionality, but also capacity to measure at extreme levels of the construct (i.e., as afforded by the inclusion of items with extreme means, sometimes called high and low difficulty items). This

procedure was not intended necessarily to be the final revision or refinement of the scales, as this requires more complex multivariate and psychometric procedures (e.g., item response theory, factor analysis).

Tables 3-5 show that, as a general finding, most of these themes have a reasonable degree of reliability (internal consistency) already — there are not very many under .65 on Alpha. The problem is on the unidimensionality side, as indicated by so many VIC values well above .01. Particularly, themes with VIC values greater than .04 are likely measuring multiple themes and should be split up, specifically themes 0, 3, 5, 7, 8, 12, and 18. Revising to improve unidimensionality is a more complicated process that needs further attention in the broader project after my thesis.

Radical shortening of these scales is beyond the scope of my thesis, because it requires a look at more advanced techniques (like factor analysis and item-response theory analyses). I used a clearly specified, straightforward procedure and took it as far as it could go, which is enough in many cases of scale development — but here, some of the scales need something more. Based on their relatively low Alpha or high VIC values (as indicated in Tables 3-5), those scales that need further attention after my thesis are 0, 3, 5, 7, 8, 12, 18.

Correlations Analyses

Tables 7 and 8 indicate that in the United States and India, the themes were highly correlated with one another, indicating their potential to predict all other democidal themes. Although the correlations are high, they are not perfect and it is likely that more than one underlying ‘factor’ can be derived from a correlation matrix

like this. If the scales were radically shortened, a number of these between-scale correlations might be reduced.

In the American data, there is a bit more evidence for more than one underlying ‘factor’. This is because some of the correlations are relatively modest in size, between Democidal Thinking Pattern (DTP) scales, falling under .50. Scale 8 had modest correlations with scales 17-19, and these latter three had modest correlations among each other.

There are correlations between many of the poll items at the end and the DTP scales. Because the DTP scales are so highly intercorrelated, the correlations between the poll items with the various DTP scales tend to be somewhat similar.

All of the following results can be found in Table 8. In the United States, question “Pew 1” was negatively correlated with scales 0-19 ($p<.001$), such that participants who thought “moral decline” was a big problem in their country agreed more with statements within themes 0-19, as compared to participants who thought it was a small problem. Question “Pew 4” was negatively correlated with scales 0-19 ($p<.001$), such that participants who thought “immigration” was a big problem in their country agreed more with statements within themes 0-19, as compared to participants who thought it was a small problem. Question “Pew 3” was negatively correlated with scales 0-5 and 7-17 ($p<.001$) and scales 6 and 19 ($p<.01$), such that participants who thought “terrorism” was a big problem in their country agreed more with statements within these themes, as compared to participants who thought it was a small problem. Question “Pew 6” was negatively correlated with scales 1, 2, 5, 8, and 10-16 ($p<.001$) and scales 0, 3, 6-7, 9, and 17 ($p<.01$), such that participants who thought “crime” was a

big problem in their country agreed more with statements within these themes, as compared to participants who thought it was a small problem. Question “Pew 8” was negatively correlated with scale 19 ($p<.001$) and scales 8, 14, 15 ($p<.01$), such that participants who thought “economic inequality” was a big problem in their country agreed more with statements within these themes, as compared to participants who thought it was a small problem. Question “Pew 2” was negatively correlated with scale 10 ($r=-0.192, p<.01$), such that participants who thought “conflict between various groups in our country” was a big problem agreed more with statements within theme 10, as compared to participants who thought it was a small problem. Question “Pew 7” was also negatively correlated with scale 10 ($r=-0.161, p<.01$), such that participants who thought “corrupt political leaders” was a big problem in their country agreed more with statements within theme 10, as compared to participants who thought it was a small problem. Overall, the DTP scales were particularly predictive of Americans’ beliefs about immigration and moral decline, but some other beliefs as well.

All of the following results can be found in Table 9. In India, question “Pew 2” was positively correlated with scales 0-5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, and 19 ($p<.001$) and scales 6, 11, 13, 15, and 17 ($p<.01$), such that participants who thought “conflict between various groups in our country” was a small problem agreed more with statements within these themes, as compared to participants who thought it was a big problem. Question “Pew 4” was negatively correlated with scales 0, 2, 5-6, 11-14, 16-18 ($p<.001$) and scales 1, 4, 7, 9-10, 15, 19 ($p<.01$), such that participants who thought “immigration” was a big problem in their country agreed more with statements within these themes, as compared to participants who thought it was a small problem. Question

“Pew 7” was positively correlated with scales 7, 9, 12, and 19 ($p<.001$) and scales 2-4, 6, 13-14, and 16 ($p<.01$), such that participants who thought “corrupt political leaders” was a small problem in their country agreed more with statements within these themes, as compared to participants who thought it was a big problem. Question “Pew 1” was positively correlated with scale 19 ($p<.001$) and scales 2, 4, 7, 15-16 ($p<.01$), such that participants who thought “moral decline” was a small problem in their country agreed more with statements within these themes, as compared to participants who thought it was a big problem. Question “Pew 5” was positively correlated with scale 18 ($p<.001$) and scales 0-2, 5-7, 9, 16, and 19 ($p<.01$), such that participants who thought “economic inequality” was a small problem in their country agreed more with statements within these themes, as compared to participants who thought it was a big problem.

All of the following results can be found in Table 8. In the United States, question “WVS 4” was negatively correlated with scales 0-19 ($p<.001$), such that participants who indicated that they would *not* like “immigrants/foreign workers” as neighbors were also more likely to endorse all the DTP themes, as compared to participants who would be *ok* with “immigrants/foreign workers” as neighbors. Question “WVS 2” was negatively correlated with scales 0-18 ($p<.001$) and scale 19 ($p<.01$), such that participants who indicated that they would *not* like “people of a different race” as neighbors were also more likely to endorse all the DTP themes, as compared to participants who would be *ok* with “people of a different race” as neighbors. Question “WVS 7” was negatively correlated with scales 0-16 and 18 ($p<.001$) and scales 17 and 19 ($p<.01$), such that participants who indicated that they would *not* like “homosexuals” as neighbors were also more likely to endorse these DTP

themes, as compared to participants who would be *ok* with “homosexuals” as neighbors. Question “WVS 6” was negatively correlated with scales 0-7, 9-15, and 17-19 ($p<.001$), such that participants who indicated that they would *not* like “people of a different religion” as neighbors were also more likely to endorse these DTP themes, as compared to participants who would be *ok* with “people of a different religion” as neighbors. Question “WVS 5” was negatively correlated with scales 0-6, 8-12, 14, and 16-18 ($p<.001$) and scales 7 and 15 ($p<.01$), such that participants who indicated that they would *not* like “people who speak a different language” as neighbors were also more likely to endorse these DTP themes, as compared to participants who would be *ok* with “people who speak a different language” as neighbors. Question “WVS 3” was negatively correlated with scales 1-6, 8-14, and 17-18 ($p<.001$) and scales 7, 15-16, 19 ($p<.01$), such that participants who indicated that they would *not* like “people who have AIDS” as neighbors were also more likely to endorse these DTP themes, as compared to participants who would be *ok* with “people who have AIDS” as neighbors.

All of the following results can be found in Table 9. In India, question “WVS 5” was negatively correlated with scales 2, and 4-6 ($p<.001$) and scales 0, 3, 10-13, and 16-18 ($p<.01$), such that participants who indicated that they would *not* like “homosexuals” as neighbors were also more likely to endorse these DTP themes, as compared to participants who would be *ok* with “homosexuals” as neighbors. Question “WVS 3” was negatively correlated with scales 0-2, 5, 7, 11, 14, and 16 ($p<.001$) and scales 3-4, 9, 12, 17-18 ($p<.01$), such that participants who indicated that they would *not* like “people who have AIDS” as neighbors were also more likely to endorse these DTP themes, as compared to participants who would be *ok* with “people who have

AIDS” as neighbors. Question “WVS2” was negatively correlated with scales 1, 6, 9, and 16 ($p<.01$), such that participants who indicated that they would *not* like “people of a different race” as neighbors were also more likely to endorse these DTP themes, as compared to participants who would be *ok* with “people of a different race” as neighbors. Question “WVS 4” was negatively correlated with scale 15 ($p<.01$), such that participants who indicated that they would *not* like “immigrants/foreign workers” as neighbors were also more likely to endorse theme 15, as compared to participants who would be *ok* with “immigrants/foreign workers” as neighbors. A general conclusion is that people who wanted less contact with minorities or groups of people who are different than them, were also more likely to endorse democidal thinking.

