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Two hundred and fifty-three subjects were used in an experiment to try to determine how differences in news media presentations affect the reader's view of terrorism. Two stories about a terrorist attack were used, one describing a bombing, the other a hijacking. Both stories had two versions using no one injured or eight innocent people injured. One group of subjects was given no additional information about terrorism. The second group was given information after the description that emphasized the salience of terrorism. The third group received information that de-emphasized the seriousness of terrorism. Subjects were also given a questionnaire designed to measure authoritarianism and one to measure conservatism. It was found that subjects scoring high on authoritarianism or conservativism favored more severe punishment for terrorists than did those scoring lower on the two scales. Findings did not support the hypothesis that providing people with information about terrorism could lessen the impact of terrorist events.
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CHANGING PEOPLE'S REACTION TO TERRORISM

Terrorism has been the concern of governments, citizens, and scientists for decades. Today, bombings in Northern Ireland and kidnapings in Beirut capture the world's attention. Eight years ago there were American hostages in Iran. Fifteen years ago the Munich Olympic Games and Lod Airport made the front page. Seventy-three years ago the assassination of a crown prince by a terrorist group triggered the First World War. These examples show the primary methods used by terrorist groups to advance their causes. According to Jenkins (1982) six basic methods comprise 95 percent of terrorist attacks: bombings, assassination, armed assaults, kidnapings, barricade and hostage situations, and hijackings. Terrorism in turn is a tactic of psychological warfare.

The concept of a clear distinction between peace and war is a Western idea. For example, the Byzantine Empire was always prepared for war. They were constantly involved in intelligence gathering so if battle were necessary, they had a range of strategies that could be used to demoralize, weaken or outmaneuver possible antagonists. Only when the enemy's defenses had been thoroughly undermined would Byzantium attack (Bozeman, 1986).

Terrorism can be defined as the threat of use or violence for political purposes by individuals or groups,
whether acting for, or in opposition to, established governmental authority (Milavsky, Kessler, Stipp, & Rubens, 1982). The first part of this definition describes state-sponsored terrorism; the second can be shown by examples of either self-promoted terrorism or tactical terrorism. Fromkin (1975) asserts that terrorism is merely the first step toward a more remote goal for the terrorist. Terrorists aim for a psychological result from their victims. In contrast, military and revolutionary actions have as a goal a physical result. This description allows one to distinguish between terrorism and guerrilla warfare. In guerrilla warfare the attack is made against the target to destroy the target. In terrorism, the attack is not made against the target, but rather at some other place designed to confuse or cause fear in the target. Fromkin (1975) gave an example of this distinction, "T. E. Lawrence, the guerrilla leader, attacked a railway because he wanted to destroy it, whereas the Arab terrorist attacks an airline even though he or she does not want to destroy it" (p. 694). He suggested that terrorism is an indirect strategy in which the effectiveness is determined by the response it elicits. Netanyahu (1986) asserts that terrorists attempt to blur the distinction between combatants and noncombatants. This enables the public to accept the murder of innocent people as a regrettable but understandable expression of the terrorist’s purported grievances.
Definitions of terrorism vary based on what aspect is studied. Crenshaw (1981) defines terrorism as "a form of political behavior resulting from the deliberate choice of a basically rational actor, the terrorist organization" (p. 380). Another definition (Simmons & Mitch, 1985) distinguishes between terrorism and other forms of aggression by the motivation of the terrorist to gain publicity from his or her actions. Jenkins (1982) suggests terrorism is best defined by the quality of the acts, not the identity of the perpetrators or the nature of their cause. Fromkin (1975) and Cooper (1976) suggest that terrorism is the weapon of those who are prepared to use violence but believe they would lose any contest of sheer strength. This point is underlined by the large number of terrorist groups compared to the small number of successes in overthrowing a target government. Thus, terrorism remains an ingredient, not a recipe for seizing power (Jenkins, 1982). The key characteristic of a terrorist act, as used in this study, involves committing violent acts or threatening the use of violence for political ends.

Linkages between the Soviet Union and countries that support terrorism are important to note when discussing terrorism (Casey, 1986; Livingstone, 1982). Bozeman (1986) noted that the Byzantine Empire and the Soviet Union both derived their policies from the same Eastern traditions of not polarizing peace and war. The application, however, is
different. Byzantium attempted to "assure the identity, security, and survival of the state in an international society of entities that were highly diverse both culturally and politically" (p. 33). According to Bozeman, the Soviet Union's goal is to obtain world dominance. During the past 20 years, the USSR has worked to gain influence over the world's revolutionary and terrorist movements (Livingstone, 1982). Through international intrigue, offers of arms and assistance, and the training and indoctrination of thousands of revolutionaries in a network of schools and camps scattered across the world, these efforts seem to have been largely successful.