Table 8 shows that, in the United States, Caucasian participants were less likely to endorse statements within scale 8 ($r=-0.193$, $p<.01$), than were Asian, African-American, and Hispanic participants. Table 8 shows that sex was negatively correlated with scale 19 ($r=-0.178$, $p<.01$) and scale 18 ($r=-0.161$, $p<.01$), such that male participants were more likely to endorse statements within these scales than were female participants.

Table 9 shows that, in India, “Age” was positively correlated with scale 8 (group/national unity), such that the older the participant was, the higher their endorsement of statements within this scale ($r=0.218$, $p<.001$).

Means for Religion in India

And finally, the religion demographic category (only recorded in India) was analyzed in relation to the 20 scales. Table 10 indicates that the following scales had a p (sig.) value of less than .05: 0, 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and Pew 4.

This suggests, there is a significant relation between what religion category one chooses and how one scores on these scales and Pew 4.

In order to further unpack these results, mean scores on these 15 scales and Pew 4 were calculated for each of the six religion categories (see Table 11). Table 11 indicates that, as compared to Christians and Muslims, Hindus reported higher scores (i.e. greater endorsement) on scales 0-2, 7-14, and 16-18. Additionally, Hindus scored lower on item Pew 4, indicating that they viewed immigration as a big problem, as compared to Muslims and Christians. However, there were far fewer Muslims and Christians in the sample than Hindus, so these mean comparisons are rather hazardous. Given these problems, the main conclusion here should simply be that religion appears to be a possible correlate of variation in democidal mindset, an issue that deserves further research.

Discussion

In both countries, participants who endorsed one belief within the democidal mindset tended to also endorse the other beliefs. This result could possibly mean that if someone uses one theme (e.g., “uncivilized or uncivilizable” language) in their speech, then they are likely to also endorse all other democidal themes. This could inform practitioners’ analyses. Specifically, if practitioners observe explicit examples of one theme in someone’s speech, then they could possibly predict that the speaker also endorses or uses all other democidal themes — thus, elevating the speaker’s dangerousness, especially if he/she is in a position of power. It is noteworthy that themes 1 (racialism), 13 (internal enemies), and 16 (something held sacred) were significantly correlated with all the themes quite strongly for India, indicating their potential to predict all other democidal themes. To a lesser extent, theme 4 (crush, eliminate) was significantly correlated with all the themes quite strongly for the United States, indicating theme 4’s potential to predict all other democidal themes.

The means religion results in India suggest that the democidal mindset possibly differs by the religion one identifies with. However, given the dominance of Hindus in the sample, as compared to Christians and Muslims, it is hard to draw firm conclusions from the data. As compared to Christians and Muslims, the data indicates that Hindus were more likely to endorse the following themes: essentialism, racism, uncivilized, group or national unity, nationalism, xenophobia, conspiracy, subversion, traitor talk, internal enemies, threat of annihilation of our people, something held sacred, attachment/entitlement to land, and revenge or retaliation language. Additionally, the data indicates that Hindus were more likely to think that “immigration” was a big

problem in their country, as compared to Muslims and Christians. It is important to be cautious when drawing conclusions here, for the sample did not have an equal number of individuals for each religion category.

In the United States, Pew items 1 and 4 were predictive of the democidal mindset. Participants who thought that “Moral decline” and “Immigration” were *big* problems in their country were more likely to endorse the democidal mindset. Participants who thought that “Moral decline” was a big problem were especially likely to endorse the following themes: purity/cleansing language, nationalism, conspiracy, subversion, traitor talk, internal enemies, threat of annihilation of our people, dualistic thinking, and something held sacred. Participants who thought that “Immigration” was a big problem were especially likely to endorse the following themes: essentialism, racialism, uncivilized, purity/cleansing language, nationalism, xenophobia or foreign influence, subversion, traitor talk, internal enemies, threat of annihilation of our people, dualistic thinking, and something held sacred.

In India, Pew item 2 was predictive of certain themes of the democidal mindset. Participants who thought that “Conflict between various groups in [their] country” was a *small* problem were more likely to endorse the following themes: uncivilized, dehumanization, crush, threat of annihilation of our people, something held sacred, revenge language, and tactics/excuses for violence.

The ways in which responses to the Pew items and the democidal mindset themes were mutually predictive of one another are easy to make sense of and provide initial concurrent validity evidence for our assessment of the democidal mindset.

In the United States, WVS items 2, 4, and 7 were predictive of certain themes of the democidal mindset. Participants who indicated that they would *not* like as neighbors (one or more of the following) (1) people of a different race, (2) immigrants/foreign workers, or (3) people who speak a different language, were especially likely to endorse the following themes: essentialism, racialism, uncivilized, dehumanization, crush, purity, xenophobia or foreign influence, traitor talk, and threat of annihilation of our people.

Limitations and Future Directions

This research suggests a first, tentative, psychological, attitudinal formula for democide. A larger number of beliefs within the democidal mindset present (in the general population or a leader) indicates a larger risk for democide.

Researchers have proposed many non-psychological conditions that increase the likelihood of democide. These conditions suggest explanations like difficult conditions of life, intergroup competition, or conditions created by uneven distribution of power (Saucier & Akers, 2018). Only psychological accounts were focused on here. Future research should compile these diverse predictors into an index that will enable an assessment of the potential for violence. Researchers hypothesize that the greater the number and intensity of these predictors present, the more likely the violence.

Saucier and Akers (2018) selected materials almost exclusively from elites, given that democide is virtually always led by elites. How well does this framework of the Democidal Mindset Questionnaire apply to studying the general population? If the democidal mindset is prevalent in a population (even if it's not among the country's elites), does it predict future democide? If the democidal mindset is widely shared, and

actually contributes to democide, researchers predict that such populations would see the emergence of more mass killings. Future research should repeat our study on multiple populations, including countries with recent democides like Sudan or Syria, in order to compare the levels of democidal thinking between countries with and without current democides.

The questionnaire has a content-validity basis due to the range of sources from which it was derived. To examine to what degree *predictive* validity can be added to that initial basis, further data on the actual base-rate occurrence of the identified thinking patterns in everyday human activities is needed.

Beyond my thesis project, researchers repeated the same procedures with a college-student sample, to examine generalizability of findings.

Both WVS and PEW are large, well-recognized research institutions that collect data in many countries, over many years. A vast amount of data has already been collected on each of the poll items that were included in the questionnaire. The WVS item, included in our study, was surveyed in 59 countries, every year from 1981-2014, and will most likely be surveyed again in the future. The Pew item, included in our study, was surveyed in 96 countries, however, only in the summer of 2002. When correlations do exist between the poll items and the Democidal Thinking Pattern (DTP) scales — using previously gathered data on the poll items — broader conclusions about the Democidal Mindset Questionnaire are able to be drawn. Specifically, inferences or predictions may be made about groups and/or countries not directly studied, based on existing data previously collected by others. The WVS item is more useful for making possible predictions because it was surveyed more recently and will likely be surveyed

again in a diverse range of future populations. Researchers could possibly predict that populations who score high on the WVS item, that were not measured directly in our study, are also high on the democidal mindset. This allows researchers and practitioners to gain possible insight on a larger number of countries, which could be important for early detection and prevention of democide.

Future research should seek to discriminate the democidal mindset from related but distinct phenomena. For example, Chirot (1994) proposed some of the features we have identified — a belief that intergroup (e.g., racial) conflict is inevitable, a preoccupation with revenge, group or national unity, and xenophobia — as contributors to the development of tyranny, when arising in a chaotic political or economic situation. Additionally, there may be overlap between the democidal mindset and militant extremism, given that “numerous democide perpetrators (e.g., Stalin, Hitler, Mao) began their political careers as extremists on the periphery of power” (Saucier & Akers, 2018, p. 27).

Conclusion

This research is novel in diverse ways. The questionnaire takes into account a wide perspective of types of democides, establishing a tool that may be applied globally. The questionnaire also provides an unprecedented starting-point for prediction and prevention of mass killings, going beyond previous analyses that stop at characterizing sociopolitical violence (Saucier & Akers, 2018, p. 29).

The ultimate goal of this research is to develop and test a tool that can be used to prevent democides. Previous scholars have analyzed stages of democide from a theoretical lens, but for the most part, their conclusions have not been empirically based. This questionnaire is one of the first, if not *the* first, empirical tools to assess democidal thinking, an early warning sign of democide itself.

This research takes an interdisciplinary approach when investigating the complexity of genocide prevention. The foundational work completed by Saucier and Akers (2018) built on theories and models from a variety of disciplines (i.e. political science, government, sociology, etc.). In addition, the data that was used for this research was real archival data, in other words many hundreds of statements from real people. We are tackling a real-world problem by using real-world data.

This research lies exactly at the intersection of scholarship and advocacy. A statistically reliable and valid psychological tool that will enable and encourage the international community to act more frequently to prevent democide was created.