After World War II, as Soviet military power grew, they began to support terrorist and guerrilla groups in other countries (Romaniecki, 1974). Intensified support of terrorist and guerrilla groups is coupled with support of existing pro-soviet regimes threatened by non-communist insurgents (Schultz, 1986). Soviet propaganda often follows such actions so the true intent of such aid is obscured from observers. This propaganda seeks to influence other governments' policies, undermine confidence in leaders and institutions, disrupt relations between other nations, and discredit and weaken major opponents (Schultz, 1986). This support acts as a means of diverting the resources of the industrialized democracies from the task of competing with the massive Soviet military build-up (Livingstone, 1982).
Specific origins of terrorism range from Bonanate's (1979) Blockage Theory to a framework of factors suggested by Crenshaw (1981). Crenshaw's framework involves preconditions which set the stage for terrorism in general, and precipitants that provide opportunities for terrorism to occur. Bonanate (1979) proposes four types of terrorism: state and revolutionary terrorism are internal, colonial and terrorism for independence are external. Terrorism results when a society is blocked. It is strong enough to preserve itself, yet is resistant to change.

The role of the media in the terrorist campaign may be more important than the act itself. The ability of the media to influence behavior has been the subject of many studies (Huesman, 1982; Milavsky, Kessler, Stip, & Rubens, 1982; Phillips, 1979; Singer, Singer, & Rapaczynski, 1984). Mazur (1982) compared the reports of bomb threats against nuclear facilities and the content of articles in magazines and newspapers to explain the role of media coverage. He found a close relationship between bomb threats and media coverage, with peaks in number of bomb threats occurring after peaks in media coverage.

Kupperman (1982) calls the role of the media in a terrorist campaign pivotal. Weiman (1983) found that press attention appears to be sufficient to enhance the status of the people, problem, or cause underlying a terrorist event. Hacker (1981) calls terror and terrorism triadic. It needs
a perpetrator, a victim, and an audience. This audience can only be reached with the help of the media. He suggests that if terrorism and the media did not exist independently, they would have had to invent each other. According to Jenkins (cited in Kuperman, 1982) the power of the media is exercised with virtually no control of what can be responsibly reported without jeopardizing innocent lives. He is not talking about governmental control, but rather internal control by editors in the organization.

Two studies using subjects from Northern Ireland point to the media's role in bringing terrorist violence to the attention of the public. Mercer, Bunting, and Snook (1979) compared university students in Northern Ireland to students in the Republic of Ireland. Students in the safe areas of Belfast and the Republic perceive the violence as being more serious than do their counterparts in Northern Ireland and in the dangerous parts of Belfast. Their explanation for this difference is that the residents in the relatively safe areas are exposed to the violence only through depictions by the media. Those actually living in the more violent environment experience a wide spectrum of life in that environment and thus perceive the situation as somewhat less serious.

Cairns, Hunter, and Herring (1980) studied children in Northern Ireland and Scotland. Children exposed to Northern Irish television mentioned bombs and explosions more often
than children watching Scottish TV. Children in Scotland with access to only Northern Irish television also mentioned bombs and explosions more often than the children watching Scottish television. The Mercer et al. (1979) and Cairns et al. (1980) studies underscore the media's ability to influence perceptions of violence in one's environment.

There are four approaches that can be used to thwart terrorism. First is in the manner suggested by Crenshaw's (1981) framework. It may be possible for countries to neutralize precipitants and thus diminish terrorist attacks. A second way is to diminish terrorism through prevention. Airline security measures (Boltwood, Cooper, Fein, & Washburn, 1972), blockades around government buildings, training sessions for possible kidnapping targets (Newcomer & Adkins, 1980), and tighter security along borders are examples of this method. Prevention may also include studies of terrorists and their possible motivations (Holden, 1978; Jenkins, 1982; Russell & Miller, 1977; Silverman, 1973). A third way to thwart terrorism is through counterterrorism techniques. The use of both overt and covert military forces to engage in pre-emptive strikes against the terrorists, their camps, and their hosts could be very effective, but political considerations by the government make this approach unlikely (Sloan, 1986). Psychological operations (McEwen, 1986) would take advantage of inherent instabilities in various terrorist groups and
could also develop effective psychological countermeasures to terrorist attacks.

Merari and Freidland (1981) present a fourth approach to combating terrorism. They advocate denying the terrorists an essential condition to their success, namely an excitable and responsive public. The apparent randomness of terrorist attacks instills fear in the public. Fearful reactions can be minimized by providing accurate information about terrorism and thus end its effectiveness as a low power group policy tool. "As social psychologists we can only stress that a fundamental change in journalists' modus operandi might be the single most important antiterrorist remedy" (Freidland & Merari, 1985; p. 200).

Freidland and Merari (1985) noticed that the public perception of the threat and danger of terrorism seemed to be disproportionate to the terrorist's actual capabilities and that terrorism had an impact on a target group far larger than that of the immediate victims. This may be primarily because the media presentation often carries to populations far beyond that which the terrorist act is aimed. They propose a two-pronged challenge. First, social psychological methods should be harnessed to investigate factors that determine the potency of terrorism's effect on public opinion. Second, social psychologists should formulate principles, and devise means for bolstering the resistance of the public to attitudinal effects of terrorism. It is
this second challenge which is addressed by this experiment. The following hypotheses were examined:

**Hypothesis 1**

Groups receiving different stories would not differ because of changes in the stories. In order to consistently change public perceptions and thus reduce the fear of terrorism, the actual story used should not make a difference.

**Hypothesis 2**

Increasing the number of innocent people injured would increase negative attitudes towards the terrorists. If no one is injured, subjects will tend to see the cause as reasonable. Once people are injured, the legitimacy of the terrorists' goals would be questioned.

**Hypothesis 3**

When the hopelessness and irrationality of terrorism is de-emphasized, subjects would be less fearful about terrorism, especially if no innocent people are injured. When terrorist acts are made more salient, subjects would have more negative and fearful attitudes whether or not people were injured. Providing accurate information about terrorism (de-emphasizing the irrationality and hopelessness) would reduce fear towards terrorism, while emphasizing the act would increase fear.
Hypothesis 4

Subjects scoring high in Authoritarianism would appear more extreme in attitudes towards terrorism than subjects scoring low. From the literature on Authoritarianism, high scorers tend to polarize their opinions, and would thus be extreme in attitudes toward terrorists.

Hypothesis 5

Subjects scoring high in Conservatism would have more negative attitudes towards terrorism than subjects scoring low on the instrument. In this country, most terrorism is seen to be committed by left-wing groups against governments.

METHOD

Subjects

Two hundred and fifty-three students from undergraduate psychology classes at North Texas State University participated in this experiment. Ages ranged from 18 to 58 with 85 percent of the sample less than 25 years old. There were 98 males (38.7%) and 141 females (55.75%). Fourteen subjects did not report their sex.

Designs

The design was a 2 (different stories) x 2 (number of innocent victims) x 3 (type of ending). One story was about a hijacking, the other a bombing. Each story had either no innocent victims injured or eight innocent victims injured. Each story had three different endings. The first version simply reported the event. The second emphasized the
salience of the terrorist act by giving information that made terrorism seem to be a growing and ongoing problem. The third ending de-emphasized the hopelessness and irrationality of terrorism by providing data showing terrorism is not a serious problem.

Instruments

Subjects were given a 25-item questionnaire on terrorism (Appendix A). There was one open-ended question to obtain the participants' ideas for punishment of the terrorists. The remainder were answered on a seven-point scale with the endpoints anchored. The questions covered punishment of terrorists, the perceived threat of terrorism, media coverage of terrorist situations, and perceived political orientation of the described terrorist groups. The biographical questions obtained the subjects' sex and age. The subjects then completed the Radical-Conservatism Scale by Comery and Newmeyer (1965), the Balanced F-Scale by Athanasiou (1968), and the Sensation Seeking Scale by Zuckerman, Eysenck, and Eysenck (1978).

Comery and Newmeyer's Radicalism-Conservatism Scale consists of 27 socio-political statements in 11 content areas: religiosity, pacifism, welfarism, anti-unionism, weak federal government, morality, racial tolerance, severe treatment of criminals, service to country, world government, and service to the individual. Responses are scored on a Likert scale ranging from "disagree very
strongly" (1) to "agree very strongly" (9). Total scores can vary from 27 (radical) to 270 (conservative). After summing the individual scores, a mean score is obtained. This scale is listed in Appendix B.

The scale was developed from 120 items tapping 25 socio-political variables. These were then rated on nine-point scales. Through factor analytic procedures, nine factors emerged. Sixty-seven of the items loaded on a major second-order factor called Radical-Conservatism. Two parallel forms (A and B) were constructed each using 27 different items from the original 67. The two forms correlated .96 using the original subjects. Form A was used with the substitution of two items from Form B.

This scale was chosen for its brevity and because it seems to be the only measure of radicalism and conservatism that has been developed. It was chosen over a dogmatism scale because, according to Robinson and Shaver (1973) citing Plant, the Dogmatism Scale appears to be a better measure of general authoritarianism than the F-Scale in a large student population. The Radicalism-Conservatism Scale attempts to tap a different socio-political attitude area than does the Authoritarian scale.

A number of questionnaires have been constructed to measure Authoritarianism. The instrument used here was the Balanced F-Scale by Athanasiou (1968). This particular scale was chosen because of the author's attempt to balance
the wording of the items. Early versions of the California F-Scale did not have this characteristic. The scale consists of 27 counterbalanced items scored on a six-point Likert scale (Appendix C). These items came from an unpublished list by Christie and his associates. The internal criteria for choosing the particular items was based on the item analyses by Smith (1965) using a sample of Peace Corps volunteers. Robinson and Shaver (1973) reported scale construction information. Stems which correlated negatively with an acquiescent response set and which were not clearly concerned with religion and politics were retained. A test-retest study yielded a coefficient of stability of .86 over a two-week period. Original subjects were engineering students and students who transferred out of engineering. All but four of the items discriminated between engineering students and those who transferred out of the program. This supports the hypothesis that the engineering students would score higher in Authoritarianism.

A third instrument was used to try to make the other items less obvious, thereby decreasing the salience of the dependent measures, and thus make the purpose of this part of the experiment less apparent. The scale used is the Sensation Seeking Scale by Zuckerman, Eysenck, and Eysenck (1978) (Appendix D). It was chosen because it can also be answered on a Likert-type scale. A six- or nine-point scale
was used, according to which dependent measure it was paired with when administered.