Table 1: Distribution of 20 Themes Detected in Statements from 20 Diverse Cases of Democide

Theme	NG	RW	BO	IR	TU	BA	IA	SU	CH	CA	GU	AR	AU	FR	IN	ET	US	MX	BC	AS
Tactics/excuses for violence																				
Disposition(alism)/essentialism																				
Purity/cleansing language																				
Dehumanization																				
Deadlist/fi chthonous thinking																				
Internal enemies																				
Crush, smash, exterminate, eliminate																				
Group or national unity																				
Racialism in some form																				
Xenophobia or foreign influence																				
Uncivilized or uncivilizable																				
Attachment/entitlement to land																				
Body or disease metaphor																				
Revenge or retaliation language																				
Traitor talk (treason, treachery, etc.)																				
Conspiracy																				
Subversion																				
Something held sacred																				
Nationalism/ethnonationalism																				
Threat of annihilation of our people																				

Note. NG – Nazi Germany, RW – Rwanda, BO – Bosnia, IR – Iraq (Saddam), TU – Turkey (Armenians), BA – Bangladesh, IA – Japan, SU – Soviet Union (Stalin), CH – China (Maoist), CA – Cambodia, GU – Guatemala, AR – Argentina, AU – Australia (aborigines), FR – France (Revolution), IN – Indonesia (E. Timor), ET – Ethiopia, US – United States (Trail of Tears), MX – Mexico (peonage), BC – Belgian Congo, AS – Assam.

Table 2: Theme Name Key

Theme #	Theme Name
0	Dispositionalism/essentialism
1	Racialism in some form
2	Uncivilized or uncivilizable
3	Dehumanization
4	Crush, smash, exterminate, eliminate
5	Purity/cleansing language
6	Body or disease metaphor
7	Group or national unity
8	Nationalism/ethnonationalism
9	Xenophobia or foreign influence
10	Conspiracy
11	Subversion
12	Traitor talk (treason, treachery, etc.)
13	Internal enemies
14	Threat of annihilation of our people
15	Dualistic/dichotomous thinking
16	Something held sacred
17	Attachment/entitlement to land
18	Revenge or retaliation language
19	Tactics/excuses for violence

Table 3: Reliability Analysis Round 1

Theme	Number of Items	Country	N	Alpha	VIC	Alpha Lowering Items	Low Mean Item	High Mean Item	Items Removed
0	12	USA	248	0.853	0.0224	96	37, 72, 132	96	86_r, 99_r, 170_r
		India	242	0.761	0.0491	31_r, 86_r, 96, 99_r, 170_r	31_r	96	
1	10	USA	249	0.854	0.0159		193	159	
		India	241	0.836	0.0345	168_r	168_r	135, 159	
2	7	USA	257	0.756	0.0123	200_r	63	165	
		India	242	0.760	0.0261	200_r	200_r	57	
3	6	USA	251	0.788	0.0381	56, 131	77, 202	131	56
		India	244	0.830	0.0165	56	77	131	
4	10	USA	253	0.814	0.0234	125_r	33, 166	125_r	125_r
		India	240	0.675	0.0571	48, 125_r, 158_r	125_r	48	
5	7	USA	256	0.776	0.0178	14_r	105	155	
		India	242	0.670	0.0528	14_r, 155	14_r	155	
6	5	USA	254	0.879	0.0050	198	73, 113	111, 198	198
		India	247	0.827	0.0019		73, 198	111	
7	8	USA	254	0.567	0.0226	82_r, 112_r	35, 120, 207	82_r	
		India	246	0.454	0.0530	82_r, 112_r	112_r	117	
8	7	USA	247	0.655	0.0129		80	205_r	
		India	250	0.280	0.0543	102_r, 205_r	102_r	69, 91, 108	
9	9	USA	255	0.857	0.0116	149_r	24, 101, 136	149_r	76, 149_r
		India	244	0.854	0.0291	76	149_r	39	
10	8	USA	253	0.802	0.0451	154_r	44	154_r	154_r
		India	247	0.689	0.0678	154_r	154_r	8, 71	
11	5	USA	256	0.555	0.0196	4_r	145	4_r	4_r
		India	250	0.547	0.1043	4_r	4_r	156	
12	9	USA	252	0.825	0.0203	2_r	68, 186	2_r	
		India	241	0.808	0.0766	2_r	186	89	
13	9	USA	253	0.764	0.0179	66	138	175_r	66, 175_r
		India	243	0.687	0.0744	110, 175_r	34, 138, 175_r, 192	110	
14	7	USA	253	0.724	0.0091		137	182	
		India	246	0.794	0.0338	187_r	187_r	182	
15	8	USA	253	0.669	0.0212	47, 116_r	60	116_r	47, 116_r
		India	244	0.682	0.0315	116_r	116_r	208	
16	7	USA	221	0.377	0.0432	51_r	129	51_r	51_r
		India	231	0.703	0.0590	51_r, 196	51_r	196	
17	6	USA	250	0.596	0.0112	150_r	88	150_r	150_r
		India	242	0.657	0.0567	150_r	150_r	3	
18	7	USA	256	0.666	0.0161	85, 97_r	127	85	
		India	244	0.762	0.0436	97_r	97_r	85	
19	6	USA	253	0.788	0.0170		130	92_r	92_r
		India	239	0.720	0.0481	92_r, 121	92_r	121	

Note. “_r” indicates an item that was stated in reverse form.

Table 4: Reliability Analysis Round 2

Theme	Number of Items	Country	N	Alpha	VC	Alpha-Lowering Items	Low Mean Item	High Mean Item	Items Removed
0	9	USA	250	0.812	0.0289	96	72, 132	96	
		India	243	0.815	0.0467	31 r, 96	31 r	96	
3	5	USA	254	0.793	0.0453	131	77, 202	131	
		India	245	0.839	0.0118	131	77	131	
4	8	USA	253	0.835	0.0115	184	33, 166	48	
		India	243	0.781	0.0240	48	28, 33, 184	48	
6	4	USA	256	0.880	0.0002		73, 113	111	
		India	251	0.800	0.0024		73	111	
9	7	USA	255	0.827	0.0075		24, 101, 136	39, 134	
		India	246	0.856	0.0033		24	39	
10	7	USA	253	0.843	0.0135	84	44	71	84
		India	249	0.800	0.0086		104	8, 71	
11	4	USA	256	0.634	0.0107		145	176	
		India	250	0.755	0.0013		172	156	
13	7	USA	255	0.768	0.0195	110, 192	138	110	
		India	248	0.779	0.0258	110	34, 138, 192	110	
15	6	USA	254	0.732	0.0075		60	46	
		India	248	0.740	0.0100	208	60	208	
16	6	USA	244	0.690	0.0063		129	185	
		India	239	0.772	0.0314	196	129, 199	196	
17	5	USA	252	0.628	0.0168	157	88	3	157
		India	244	0.761	0.0026		88	3	
19	5	USA	254	0.777	0.0096		130	177	
		India	246	0.782	0.0081	121	130	121	

Note. “_r” indicates an item that was stated in reverse form.

Table 5: Reliability Analysis Round 3

Theme	Number of Items	Country	N	Alpha	VC	Alpha-Lowering Items	Low Mean Item	High Mean Item
10	6	USA	253	0.845	0.0079		44	71
		India	250	0.774	0.0088	8	104	8, 71
17	4	USA	254	0.644	0.0165	88	88	3
		India	248	0.704	0.0011		88	3

Table 6: Reliability Analyses 1 to 2

Theme	Country	Alpha	VIC
0	USA	-	□
	India	□	-
3	USA	□	□
	India	□	-
4	USA	□	-
	India	□	-
6	USA	□	-
	India	-	□
8	USA	-	□
	India	□	□
9	USA	-	-
	India	□	-
10	USA	□	-
	India	□	-
11	USA	□	-
	India	□	-
13	USA	□	□
	India	□	-
15	USA	□	-
	India	□	-
16	USA	□	-
	India	□	-
17	USA	□	□
	India	□	-
19	USA	-	-
	India	□	-

Note. “▲” indicates a “good” change and “-” indicates a “bad” change.

Table 7: Reliability Analyses 2 to 3

Theme	Country	Alpha	VIC
10	USA	□	-
	India	-	□
17	USA	□	-
	India	-	-

Note. “▲” indicates a “good” change and “-” indicates a “bad” change.