All subjects were given the questions and questionnaires in the same order: 20 questions of the Sensation Seeking Scale, then the Radicalism-Conservatism scale, the remaining 20 questions of the Sensation Seeking Scale, and finally the Balanced F-Scale. This order was used instead of completely randomizing all the questions because the two dependent measures used different Likert scales.

Procedure

Subjects were greeted at the door by the experimenter and were given the informed consent forms. When the forms were completed and collected, subjects received stapled handouts containing one of the two stories simulating a newspaper article describing a terrorist incident. The two stories varied in number of people injured (none or eight) and in the type of information given in the second paragraph. One version of the two articles provided no additional information, the second mentioned terrorism statistics, and the third gave information that indicated that terrorism is not the threat it seems to be. Versions of Story 1, the hijacking, are in Appendix E. See Appendix F for the versions of the bombing story. After reading the article, the subjects answered the 25 questions on terrorism and gave some biographical information. Then they completed
the Balanced F-Scale and the Radicalism Conservatism Scale in the order described above.

Subjects were thoroughly debriefed after the experiment. They were told the reasons for the study and about the other groups involved. The participants were encouraged to ask questions about the experiment to clear up any doubts. See Appendix G for the debriefing procedure.

RESULTS

Factor analysis of the Terrorism Questionnaire yielded six factors: Punishment of Terrorists, Awareness of Terrorism, Media Capability, Media Responsibility, Fear of Terrorism, and Attitudes Towards Freedom Fighters. Using the principle components method with varimax rotation, these factors accounted for 47.7 percent of the variance. The factor matrix is reported in Table 1 (Appendix H). Table 2 (Appendix I shows the means and standard deviations of the terrorism questions.

The Punishment of Terrorists factor had four items that accounted for 11.9 percent of the variance. The second factor, Awareness of Terrorism had five items and 9.5 percent of the variance. Factor three, Media Capability, accounted for 8.2 percent of the variance with six items. Three items for Factor four, Media Responsibility, accounted for 6.9 percent of the variance. Fear of Terrorism had five items and 6.0 percent of the variance. Factor six, Attitude
Towards Freedom Fighters, involved three items and accounted for 5.3 percent of the variance.

Using multiple analyses of variance (MANOVA) procedures, the six terrorism factors were used as dependent variables. Main effects and interactions were examined for ending (no information, salience of act, de-emphasizing act), story (hijacking, bombing), and injury (no innocent victims, eight innocent victims). Neither the three-way nor any of the two-way interactions approached significance.

The first MANOVA included Conservatism as an independent variable. The range on this variable was from 95 to 171. Median split procedures were used to break the low and high groups at a score of 130. A main effect was found for Conservatism, Multiple Pillais, $E(6, 164) = 3.508$, $p < .003$. The Univariate ANOVA $F(1, 169) = 20.254$, $p < .001$. Factor One represents Punishment of Terrorists. Univariate ANOVA indicated that those who were more conservative ($M = .331$) thought punishment for terrorists should be more severe than did low conservatives ($M = -.217$).

The second MANOVA used Authoritarianism as an independent variable. The range on this variable was 67 to 130 with a median split of 100. A main effect was found for Authoritarianism, Multiple Pillais, $E(6, 180) = 3.92$, $p < .001$. The two factors represented Punishment of Terrorists $F(1, 185) = 7.730$, $p < .006$, and Awareness of Terrorism $F(1,
(185) = 8.070, p < .005. Those who were more Authoritarian reported that terrorists should be punished more severely (M = .176) and showed more awareness of terrorism (M = .230) than did those low in authoritarianism (M = -.192 and M = -.188, respectively).

Hypothesis 1, groups receiving different stories would not differ because of changes in the stories, was not upheld. Participants with different stories answered significantly different on Factor six $F(2, 169) = 4.333, p < .039$ so the stories did not collapse.

Increasing the number of innocent people injured did not increase negative attitudes towards the terrorists. The Pillais showed $F(6, 164) = .836$ n.s. for the conservative group and $F(6, 180) = 1.063$ n.s. for the authoritarian MANOVA.

The third hypothesis, subjects would be less fearful if the helplessness and irrationality of terrorism is de-emphasized especially if no innocent people are injured, was not upheld. The Pillais was $F(6, 164) = 1.452$ n.s. for the conservative MANOVA and $F(12, 362) = .872$ n.s. for the authoritarian group.

Hypothesis 4, subjects scoring high in Authoritarianism would appear more extreme in their attitude towards terrorists, was supported. The MANOVA for Authoritarianism, addressed above, showed a main effect for Authoritarianism. The univariate ANOVA showed that high authoritarians were
more aware of terrorism and wanted more severe punishment for terrorists.

Subjects scoring high in Conservatism would have more negative attitudes towards terrorism than those who were low in Conservatism, hypothesis 5, was also supported. As described above, those who were more conservative favored more severe punishment of terrorists.

DISCUSSION

Only two significant main effects were found: one between Conservatism and the first factor of the terrorism questionnaire and one between the first two factors of the terrorism questionnaire and Authoritarianism. All other comparisons yielded non-significant results.