Table 8: Correlations for United States of America

	Scale 10	Scale 11	Scale 12	Scale 13	Scale 14	Scale 15	Scale 16	Scale 17	Scale 18	Scale 19	Scale 110	Scale 111	Scale 112	Scale 113	Scale 114	Scale 115	Scale 116	Scale 117	Scale 118	Scale 119
Scale 10	1																			
Scale 11	.862	1																		
Scale 12	.836	.832	1																	
Scale 13	.769	.771	.718	1																
Scale 14	.761	.784	.765	.785	1															
Scale 15	.803	.800	.790	.693	.749	1														
Scale 16	.689	.695	.683	.740	.779	.702	1													
Scale 17	.613	.608	.636	.599	.666	.640	.532	1												
Scale 18	.618	.590	.647	.486	.517	.646	.421	.586	1											
Scale 19	.771	.769	.789	.699	.742	.777	.602	.627	.609	1										
Scale 110	.603	.629	.614	.559	.710	.663	.697	.558	.508	.636	1									
Scale 111	.680	.674	.699	.646	.762	.740	.716	.604	.521	.675	.724	1								
Scale 112	.730	.724	.774	.662	.812	.785	.659	.693	.597	.789	.725	.745	1							
Scale 113	.640	.641	.660	.608	.730	.689	.686	.599	.589	.679	.750	.763	.721	1						
Scale 114	.736	.731	.753	.686	.704	.723	.691	.565	.566	.753	.699	.707	.736	.711	1					
Scale 115	.677	.704	.715	.625	.735	.732	.645	.631	.599	.698	.687	.692	.789	.732	.701	1				
Scale 116	.585	.656	.590	.557	.594	.657	.476	.523	.605	.653	.598	.588	.647	.618	.619	.632	1			
Scale 117	.601	.659	.620	.582	.620	.593	.505	.546	.564	.603	.511	.507	.591	.467	.579	.548	.627	1		
Scale 118	.661	.720	.677	.685	.758	.642	.672	.621	.505	.660	.633	.680	.584	.618	.620	.542	.603	.542	1	
Scale 119	.570	.625	.629	.614	.666	.528	.516	.517	.489	.580	.521	.637	.708	.544	.552	.632	.540	.492	.679	1
Pew 1	-.363	-.320	-.373	-.250	-.325	-.464	-.350	-.371	-.424	-.324	-.461	-.434	-.427	-.447	-.451	-.457	-.435	-.300	-.263	-.227
Pew 2	.011	.029	.033	-.033	-.027	-.015	-.070	.026	.019	.010	-.192	.083	-.029	.083	-.093	-.097	-.063	-.027	-.035	.005
Pew 3	-.263	-.250	-.267	-.228	-.239	-.265	-.191	-.248	-.217	-.276	-.279	-.283	-.280	-.377	-.335	-.339	-.346	-.215	-.120	-.200
Pew 4	-.487	-.419	-.484	-.368	-.333	-.456	-.315	-.329	-.502	-.440	-.375	-.418	-.454	-.481	-.431	-.446	-.405	-.242	-.282	-.334
Pew 5	.134	.095	.133	.151	.107	.147	.087	.051	.195	.082	.014	.050	.141	.157	.161	.170	.129	.036	.020	.233
Pew 6	-.197	-.211	-.224	-.181	-.145	-.274	-.178	-.169	-.266	-.173	-.278	-.289	-.248	-.302	-.283	-.273	-.289	-.164	-.133	-.114
Pew 7	-.014	.008	.018	-.032	-.024	-.004	-.057	.043	.041	-.019	-.161	-.062	.022	.028	.027	.013	.024	.050	-.100	.144
WVS 1	-.080	-.078	.144	-.032	-.103	.145	-.070	.088	.117	-.095	.157	.104	-.143	.111	.138	.138	.103	.115	-.048	-.092
WVS 2	-.506	-.484	-.469	-.438	-.431	-.474	-.329	-.320	-.301	-.585	-.305	-.251	-.442	-.305	-.395	-.341	-.280	-.382	-.348	-.194
WVS 3	-.355	-.302	-.360	-.258	-.330	-.357	-.271	.177	-.262	-.305	-.255	-.301	-.252	-.211	-.228	.198	.197	-.312	-.259	-.199
WVS 4	-.523	-.487	-.511	-.500	-.438	-.444	-.340	-.279	-.341	-.566	-.325	-.399	-.429	-.374	-.443	-.394	-.306	-.313	-.384	-.317
WVS 5	-.311	-.320	-.353	-.207	-.247	-.411	-.262	.202	-.217	-.377	-.226	-.230	-.274	.144	-.284	-.168	-.216	-.309	-.238	-.085
WVS 6	-.380	-.339	-.348	-.432	-.344	-.270	-.380	-.228	.156	-.362	-.261	-.228	-.286	-.214	-.352	-.239	.143	-.223	-.314	-.221
WVS 7	-.480	-.446	-.464	-.392	-.353	-.424	-.369	-.250	-.274	-.480	-.323	-.349	-.359	-.402	-.431	-.315	-.218	-.182	-.290	-.173
Sex	.112	.086	.055	.096	.095	.069	.088	.071	.137	.040	.030	.030	.037	.007	.045	.002	.043	.032	-.161	-.178
Age	.002	.032	.005	-.043	.025	.040	.037	.134	.066	.075	.086	.019	.040	.032	.049	.007	.067	.085	.048	.012
Education	-.038	.001	-.007	-.003	.013	-.072	-.007	.054	.045	.009	.043	.021	.034	-.010	-.027	-.020	-.022	.016	.118	.070
Caucasian	-.051	.034	-.016	.010	-.004	-.060	-.020	-.135	-.193	.086	-.103	-.032	.011	.006	-.029	.031	.001	-.119	-.105	.035
African-American	-.017	-.053	-.008	-.021	.007	.058	-.021	.073	.132	.099	.101	.008	-.031	-.031	.048	-.011	.016	.116	.086	-.059
Hispanic	-.038	-.054	-.075	.010	-.030	-.031	-.015	.022	.081	-.029	-.036	-.042	-.040	-.032	-.056	-.062	-.038	.021	-.011	-.054
Asian	.000	.013	.074	.050	.037	.047	.129	.129	.089	.015	-.006	.007	-.002	.057	.028	-.051	-.030	.017	-.019	-.005

Note. The italic indicates Sig. values of .01 or less in magnitude. The bold italic indicates Sig. values of .001 or less in magnitude.

Table 9: Correlations for India

	Scale t0	Scale t1	Scale t2	Scale t3	Scale t4	Scale t5	Scale t6	Scale t7	Scale t8	Scale t9	Scale t10	Scale t11	Scale t12	Scale t13	Scale t14	Scale t15	Scale t16	Scale t17	Scale t18	Scale t19
Scale t0	1																			
Scale t1	.814	1																		
Scale t2	.767	.807	1																	
Scale t3	.807	.815	.783	1																
Scale t4	.754	.802	.778	.788	1															
Scale t5	.764	.797	.767	.767	.776	1														
Scale t6	.801	.817	.759	.808	.798	.788	1													
Scale t7	.642	.709	.694	.638	.672	.679	.637	1												
Scale t8	.253	.317	.275	.271	.294	.304	.353	.367	1											
Scale t9	.769	.811	.796	.771	.759	.751	.779	.716	.188	1										
Scale t10	.720	.778	.707	.748	.767	.738	.786	.627	.394	.768	1									
Scale t11	.720	.770	.725	.762	.747	.767	.768	.662	.339	.726	.745	1								
Scale t12	.791	.830	.788	.792	.813	.795	.802	.678	.346	.777	.777	.778	1							
Scale t13	.731	.783	.752	.763	.788	.747	.782	.704	.326	.803	.803	.778	.828	1						
Scale t14	.810	.830	.778	.790	.780	.751	.784	.683	.217	.807	.764	.769	.836	.791	1					
Scale t15	.688	.759	.718	.778	.789	.704	.735	.658	.356	.721	.716	.703	.760	.741	.741	1				
Scale t16	.751	.812	.803	.761	.798	.762	.740	.703	.353	.759	.739	.724	.781	.784	.774	.710	1			
Scale t17	.734	.811	.778	.757	.778	.730	.735	.686	.330	.770	.745	.710	.781	.769	.765	.700	.791	1		
Scale t18	.774	.831	.790	.771	.803	.770	.788	.670	.239	.813	.784	.724	.800	.767	.815	.716	.774	.778	1	
Scale t19	.739	.743	.728	.730	.773	.705	.756	.645	.157	.785	.717	.710	.791	.764	.804	.689	.753	.722	.766	1
Pew 1	.151	.130	.176	.131	.175	.082	.148	.177	.030	.150	.119	.119	.150	.137	.198	.168	.185	.088	.140	.251
Pew 2	.232	.237	.264	.251	.270	.216	.198	.241	.019	.283	.136	.197	.239	.194	.275	.198	.279	.195	.254	.309
Pew 3	.028	.039	.039	.057	.072	.030	.062	.025	-.071	.094	.020	.039	.027	.053	.060	.062	.044	.005	.061	.098
Pew 4	-.270	-.186	-.223	-.154	-.201	-.224	-.226	-.200	-.138	.195	.163	-.213	-.279	-.212	-.222	.168	-.205	-.227	-.212	-.170
Pew 5	.182	.197	.174	.133	.148	.190	.166	.165	.077	.182	.094	.095	.142	.135	.156	.101	.197	.122	.207	.184
Pew 6	.013	.002	.018	.036	.043	.043	.017	.040	.043	.085	.016	.016	.009	.019	.018	.035	.001	.055	.011	.076
Pew 7	.157	.157	.183	.180	.172	.157	.178	.234	.008	.270	.108	.157	.206	.203	.192	.136	.202	.140	.153	.284
WVS 1	.014	.013	.057	.006	.031	.013	.018	.131	.012	.083	.005	.030	.029	.056	.026	.030	.071	.036	.071	.031
WVS 2	.140	.161	.103	.128	.121	.127	.165	.099	.019	.174	.127	.142	.132	.127	.128	.088	.164	.132	.138	.108
WVS 3	-.238	-.218	-.211	-.200	.189	-.216	.154	-.210	.088	.180	.137	-.207	.181	.124	-.211	.145	-.250	-.203	-.200	.147
WVS 4	.128	.111	.080	.108	.086	.097	.109	.147	.136	.115	.077	.059	.136	.064	.155	.204	.112	.099	.128	.061
WVS 5	.200	.141	-.210	.186	-.221	-.259	-.233	.147	.128	.142	.176	.172	.184	.200	.133	.153	.162	.201	.188	.136
WVS 6	.094	.085	.116	.115	.115	.102	.088	.072	.010	.159	.094	.087	.087	.065	.090	.123	.092	.058	.139	.084
WVS 7	.083	.080	.093	.052	.076	.104	.059	.028	.001	.078	.083	.129	.116	.088	.074	.031	.088	.062	.120	.096
Sex	.031	.086	.105	.074	.022	.040	.021	.041	.038	.051	.040	.142	.100	.041	.060	.044	.105	.077	.039	.036
Age	.031	.063	.050	.079	.023	.016	.018	.074	.218	.119	.014	.026	.039	.025	.087	.004	.082	.016	.044	.151
Education	.011	.017	.008	.006	.025	.006	.008	.016	.052	.014	.013	.004	.002	.028	.021	.039	.001	.028	.013	.095

Note. The italic indicates Sig. values of .01 or less in magnitude. The bold italic indicates Sig. values of .001 or less in magnitude.

Table 10: Means for Religion in India A

	F	Sig.	Eta
Scale t0 * What is your religion?	3.310	0.007	0.250
Scale t1 * What is your religion?	3.015	0.012	0.239
Scale t2 * What is your religion?	2.674	0.022	0.226
Scale t3 * What is your religion?	1.946	0.087	0.194
Scale t4 * What is your religion?	3.318	0.006	0.250
Scale t5 * What is your religion?	4.508	0.001	0.289
Scale t6 * What is your religion?	2.703	0.021	0.227
Scale t7 * What is your religion?	3.239	0.007	0.248
Scale t8 * What is your religion?	2.604	0.026	0.223
Scale t9 * What is your religion?	2.051	0.072	0.199
Scale t10 * What is your religion?	2.013	0.077	0.197
Scale t11 * What is your religion?	1.730	0.128	0.184
Scale t12 * What is your religion?	2.472	0.033	0.218
Scale t13 * What is your religion?	2.866	0.016	0.234
Scale t14 * What is your religion?	2.268	0.048	0.209
Scale t15 * What is your religion?	2.308	0.045	0.211
Scale t16 * What is your religion?	2.754	0.019	0.229
Scale t17 * What is your religion?	2.749	0.019	0.229
Scale t18 * What is your religion?	2.353	0.041	0.213
Scale t19 * What is your religion?	1.253	0.285	0.157
Pew 1 * What is your religion?	1.133	0.343	0.149
Pew 2 * What is your religion?	0.341	0.888	0.083
Pew 3 * What is your religion?	2.116	0.064	0.202
Pew 4 * What is your religion?	4.459	0.001	0.287
Pew 5 * What is your religion?	0.917	0.471	0.135
Pew 6 * What is your religion?	1.453	0.206	0.169
Pew 7 * What is your religion?	1.454	0.205	0.169
WVS 1 * What is your religion?	1.128	0.346	0.149
WVS 2 * What is your religion?	0.440	0.820	0.094
WVS 3 * What is your religion?	0.581	0.715	0.108
WVS 4 * What is your religion?	1.084	0.370	0.146
WVS 5 * What is your religion?	1.861	0.102	0.190
WVS 6 * What is your religion?	2.131	0.062	0.203
WVS 7 * What is your religion?	1.053	0.387	0.144

Table 11: Means for Religion in India B

What is your religion?		Scale 10	Scale 11	Scale 12	Scale 14	Scale 15	Scale 16	Scale 17	Scale 18	Scale 112	Scale 113	Scale 114	Scale 115	Scale 116	Scale 117	Scale 118	Pew 4
Hindu	Mean	2.894	3.105	2.998	3.211	3.270	3.135	3.118	3.489	2.998	3.279	2.882	3.294	3.130	3.207	2.981	2.500
	N	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200
	Std. Deviation	0.642	0.834	0.800	0.832	0.694	1.098	0.538	0.487	0.827	0.856	0.886	0.860	0.919	0.972	0.848	0.962
Muslim	Mean	2.636	2.915	2.857	3.000	3.275	2.769	2.919	3.363	2.747	3.187	2.802	3.315	2.846	3.154	2.802	2.769
	N	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13
	Std. Deviation	0.725	0.850	0.793	0.774	0.984	0.820	0.708	0.582	0.876	0.800	0.844	0.911	1.092	1.130	0.906	0.832
Sikh	Mean	2.194	2.567	2.381	2.250	2.429	1.867	2.542	3.286	2.259	2.571	1.762	2.444	2.889	2.500	2.095	3.333
	N	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
	Std. Deviation	0.929	1.290	1.033	1.023	0.714	0.902	0.688	0.515	0.932	1.309	0.825	1.206	1.084	0.661	1.053	1.155
Christian	Mean	2.581	2.714	2.632	2.788	2.993	2.740	2.897	3.328	2.723	3.007	2.653	2.963	2.797	2.944	2.673	3.032
	N	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31
	Std. Deviation	0.647	0.799	0.920	0.977	0.781	1.132	0.646	0.525	0.852	0.760	0.919	0.858	0.928	0.880	0.930	0.875
Jain	Mean	2.042	1.400	1.786	1.625	1.429	1.300	1.938	2.357	1.556	1.929	1.500	1.833	1.417	1.250	1.571	3.000
	N	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
	Std. Deviation	0.648	0.283	0.909	0.530	0.000	0.424	0.088	0.303	0.157	0.101	0.101	0.236	0.354	0.354	0.404	0.000
Other	Mean	2.327	2.818	2.343	3.039	2.707	2.963	2.861	3.357	2.541	2.376	2.552	3.333	2.307	2.450	2.726	4.000
	N	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
	Std. Deviation	0.394	0.996	0.823	0.926	0.624	0.464	0.967	1.009	0.833	0.787	0.708	1.532	1.108	1.013	0.539	0.707
Total	Mean	2.817	3.022	2.916	3.121	3.201	3.035	3.060	3.449	2.923	3.205	2.819	3.234	3.042	3.133	2.908	2.622
	N	254	254	254	254	254	254	254	254	254	254	254	254	254	254	254	254
	Std. Deviation	0.661	0.853	0.832	0.870	0.744	1.098	0.583	0.517	0.844	0.860	0.894	0.891	0.948	0.983	0.869	0.973

Box 1: Examples of Items Stated in Reverse Form

All ethnic groups are, basically, equally good.

Many societies have contributed to important advances in art, science, and technology.

It would benefit our people to have more mixing and contact with people from different cultures.

There is much we can learn from the people of other countries.

Every human is partly good and partly bad — there are no bad people separate from the good people.

Progress and success always require making compromises with the opposition.

An important job of the media is to critique our police and military, so that we can constantly work to improve them.

People who cooperate with the enemy may still be good people.

Vengefulness is an undesirable characteristic.

Protecting lives is more important than protecting a homeland.

Appendix A: Statement of Informed Consent - World Attitudes

Survey_India

University of Oregon Department of Psychology
Statement of Informed Consent – “World Attitudes Survey”

Introduction & Purpose of the Study:

You are invited to participate in a research study of world attitudes.