Two possible problems with the experimental manipulations may have lead to the non-significant results: the salience of the conditions in the article and the realism of the articles. The articles were very short, none were longer than one typewritten page. Because of this, it is possible that the participants were not given enough information to affect their outlook. At least one subject remarked on the brevity of the article. Lengthening the articles by adding information about the particular group and what happened may make the conditions more salient.

Another problem may be due to a lack of realism. An attempt was made to make the article appear real. The articles did not have a title, however, and were not very long.
A typical article from the front page of a newspaper has approximately 20 paragraphs with about 40 words per paragraph. Each article has a bold heading and sometimes has a picture. Addition of these elements would have made the article appear more real. Further research studying this question could use real articles like those used by Wiemann (1983).

The predictions for the hypotheses about differences due to the stories, number of innocent people injured, and that subjects would be less fearful when hopelessness and irrationality of terrorism is de-emphasized were not supported. The other two experimental hypotheses, that Authoritarians would appear more extreme in attitudes towards terrorism and Conservatives would have more negative attitudes towards terrorism, were supported.

The main effect on the Punishment of Terrorists factor by Conservatism indicates that subjects scoring high in Conservatism endorsed more severe punishment for the members of the groups in the articles. The same conclusion can be drawn for subjects scoring high on Authoritarianism. In addition, authoritarians were more aware of terrorism. From the literature on Authoritarianism and Conservatism, these results are not unexpected. In this country, according to reports by the media, it has been the conservatives who have been most in favor of longer prison terms and capital punishment.
A best case interpretation of the results of this experiment eliminates providing the public with information about terrorism as a way to bolster public resistance to the attitudinal effects of terrorism. These findings did not support Freidland and Merari's (1985) study that fearful reactions to terrorism can be minimized by providing accurate information about it. Attempts to make the terrorist event more salient apparently did not work. This remains a possibility because a manipulation check was not done.

This experiment will add a little to what is known about terrorism and the public's reaction to it. If Freidland and Merari's (1985) hypothesis is to be upheld, the best results may be with Authoritarians as they are already more aware of terrorism. The effect of changes in reporting techniques may be more evident in this group than in others.
APPENDIX A

TERRORISM QUESTIONNAIRE
Terrorism Questionnaire

Respond to each question by circling the number on the scale that best reflects your answer.

1. How would you describe the group in the above article?
   Definitely not a terrorist group definitely a terrorist group
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

2. Should newspaper articles on terrorism be given prominent coverage or should they be buried among other stories?
   prominent buried
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

3. Should convicted terrorists who have killed innocent people be sentenced like other criminals?
   Definitely not definitely should
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

4. Generally speaking, how often do newspapers report terrorist actions in an accurate manner?
   never always
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

5. Where would you place this group on the political spectrum?
   extreme left extreme right
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

6. How much is the terrorists' cause helped by newspaper coverage?
   not at all very much helped
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

7. How neutral was the media report of this incident?
   very not at all biased
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

8. If no one was injured in a terrorist incident, how should the terrorists be punished?
   severely lightly
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
9. How afraid are you of becoming involved in a terrorist incident?
   very afraid 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not afraid

10. Should convicted terrorists be treated easier or more severely than other criminals?
    easier 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 severely

11. Is a freedom fighter ever justified in hijacking an airplane?
    never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 always

12. How appropriate was the media report of this incident?
    very appropriate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not at all appropriate

13. How likely are your chances of becoming involved in a terrorist incident?
    very likely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not likely

14. How similar are freedom fighters and terrorists?
    not at all similar 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very similar

15. How objective was the media report of this incident?
    very objective 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not at all objective

16. If innocent victims are injured in a terrorist incident, how should the terrorists be punished?
    severely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 lightly

17. How certain are you of the political ideological position of the group in the article?
    very certain 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not at all certain

18. Are the number of terrorist incidents increasing or decreasing?
    increasing 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 decreasing
19. How serious is the problem of terrorism in the United States?

very serious 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very not at all serious

20. How often do terrorist actions occur in a given year?

rarely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very often

21. Does the media usually under emphasize or over emphasize terrorist activities?

under 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 over

22. How serious is the problem of terrorism in the world?

very serious 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 not at all serious

23. How much is the terrorist cause hurt by newspaper coverage?

not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very much

24. How often are actions by freedom fighters justified?

never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 always

Please write your response to the next questions.

25. What punishment should the members of the group in the story get if convicted?

26. Sex MALE_____ FEMALE_____

27. AGE_____

28. Last four digits of Social Security/Student ID Number_____________

29. Code Number_____
APPENDIX B

RADICALISM-CONSERVATISM SCALE
Radicalism-Conservatism Scale

Respond to each question by circling the number on the scale that best reflects your answer.

1. Every child should have religious instruction.
2. God exists in the form in which the Bible describes him.
3. All people alive today are the descendants of Adam and Eve.
4. This country should disarm regardless of whether or not other countries do.
5. If my country had been destroyed, I would still not push the button to wipe out the attacking enemy nation.
6. Our country should be engaged constantly in research to develop superior weapons for our nation's defense.
7. Many large unions have officers with criminal records.
8. Most unions do not elect officers by honest, secret-ballot elections.
9. Central government should run only those things which cannot be run effectively at the local level.
10. The federal government has too much power over citizens and local government.
11. Greater centralization of power would be better for this country.
12. A greater degree of government control over business would result in a weakening of this country's economy.
13. Motion pictures which offend any sizable religious group should be banned.