The primary purpose of the study is to learn more about people’s attitudes and beliefs. Eventually, this research may lead to findings of scientific and societal importance.

Description of Study Procedures:

You have volunteered as a possible participant in this study. If you decide to participate in this study, you will complete a survey that will take approximately 30 minutes to complete.

1. In the first part of the study, you will be asked to answer 210 questions about your attitudes.
2. In the second part of this study you will be asked to complete an additional 2 items, also regarding your attitudes.
3. In the final part of this study, you will be asked to answer some demographic information (e.g. age, sex, ethnicity/race).
4. After you complete this survey, you will receive \$6 in payment via the Amazon.com M-Turk payment system.

Risks/Discomforts of Being in the Study:

There are no reasonable foreseeable (or expected) risks. This study may include risks that are unknown at this time.

Benefits of Being in the Study:

There are no expected benefits of participating in this study.

Costs:

There is no cost to you to participate in this research study.

Confidentiality:

None of the information that you provide in this study will be associated with you in the future, as all participants are known to the researcher only by number. Your identity will not be stored with the data from your survey. Your participation is voluntary. If you decide to participate,

you are free to withdraw your consent and discontinue participating at any time without penalty.

Please note that regulatory agencies, and the Institutional Review Board and internal University of Oregon auditors may also review the research records.

Voluntary Participation/Withdrawal:

- Your participation is voluntary.
- You are free to withdraw at any time, for whatever reason.
- There is no penalty or loss of benefits for not taking part or for stopping your participation.
- If at any point you feel uncomfortable answering a question, you may select the option "prefer not to answer". However, the final part of the study requires that you fill in some personal information before proceeding (e.g. your sex, age, etc). This is required for that portion of the study to work.
- If you withdraw early, you will be paid based on percentage of expected time actually spent in the study. The expected amount of time is 30 minutes. Therefore, if you withdraw after 15 minutes, you will get 50% of the regular compensation; if you withdraw after 5 minutes, you will get 17%.

Contacts and Questions:

If you have any questions related to the research, please feel free to contact Ashleigh Landau of the University of Oregon Department of Psychology. Her e-mail address is alandau2@uoregon.edu. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact the Office for Protection of Human Subjects, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403, (541) 346-2510 or ResearchCompliance@uoregon.edu. This Office oversees the review of the research to protect your rights and is not involved with this study.

Copy of Consent Form:

You may print a copy of this screen for you records.

Electronic Signature:

Your decision to continue with this survey indicates that you have read and understand the information provided above, that you willingly agree to participate, that you may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty, that you have received the opportunity to print a copy of this form, and that you are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies.

Appendix B: Statement of Informed Consent - World Attitudes

Survey_USA

University of Oregon Department of Psychology
Statement of Informed Consent – “World Attitudes Survey”

Introduction & Purpose of the Study:

You are invited to participate in a research study of world attitudes. The primary purpose of the study is to learn more about people’s attitudes and beliefs. Eventually, this research may lead to findings of scientific and societal importance.

Description of Study Procedures:

You have volunteered as a possible participant in this study. If you decide to participate in this study, you will complete a survey that will take approximately 30 minutes to complete.

1. In the first part of the study, you will be asked to answer 210 questions about your attitudes.
2. In the second part of this study you will be asked to complete an additional 2 items, also regarding your attitudes.
3. In the final part of this study, you will be asked to answer some demographic information (e.g. age, sex, ethnicity/race).
4. After you complete this survey, you will receive \$10 in payment via the Amazon.com M-Turk payment system.

Risks/Discomforts of Being in the Study:

There are no reasonable foreseeable (or expected) risks. This study may include risks that are unknown at this time.

Benefits of Being in the Study:

There are no expected benefits of participating in this study.

Costs:

There is no cost to you to participate in this research study.

Confidentiality:

None of the information that you provide in this study will be associated with you in the future, as all participants are known to the researcher only by number. Your identity will not be stored with the data from your survey. Your participation is voluntary. If you decide to participate,

you are free to withdraw your consent and discontinue participating at any time without penalty.

Please note that regulatory agencies, and the Institutional Review Board and internal University of Oregon auditors may also review the research records.

Voluntary Participation/Withdrawal:

- Your participation is voluntary.
- You are free to withdraw at any time, for whatever reason.
- There is no penalty or loss of benefits for not taking part or for stopping your participation.
- If at any point you feel uncomfortable answering a question, you may select the option "prefer not to answer". However, the final part of the study requires that you fill in some personal information before proceeding (e.g. your sex, age, etc). This is required for that portion of the study to work.
- If you withdraw early, you will be paid based on percentage of expected time actually spent in the study. The expected amount of time is 30 minutes. Therefore, if you withdraw after 15 minutes, you will get 50% of the regular compensation; if you withdraw after 5 minutes, you will get 17%.

Contacts and Questions:

If you have any questions related to the research, please feel free to contact Ashleigh Landau of the University of Oregon Department of Psychology. Her e-mail address is alandau2@uoregon.edu. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact the Office for Protection of Human Subjects, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403, (541) 346-2510 or ResearchCompliance@uoregon.edu. This Office oversees the review of the research to protect your rights and is not involved with this study.

Copy of Consent Form:

You may print a copy of this screen for you records.

Electronic Signature:

Your decision to continue with this survey indicates that you have read and understand the information provided above, that you willingly agree to participate, that you may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty, that you have received the opportunity to print a copy of this form, and that you are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies.

Appendix C: World Attitudes Survey

This survey contains statements mentioning a wide variety of viewpoints regarding social and political issues. These are viewpoints that may be held by parts of the population within a country, by the leaders of a country, or both. We are interested in learning about your particular viewpoints with regard to these issues. You can indicate your way of thinking by how much you agree with each statement.

- 4 - *Strongly agree*
- 3 - *Mostly agree*
- 2 - *Moderately agree*
- 1 - *Agree only slightly*
- 0 - *Do not agree at all*

There is also an option to indicate that you prefer not to respond regarding a particular statement.

1. What's important is always to win: Winning is everything.
2. People who cooperate with the enemy may still be good people.
3. If land once belonged to our ancestors, it must now belong to us again.
4. An important job of the media is to critique our police and military, so that we can constantly work to improve them.
5. Power is shared throughout this society, rather than being concentrated at the top.
6. The people running this country don't really care what happens to people like me.
7. More civilized people have more rights to the land than less civilized people.
8. We should devote much attention to finding and unmasking the hidden enemies within this country.
9. Status, wealth, and power make people arrogant.
10. It is sometimes important to kill many people, in order to preserve a great many more.
11. Natural objects (and even Nature itself) have conscious life.
12. The present-day world is vile and miserable.

13. Some groups are destined to vanish, because they are inferior.
14. It would benefit our people to have more mixing and contact with people from different cultures.
15. Anyone who shows kindness to the enemy is a traitor.
16. There is natural hierarchy when it comes to races; some races are more superior than others.
17. There are certain groups of people that are stupider than donkeys: not really human in their feelings, purposes, and thoughts.
18. Sometimes the only effective way to end a conflict will be to deport all the members of the group that is causing the problem.
19. I value being a citizen of a nation that is diverse — with more than one religion, language, and ethnicity.
20. Human interests and dignity ought to prevail in our thoughts and actions.
21. A certain race wants to exterminate our race.
22. It is impossible to communicate with the dead.
23. A successful political movement is one that will sweep away the bad and purify the country.
24. It's wrong to believe ideas from foreign countries.
25. I am materialistic: The most important things in life are money and material possessions.
26. I believe in biological evolution.
27. There is currently a dark plot to destroy the fabric of our nation.
28. We must crush our enemies.
29. When wild and uncivilized peoples are occupying valuable lands, the government should remove them.
30. Some groups of people are instinctively submissive to other groups of people.
31. All ethnic groups are, basically, equally good.

32. Certain people within our country are in league with the enemy and will launch an uprising.
33. In order to make progress or succeed it is always necessary to crush the opposition — or opposing ways of thought.
34. People in our country who resist adopting our culture are our enemies.
35. Ideally, our country would consist of people with just one language, religion, and culture.
36. It would be pointless to reduce one's possessions and live more simply.
37. Some ethnic groups are evil by nature.
38. We should never let ourselves be ruled by people from certain ethnic groups.
39. A certain group of other people is taking the places and positions in our society that should be reserved for our people.
40. Only some groups are capable of true art and science.
41. A certain group of people cannot be changed and therefore does not belong in our country anymore.
42. Ours should be a plural nation celebrating diversity and allowing for many different cultures.
43. To be happy, it is necessary have enough resources to get the things one desires.
44. There is a global conspiracy threatening the survival of my people.
45. People from our group who associate with people from more troublesome groups are a special kind of traitor.
46. There are bad people who must be sorted out from the good, and dealt with forcefully.
47. After a period of dreadful conflict, there will come a peaceful golden age.
48. Whenever an ideology or political party is full of dangerous and wrong ideas, it should be eliminated.
49. Our people are entitled, by divine destiny, to certain areas of land and soil.