14. Every city should prevent the sale of objectionable books.

15. Sexual relations between unmarried people should be illegal.

16. The police should hunt down homosexuals and put them in jail.

17. Birth control devices should be made readily available to anyone who wants to use them.

18. Employers should be prevented by law from hiring only people of their own race.

19. Criminals convicted of three separate felonies should never be released.

20. In our country, the sentence handed out to criminals are usually too light.

21. A mentally ill man who attacks and kills a little girl should be executed.

22. A gunman who kills someone in an armed robbery should receive the death sentence.

23. Every able bodied male should be willing to serve for a period of time in his country's military service.

24. A man who is ready to die for his country deserves the highest honor.

25. The United States should work peacefully for a strong government.
26. The United States should be willing to surrender some of its rights to strengthen the United Nations.

27. Laws which benefit the people are more important than laws which strengthen the nation.
APPENDIX C

BALANCED F-SCALE
**Balanced F-Scale**

Respond to each question by circling the number on the scale that best reflects your answer.

1. Many modern paintings have both beauty and purpose.
2. What our youth need most is strict discipline, rugged determination, and the will to work and fight for family and country.
3. The minds of today's youth are hopelessly corrupted by the wrong kinds of literature.
4. Most censorship of books or movies is a violation of free speech and should be abolished.
5. Science declines when it confines itself to the solution of immediate practical problems.
6. One of the best assurances for peace is for us to have the biggest bomb and not be afraid to use it.
7. Sex offenders should be treated with expert care and understanding rather than punishment.
8. One of the most important things for children to learn is when to question authority.
9. Human nature doesn't make war inevitable for all will someday establish a peaceful world.
10. What a youth needs most is the flexibility to work and fight for what he considers right personally even though it may not be best for his family and country.
11. It is only natural and right for each person to think that his family is better than any other.
12. Sex crimes, such as rape and attacks on children, deserve more than mere imprisonment; such criminals ought to be publicly whipped or worse.

13. Drunks and degenerates who end up in the gutter on skid row deserve their fate because of their lack of moral fiber.

14. There may be a few exceptions, but in general, members of racial groups tend to be pretty much alike.

15. Poverty can be eliminated.

16. The poor will always be with us.

17. It usually helps the child in latter years if she or he is forced to conform to her or his parents' ideas.

18. A sexual pervert is an insult to humanity and should be severely punished.

19. Strict discipline of children often interferes with the development of self-direction and personal responsibility.

20. Almost everyone has at sometime hated his or her parents.

21. The worst danger to real Americanism during the last fifty years has come from foreign ideas and agitators.

22. A child ought to be whipped at once for any sassy remark.

23. It would probably be bet to discourage feeble-minded people from having children.
24. Most homosexuals are hardly better than criminals and ought to be severely punished.

25. Army life is a good influence on most young men.

26. It is the duty of a citizen to criticize or censure her or his country whenever she or he considers it to be wrong.

27. Without the friendly cooperation of many other nations, the United States probable could not survive for very long.
APPENDIX D

SENSATION SEEKING SCALE
Sensation Seeking Scale

Respond to each question by circling the number on the scale that best reflects your answer.

1. I often wish I could be a mountain climber.
2. I sometimes like to do things that are a little frightening.
3. I would like to take up the sport of water skiing.
4. I would like to try surfboard riding.
5. I would like to learn to fly an airplane.
6. I would like to go scuba diving.
7. I would like to try parachute jumping.
8. I would like to dive off the high board.
9. I would like to sail a long distance in a small but seaworthy sailing craft.
10. I think I would enjoy the sensation of skiing very fast down a high mountain slope.
11. I like some of the earthy body smells.
12. I like to explore a strange city or section of town myself, even if it means getting lost.
13. I have tried marijuana or would like to.
14. I would like to try some of the new drugs that produce hallucinations.
15. I would like to try new foods I have never tasted before.
16. I would like to take off on a trip with no preplanned or definite routes or timetables.
17. I would like to make friends in some "far-out" groups like artists or "hippies."

18. I would like to meet some people who are homosexual (men or women).

19. I often find beauty in the "clashing" colors and irregular form of modern painting.

20. People should dress in individual ways even if the effects are sometimes strange.

21. I like to go to wild "uninhibited" parties.

22. I often like to get high (drinking liquor or smoking marijuana).

23. I enjoy the company of real "swingers."

24. I like new and exciting experiences and sensations even if they are a little unconventional or illegal.

25. I like to date members of the opposite sex who are physically exciting.

26. Keeping the drinks full is the key to a good party.

27. A person should have considerable sexual experience before marriage.

28. I could conceive of myself seeking pleasures around the world with the "jet set."

29. I enjoy watching many of the "sexy" scenes in movies.

30. I feel best after taking a couple of drinks.

31. I can't stand watching a movie I've already seen before.

32. I get bored seeing the same old faces.
33. When you can predict almost everything a person will do, he or she must be a bore.

34. I usually do not enjoy a movie or play where I can predict what will happen in advance.

35. Looking at someone's home movies or travel slides bores me tremendously.

36. I prefer friends who are exciting and unpredictable.

37. I get very restless if I have to stay around home for any length of time.

38. The worst social sin is to be a bore.

39. I like people who are sharp in wit even if they do sometimes insult others.

40. I have no patience with dull or boring persons.
APPENDIX E

HIJACKING ARTICLE
Hijacking Article

Flight 777 from Phoenix was hijacked today while on route to New York City. The hijackers forced the plane to land in Rochester, Minnesota. They demanded the release of three of their group who they say are political prisoners. Thirty-nine passengers and crew members were held for three hours while police attempted to negotiate. When it became clear that their efforts were failing, special units stormed the plane. One hijacker was killed and two were wounded. No passengers were injured.

Flight 777 from Phoenix was hijacked today while on route to New York City. The hijackers forced the plane to land in Rochester, Minnesota. They demanded the release of three of their group who they say are political prisoners. Thirty-nine passengers and crew members were held for three hours while police attempted to negotiate. When it became clear that their efforts were failing, special units stormed the plane. One hijacker was killed and two were wounded. Eight passengers were injured.

Variations in information: one article will have no additional information.

The second variation is as follows: This may signal an increase in attacks in the United States. While only a few attacks have occurred, some experts say the potential is there for terrorism to be disruptive to our society.
Terrorism is viewed as a very serious world problem by 90 percent of the American people, a very serious domestic problem by 60 percent.

The third variation is as follows: While terrorism is a serious problem, no government has been overturned by the acts of a terrorist group. With cooperation among the countries of the world, the threat of terrorism can be stopped. According to some experts, economic and political pressure on host countries, the sharing of information about the identities and movements of terrorists, and the determination not to give in to the demands of terrorists will help break up these organization.
APPENDIX F

BOMBING ARTICLE
Bombing Article

A bomb exploded in a downtown Buffalo bank today, but no one was injured. Damage at this time is estimated to be $375,000. Fire fighters needed three hours to put out the resulting fires. A statement released by the group August 14th, which claimed responsibility for the bombing said "We want to call the attention of the American public to the United States' involvement in the affairs of other countries. These involvements must cease or the bombings will continue." No information is available at this time about the group.

A bomb exploded in a downtown Buffalo bank today injuring eight people. Damage at this time is estimated to be $375,000. Fire fighters needed three hours to put out the resulting fires. A statement released by the group August 14th, which claimed responsibility for the bombing said "We want to call the attention of the American public to the United States' involvement in the affairs of other countries. These involvements must cease or the bombings will continue." No information is available at this time about the group.

Variations in information: One article will have no additional information.

The second variation is as follows: This may signal an increase in attacks in the United States. While only a few attacks have occurred, some experts say the potential
is there for terrorism to be disruptive to our society. Terrorism is viewed as a very serious world problem by 90 percent of the American people, a very serious domestic problem by 60 percent.

The third variation is as follows: While terrorism is a serious problem, no government has been overturned by the acts of a terrorist group. With cooperation among the countries of the world, the threat of terrorism can be stopped. According to some experts, economic and political pressure on host countries, the sharing of information about the identities and movements of terrorists, and the determination not to give in to the demands of terrorists will help break up these organizations.
APPENDIX G

DEBRIEFING STATEMENT
Debriefing Statement

After all participants have turned in the questionnaires, the experimenter will reading the following:

Thank you for participating in this experiment. The researcher is trying to see how different articles on terrorism affect the reader. This was done by creating two different stories, one describing a hijacking, the other a bombing. The first paragraph of each story had two variations: one with no innocent people injured, the other with eight innocent people injured. One third of you did not have a second paragraph at the end of your story. This was the control condition. Another third of you were given information in the second paragraph that emphasized the seriousness of terrorism. In other words, no attempt was made to lessen the impact of the event. The remaining third of you were given information that might help put the problem of terrorism in a different perspective. This condition was an attempt to de-emphasize the seriousness of terrorism.

One of the main weapons of terrorism is fear. By analyzing the three different groups' answers to the 25 questions that immediately followed the article, some idea of how the stories affected the reader can be gained. The remaining questions were parts of three personality
questionnaires. From those measures, an idea of how different kinds of people react to terrorism will be found.