50. The spirits of dead ancestors are active, affecting events in everyday life.
51. God is always against hatred and violence.
52. Foreigners are trying to steal our lands.
53. I know an ethnicity, religion or other type of group that is inherently dirty.
54. I believe in predestination – that all things have been divinely determined beforehand.
55. Souls and spirits exist throughout nature — in animals, plants, mountains, rivers, thunder, and wind.
56. Monsters and demons — who only appear to be human — are living right here in our country.
57. Our country is the center of civilization.
58. True religion must be defended from enemies and have its authority restored.
59. Some groups of people are no better than insects.
60. Complete destruction is necessary for great reconstruction.
61. Only what is pleasant, or has pleasant consequences, is essentially good.
62. Sometimes it is necessary to take advantage of others.
63. One ethnic group is responsible for all the good that humanity has ever produced, in the arts, sciences, and technology.
64. Human society is not capable of being good.
65. Foreigners and immigrants have a beneficial effect on our society.
66. Those who try to cheat the community by keeping too much for themselves should be labeled "enemies of the people."
67. People are either for our leaders or against them – there is no reasonable middle ground.
68. Those among us who reject our people's beliefs should be called traitors.
69. We must regain the great honor, dignity, and glory of the ancient civilization created by our people.

70. Any group that dares to make our people suffer should be demolished so completely that they will be lost to history.
71. We have to be alert because certain schemers comply in public and oppose in private.
72. Certain groups of people lack the essential traits that would entitle them to civil and political rights, or to equal treatment.
73. A certain group is just like cancer.
74. We may sometimes need to repress certain political movements that disturb national unity.
75. In this society, individuals generally attempt to be dominant over other individuals.
76. So-called refugees are really infiltrators who threaten the culture, language, and very existence of our country.
77. Some ethnic groups deserve to be treated like garbage and should be disposed of.
78. Religion should play the most important role in civil affairs.
79. There is a certain group of people who are typically good-for-nothing and so an unfortunate burden on this society.
80. The main religion of this nation should be devotion to the nation itself, above all else.
81. We must maintain the purity of our ethnic group.
82. All political parties have something to contribute to the life of our nation.
83. Capitalism benefits all classes of people and should be preserved.
84. One ethnic group is secretly controlling our government behind the scenes.
85. A group of people has been made wealthy by stealing from us, and they must pay us back completely.
86. It is wrong to make claims about people's morality based on their ethnicity.
87. Many problems are only solved by military force or the firm decisions of one strong leader.

88. Native peoples have less right to permanently inhabit the land, compared to the modern people that have come to inhabit it now.
89. Sometimes large numbers of certain groups engage in treason against our country, which justifies our rounding them up to prevent any further problems.
90. If our nation is to survive, we must go now on a military offensive.
91. A prime duty is to your nationality: You must be willing to struggle and sacrifice for your nationality.
92. Torture is never acceptable.
93. Society has an innate tendency toward improvement, which can be furthered through conscious human effort.
94. Worldly possessions are the greatest good and the highest value in life.
95. There is a higher good than the pleasures of the senses.
96. Every ethnic group has its own essence, made up of that group's moral traits.
97. Vengefulness is an undesirable characteristic.
98. Modern governments have overstepped moral bounds and no longer have a right to rule.
99. All groups of people, even my enemies, are equally human.
100. Some groups of people are inherently less trustworthy than others.
101. I get disgusted when people start praising the culture of some other country.
102. It is good for a single nation to have within it many diverse cultural heritages.
103. Our people deserve to have more space — more lands — than we have historically been allowed to occupy.
104. Many of the bad events that have been happening in this country are due to the activities of foreign agents.
105. A certain ethnic group should be separated from us, so as to prevent any contaminating contact.

106. All problems can be solved through negotiations and compromise.
107. Rich people run this country for the benefit of themselves.
108. We should unify everyone who shares our cultural heritage, as a single nation.
109. We should be alert: The principal enemy of our civilization is living right here among us, in this nation.
110. I believe it is a citizen's duty to report troublemakers to the government because this maintains stability and security.
111. There is a certain group of people whose presence and influence in this country is like a plague.
112. Our personal goals deserve attention alongside our country's goals.
113. A certain group, one could say, is sucking the blood of our people.
114. Political leaders are basically immoral and untrustworthy.
115. The pleasures of the senses are the highest good.
116. Every human is partly good and partly bad — there are no bad people separate from the good people.
117. We should each build ourselves into people who will focus entirely on our duties to the nation.
118. We need to deport a large group of people so as to ensure the future of the land that is sacred to us.
119. History, philosophy, and literature provide better guidance in life than religion does.
120. One political party represents the soul of our nation.
121. A real leader is intimidating – a real leader uses whatever means necessary to make the people think twice about opposing or resisting.
122. I am in favor of a constitutional form of government.
123. Discrimination against us (my group) has grown so strong that we are now vulnerable to genocide.
124. I adhere to an organized religion.

125. Progress and success always require making compromise with the opposition.
126. We should not defile our ethnic heritage by interbreeding with other ethnic groups.
127. Vengefulness and cruelty are desirable characteristics in a leader.
128. Free market capitalism leads to gross inequalities in income and wealth, which is a great social evil.
129. God wants us, for the sake of good, to hate a certain group of people.
130. If people don't agree with us, violence is the best way to deal with the problem.
131. When our country operates abroad, we need to make use of the people of that place in whatever way will give us the most profit.
132. We should hold an entire group accountable for the actions of some of its members.
133. One must constantly purify oneself by following a strict code of religious behavior.
134. Many student protests are actually orchestrated by foreign or subversive groups who have infiltrated into our population — so these protests must be dealt with harshly.
135. Our nation is destined to lead and guide backward peoples.
136. Foreigners are to blame for our country's failures.
137. There can be no — and should be no — peaceful coexistence between our group and certain other groups.
138. Criticizing our leader makes you an enemy of our country.
139. I believe in reincarnation – rebirth of the soul in another body.
140. Sometimes it is necessary to be harsh and cruel in the name of the life and progress of the nation.
141. Once we've harmed another group of people, we should get rid of them so they don't take revenge against us.
142. There is a particular group that is like a dangerous, infectious disease that needs to be destroyed.

143. In human societies, most of the power is concentrated at the top.
144. We are now in a fight-to-the-death between two worlds, two religions, two civilizations.
145. We should imprison those journalists whose writings are demoralizing the public.
146. The world has two kinds of people: our enemies and our friends.
147. At a critical moment, a divine power will step in to help our people.
148. Ideas that interfere with development of the nation should be eliminated.
149. There is much we can learn from the people of other countries.
150. Protecting lives is more important than protecting a homeland.
151. We are threatened by a particular culture — with dangerous customs and habits — that needs to be eliminated.
152. Those who do business with a certain group of despised people should be called traitors.
153. We can tell from a person's appearance, customs or habits to which group they belong.
154. Our government values openness and transparency.
155. Some ideas can poison the virgin minds of our youth.
156. Members of a certain group are corrupting the innocence of our children.
157. My homeland is so great and holy that saving it would justify the spilling of a lot of blood.
158. It is never necessary to exterminate any group of people.
159. There are ancient racial traits that drive human behavior, events, and history.
160. Knowledge is the awareness of individual facts and an understanding of the logical relations among these facts.
161. There is no way to gain valid knowledge of reality.

162. Some groups of people cannot be civilized.
163. A certain group, seemingly loyal, works to corrupt and damage our country from within.
164. There is a certain minority group that is treasonous by nature.
165. Certain groups of people have savage customs.
166. The extermination of certain groups of people might be necessary.
167. Our use of force now is justified by the humiliations inflicted on our people by foreigners.
168. No race of people is better or superior to any other race.
169. It would be desirable to make this country free of all foreign elements.
170. It is wrong to attribute individual traits to a whole group of people.
171. I believe in government by law with the consent of those people governed.
172. Because public universities are a frequent source of dangerous thoughts against the nation, it may be necessary to have an ideology test required before admission to the institution.
173. What's important is achieving the common goals of our group (our people) — not attending to personal feelings or impulses that might get in the way.
174. We need to cleanse our lands of a certain group of people.
175. Enemies within our country are few and far between.
176. Some groups of people in our country are out to sabotage the country.
177. There are times and places where torture is acceptable.
178. I don't follow any kind of organized religion.
179. If you are protecting what is sacred and holy, anything you do is moral and justifiable.
180. A person who helps others ahead of himself quickly comes to ruin.
181. We have a leader who is divinely blessed.