Are there any questions? Thanks again for your help.
APPENDIX H

TABLES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Fac 1</th>
<th>Fac 2</th>
<th>Fac 3</th>
<th>Fac 4</th>
<th>Fac 5</th>
<th>Fac 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.208</td>
<td>0.487*</td>
<td>-0.130</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>-0.292</td>
<td>-0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.131</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.636*</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>-0.249*</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-0.114</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.466*</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>0.276*</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
<td>-0.098</td>
<td>-0.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-0.159</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>-0.680*</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>0.831*</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.709*</td>
<td>-0.187</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.656*</td>
<td>0.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-0.774*</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>-0.081</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>-0.198</td>
<td>0.301</td>
<td>0.635*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-0.120</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.626*</td>
<td>-0.108</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.202</td>
<td>-0.192</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
<td>0.641*</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>-0.178</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>-0.579*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>0.809*</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.689*</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>-0.102</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-0.151</td>
<td>-0.123</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.465*</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>-0.669*</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>-0.139</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>-0.138</td>
<td>0.443*</td>
<td>-0.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>0.730*</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>-0.111</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>-0.461*</td>
<td>-0.190</td>
<td>-0.275</td>
<td>0.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-0.373</td>
<td>0.397*</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H--Continued

*Items included in the factor: Fac 1 Punishment of Terrorists; Fac 2 Awareness of Terrorism; Fac 3 Media Capability; Fac 4 Media Responsibility; Fac 5 Fear of Terrorism; Fac 6 Attitude Towards Freedom Fighters.

Question numbers are on the left. Individual item numbers correspond to those used in the questionnaire listed in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Fac 1</th>
<th>Fac 2</th>
<th>Fac 3</th>
<th>Fac 4</th>
<th>Fac 5</th>
<th>Fac 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>-.238</td>
<td>.521*</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>-.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.809*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-.533*</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Describe group in the article</td>
<td>5.627</td>
<td>1.479</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Prominent newspaper coverage of terrorism</td>
<td>4.798</td>
<td>1.784</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Terrorists who have killed sentenced like criminals</td>
<td>6.263</td>
<td>1.703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Terrorism reported in accurate manner</td>
<td>4.403</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Where is group on political spectrum</td>
<td>3.464</td>
<td>1.807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Does media help terrorists' cause</td>
<td>4.904</td>
<td>1.632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How neutral was the media report</td>
<td>3.710</td>
<td>1.566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. No injuries, punishment of the terrorists</td>
<td>2.179</td>
<td>1.270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Fear of being involved in terrorist incident</td>
<td>3.397</td>
<td>1.915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Treatment of convicted terrorists</td>
<td>2.307</td>
<td>1.254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Freedom fighters justified in hijacking</td>
<td>2.224</td>
<td>1.533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Appropriateness of media report of incident</td>
<td>4.889</td>
<td>1.367</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Becoming involved in terrorist incident

14. Similarity of freedom fighters and terrorists

15. Objectivity of media report of incident

16. Innocents injured, punishment of terrorists

17. Knowing political ideology of group

18. Are terrorist incidents increasing

19. Seriousness of terrorism in the U.S.

20. Incidence of terrorism in a given year

21. Overemphasizing terrorism by media

22. Seriousness of terrorism in the world

23. Does media hurt terrorist's cause

24. Justification of freedom fighters' actions

25. Specific punishment of convicted terrorists
Table 3  
Conservative Group MANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>group x story x injury x ending</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>(12,330)</td>
<td>.770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>story x ending</td>
<td>1.295</td>
<td>(12,330)</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>injury x ending</td>
<td>1.005</td>
<td>(12,330)</td>
<td>.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>story x injury</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td>(6,164)</td>
<td>.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>story x injury x ending</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td>(12,330)</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group x injury x ending</td>
<td>1.310</td>
<td>(12,330)</td>
<td>.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group x story x ending</td>
<td>1.115</td>
<td>(12,330)</td>
<td>.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group x story x injury</td>
<td>1.912</td>
<td>(6,164)</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group x ending</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>(12,330)</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group x injury</td>
<td>1.091</td>
<td>(6,164)</td>
<td>.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group x story</td>
<td>1.452</td>
<td>(6,164)</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ending</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>(12,330)</td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>injury</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>(6,164)</td>
<td>.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>story</td>
<td>1.568</td>
<td>(6,164)</td>
<td>.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group</td>
<td>3.508</td>
<td>(6,164)</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Authoritarian Group MANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>group x story x injury x ending</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td>(12, 362)</td>
<td>.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>story x ending</td>
<td>1.367</td>
<td>(12, 362)</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>injury x ending</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td>(12, 362)</td>
<td>.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>story x injury</td>
<td>1.684</td>
<td>(6, 180)</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>story x injury x ending</td>
<td>1.186</td>
<td>(12, 362)</td>
<td>.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group x injury x ending</td>
<td>1.266</td>
<td>(12, 362)</td>
<td>.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group x story x ending</td>
<td>1.160</td>
<td>(6, 180)</td>
<td>.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group x story x injury x ending</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td>(12, 362)</td>
<td>.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group x story x injury x ending</td>
<td>1.109</td>
<td>(12, 362)</td>
<td>.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group x story x injury</td>
<td>1.160</td>
<td>(6, 180)</td>
<td>.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group x ending</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>(12, 362)</td>
<td>.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group x injury</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>(6, 180)</td>
<td>.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group x story</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td>(6, 180)</td>
<td>.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ending</td>
<td>.871</td>
<td>(12, 362)</td>
<td>.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>injury</td>
<td>1.083</td>
<td>(6, 180)</td>
<td>.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>story</td>
<td>1.502</td>
<td>(6, 180)</td>
<td>.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group</td>
<td>3.922</td>
<td>(6, 180)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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