182. If we allow a certain group to get into power, they will not spare our people.
183. Sometimes the military must take action against our own population, so as to ensure that the country will still exist.
184. We must smash the old world, to create a beautiful brand new world.
185. We have a holy right to our language and our way of life.
186. We need war to fix the problems with this country, and those who don't agree are traitors.
187. All groups of people in our country can — and should — coexist peacefully.
188. A spiritual world gives special powers to protective charms, talismans, and lucky objects.
189. Enemies within our country are threatening our political and cultural existence.
190. The government has no responsibility for helping people who have failed to succeed.
191. My ethnic group is a good people, who have never done any real harm to anyone.
192. Nobody should be trusted because everybody is an enemy or could become an enemy.
193. There is one group that is destined to be the master and rule over the entire world.
194. What is good can only be judged by the gratification of the senses.
195. I don't believe in a messiah who will come to save the world.
196. It is our divine mission to transform our country into a paradise, our own Promised Land.
197. There is no God or gods.
198. Some religions should be seen as infections to be contained.
199. We are in a holy war against certain groups in our country, and God will forgive us for killing them.

200. Many societies have contributed to important advances in art, science, and technology.
201. There are mysterious spirit powers within the souls of all things in nature.
202. Some groups of people are simply less human than other groups of people.
203. You should never take advantage of others, even if others are taking advantage of you.
204. Society should take care of people who are unfortunate, having lost all of their belongings.
205. My ethnic group, I must admit, has done considerable harm to others.
206. When some important group is publicly humiliated, it is natural for them to respond with drastic violent action.
207. Whatever my country needs me to believe, I will believe it with all my heart.
208. Correct principles must triumph, without making any compromises.
209. No objects have magical or spiritual powers.
210. I believe it is possible to communicate with the dead.

Appendix D: Poll Items

1. Below is list of things that may be problems in our country. For each one, please indicate whether you believe that it is a very big problem, a moderately big problem, a small problem or not a problem at all.²

	A very big problem	A moderately big problem	A small problem	Not a problem at all
(a.) Moral decline	☐	☐	☐	☐
(b.) Conflict between various groups in our country	☐	☐	☐	☐
(c.) Terrorism	☐	☐	☐	☐
(d.) Immigration	☐	☐	☐	☐
(e.) Economic inequality	☐	☐	☐	☐
(f.) Crime	☐	☐	☐	☐
(g.) Corrupt political leaders	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. Below is a list of various groups of people. For each group, please state whether you would either be OK with having them as your neighbors (living next to you), or if you would NOT want people from this group as your neighbors.³

	Would NOT like as neighbors	Would be OK as neighbors
(a.) Drug addicts	☐	☐
(b.) People of a different race	☐	☐
(c.) People who have AIDS	☐	☐
(d.) Immigrants/foreign workers	☐	☐
(e.) Homosexuals	☐	☐
(f.) People of a different religion	☐	☐
(g.) People who speak a different language	☐	☐

² “What the World Thinks in 2002.” Pew Research Center, Washington, D.C. (December 4, 2002).

³ World Values Survey 1981-2014 Longitudinal Aggregate v.20150418. World Values Survey Association (www.worldvaluessurvey.org). Aggregate File Producer: JDSystems, Madrid SPAIN.

Appendix E: Demographic Items

We'd now like to gather some information about you. Remember that all of your answers are confidential.

1. Indicate whether you are...

- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female
- ☐ Other or prefer not to say

2. What is your age?

3. Do you live in the USA, India, or outside the USA?

- ☐ I live in the USA
- ☐ I live in India
- ☐ I live in a country other than the USA or India

In question 3, “Do you live in the USA, India, or outside the USA?”, if “I live in the USA” is selected, then the following two questions appear:

3.a. Which group best describes your cultural or ethnic identity? (We recognize that many people have a diverse background. If you identify with more than one group, please choose the groups with which you most closely associate yourself.)

- ☐ American Indian or Alaska Native (Native American)
- ☐ Asian (or Asian-American)
- ☐ Black or African-American
- ☐ Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish

- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
- White or Caucasian (European-American)

3.b. To what extent do you identify with the group you selected above?

- Very little
- Somewhat
- A lot
- Very much

In question 3, “Do you live in the USA, India, or outside the USA?,” if “I live in India” is selected, then the following question appears:

3.c. What is your religion?

- Hindu
- Muslim
- Sikh
- Christian
- Buddhist
- Jain
- Other

4. What is currently your highest level of education?

- Grades 0-8 (8th grade or less)
- Grades 9-11 (some high school)
- High school graduate or GED
- Post-secondary certification
- Associate degree (2-year college degree)
- Bachelor's degree (4-year college degree)

- Master's degree
- Doctoral degree

5. I completed this questionnaire using a...

- Computer (desktop, laptop, or tablet)
- Smart phone (mobile phone)
- Other device

Appendix F: Debriefing Statement - World Attitudes Survey

University of Oregon Department of Psychology
Debriefing Statement – “World Attitudes Survey”

Purpose:

This study's aim was to gather more information on people's attitudes and viewpoints on a variety of political and social issues. This information will help us to make inferences and predications on a wide range of topics.

Feedback and further information:

If you have any questions related to the research, please feel free to contact Ashleigh Landau of the University of Oregon Department of Psychology. Her e-mail address is alandau2@uoregon.edu. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact the Office for Protection of Human Subjects, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403, (541) 346-2510 or ResearchCompliance@uoregon.edu. This Office oversees the review of the research to protect your rights and is not involved with this study.

You may print or save this debriefing form if you would like to keep a copy of the information.

Thank you very much for participating!

Bibliography

- Beck, A. T. (1999). *Prisoners of hate: The cognitive basis of anger, hostility, and violence*. New York: Harper.
- Brass, Paul. 2003. "The Partition of India and Retributive Genocide in the Punjab, 1946– 47: Means, Methods, and Purposes." *Journal of Genocide Research* 5 (1): 71– 101.
- Chiot, D., & McCauley, C. (2010). *Why not kill them all?: The logic and prevention of mass political murder*. Princeton, N.J. ; Woodstock: Princeton University Press.
- Egan, V., Cole, J., Cole, B., Alison, L., Alison, E., Waring, S., and Elntib, S. (2016). Can you identify violent extremists using a screening checklist and open-source intelligence alone? *Journal of Threat Assessment and Management*, 3(1), 21-36.
- Finkel, J. P. (2014). Atrocity prevention at the crossroads: Assessing the President's Atrocity Prevention Board after two years. *United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Center on Genocide Prevention, Series of Occasional Papers*, No. 2, September 2014.
- Hofstadter, R. (1964, November). The paranoid style in American politics. *Harper's Magazine*.
- Landau, A. (under review). Examining Rwanda's radio for genocidal thinking: Contributions of a content analysis and latent dirichlet allocation analysis.
- Leader, J. (2001). *Rwanda's Struggle for Democracy and Peace, 1991-1994*. Washington, D.C.: The Fund for Peace.
- Leader Maynard, J., & Benesch, S. (2016). Dangerous speech and dangerous ideology: An integrated model for monitoring and prevention. *Genocide Studies and Prevention: An International Journal*, 9(3), 75-90.
- Lickel, B., Miller, N., Stenstrom, D. M., Denson, T. F., Schmader, T. (2006). Vicarious retribution: The role of collective blame in intergroup aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10, 372-390.
- Pew Research Center (December 4, 2002). "What the World Thinks in 2002." Washington, D.C.
- Rozin, P., Haidt, J., and McCauley, C. (2000). "Disgust." In Lewis and Haviland-Jones, eds., *Handbook of Emotions*, 637– 53.
- Rummel, R. J. (1994). *Death by government*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

- Saucier, G. (2013). Isms dimensions: Toward a more comprehensive and integrative model of belief-system components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 104(5), 921-939.
- Saucier, G., & Akers L. G. (2018). Democidal thinking: Patterns in the mindset behind organized mass killing.
- Shaw, M. (2015). *What is genocide?* (Second ed.). Cambridge.
- Stanton, G. H. (2005). Early warning. In *Encyclopedia of genocide and crimes against humanity* (pp. 271-273). Thomson-Gale.
- Suedfeld, P. (2001). Theories of the Holocaust: Trying to explain the unimaginable. In D. Chirot & M. E. P. Seligman (Eds.), *Ethnopolitical warfare: Causes, consequences, and possible solutions* (pp. 51-70). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Weitz, E. (2003). *A century of genocide: Utopias of race and nation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- World Values Survey 1981-2014 Longitudinal Aggregate v.20150418. World Values Survey Association (www.worldvaluessurvey.org). Aggregate File Producer: JDSystems, Madrid SPAIN.