

Manual

Political Psychology Scales

For use in research
and for rating political leaders
and historical figures.

by William A. McConochie, Ph.D.
Testmaster, Inc.
71 E. 15th Ave.
Eugene, Or. 97401

June 14, 2007 Edition.

Copyright 2006, William A. McConochie.

Introduction:

The scales described in this manual are available in downloadable form on the author's web site, politicalpsychologyresearch.com.

This manual describes research questionnaires or scales developed by the author, beginning with a measure of violence-proneness in 1998 and continuing with a measure of the Eidelson worldviews in 2003 and proceeding through a series of several related studies through the date of this manual version. The scales may be copied and used by researchers and journalists but may not be copied and sold either separately or as part of a larger publication.

Detailed research findings of the studies involved have been written up and self-published by the author as a 300-page single-spaced college textbook intended for upper division undergraduates, graduate students and educated lay readers. This manuscript is available from the author. The author is preparing journal

articles as well and is seeking a trade publisher for the textbook. These and other articles are available on his webs site (politicalpsychologyresearch.com).

The first section of the manual describes each instrument and its basic statistical properties, including reliability and validity data. The second section provides the scales themselves and scoring instructions. Four of the scales in Spanish, French and German. The translated scales are the At Risk for Violence Test, The Terrorism Endorsement Scale, the Warmongering scale and the Warmongering-Proneness rating form (numbers 19, 20, 9 and 10, below). These versions are available over the Internet site.

Each of the scales may be referred to as the “McConochie.....scale”, e.g. the “McConochie Social Disenfranchisement Scale” (McSDS), the “McConochie Pro-Public Democracy Endorsement Scale” (McPPDES).

Section I. Scale Descriptions and Statistical Properties.

Scales Included:

1. Social Disenfranchisement. (Eidelson worldviews).
2. Sustainability Endorsement.
3. Positive Foreign Policy Endorsement.
4. Proportional Public School Budgeting Endorsement.
5. Pro-Public Democracy Endorsement.
6. Warmongering-10
7. Warmongering-12.
8. Warmongering-20.
9. Warmongering-32
- 9-A. Warmongering-44
10. Warmongering-Proneness.
11. Xenophobia.
12. Political Lying and Conniving Endorsement.
13. Propaganda Endorsement.
14. Messianic self-image.
15. Religious Fundamentalism Scale.
16. Kindly Religious Beliefs Scale.
17. Religiousness.
18. Human Rights Endorsement.

19. At Risk for Violence Test.
20. Terrorism Endorsement Scale.
21. Government Type Preferences items.
22. Value of Religion Scale.
23. Meta-religion endorsement
24. Authoritarianism Endorsement Scale.

The data for each scale includes a description of content measured, a sample scale item, the number of items, typical score range, mean, standard deviation, Cronbach alpha reliability, and sample validity data (** = significant at .01 level. * = .05 level).

1. **McConochie Social Disenfranchisement Scale.** With individual, group and total scores. I define the content reflected of the Eidelson worldviews as “Social Disenfranchisement” because this seems to describe the overall perspective reflected in the scales.

The Eidelson worldviews were introduced to the scientific community in the *American Psychologist* journal in 2003.ⁱ These worldviews had not been measured but were described in enough detail to inspire me to develop scales to measure each of the worldviews at both the individual level and group level. The scale items were written to reflect how a person sees the world as an individual and then as a member of a group. The items are presented in Likert scale format, as follows:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

This instrument measures the Eidelson worldviews: vulnerability, helplessness, distrust, injustice and superiority, at both the individual and group levels, with 8 items at each level for a total of 80 items. Typical items:

“I am more special and important than other people are.”

“A group I’m in has a long history of persecution by other groups.”

Basic scale statistics:

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Sample size</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard deviation</u>	<u>Alpha reliability</u>
Soc. Dis. Individual	381	49	142	98.8	19.0	.96
Soc. Dis. Group	380	45	142	101.5	17.0	.94
Soc. Dis. Total	378	97	262	200.0	33.2	.97

Validity data is evident in positive correlations with several antisocial measures and negative correlations with several pro-social measures, as follow:

Trait	Pearson product-moment r , (for individual, group and total scores). <u>Social Disenfranchisement:</u>	Sample characteristics: Age range: 13-86, mean 29.7, s.d. 15. 45% males. Education mean 14.3 yrs., s.d. 2.9. Sample size below.
Warmongering (20-item scale)	.66**, .70**, .74**	373
Endorsement of anarchy	.46**, .40**, .47**	380
Endorsement of military dictatorship	.50**, .44**, .52**	380
Endorsement of tribal (special interest group) democracy	.39**, .33**, .40**	380
Endorsement of public democracy	-.41**, -.45**, -.46**	380
Endorsement of more	-.63**, -.57**, -.65**	380

democratic forms of government (public democracy versus anarchy, dictatorship, monarchy and tribal democracy).		
Sustainable policies endorsement	-.54**, -.61**, -.63**	380
Proportional public school budgeting endorsement	-.38**, -.35**, -.40**	381

2. **McConochie Sustainability Endorsement Scale**. This instrument measures endorsement of government policies and programs that promote sustainable practices with 12 items in Likert scale format as above. Typical item:

“My national government should support ...
 ...international treaties and efforts to reduce greenhouse gasses and global warming.”

Basic scale statistics:

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Sample size</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard deviation</u>	<u>Alpha reliability</u>
Sustainability endorsement	383	29	60	45.0	7.5	.76

Validity data is evident in positive correlations with several pro-social measures and negative correlations with several anti-social measures, as follow:

	Pearson product-moment correlation	Sample characteristics: Age range: 13-86, mean 29.7, s.d. 15.
--	------------------------------------	--

Trait	coefficient. <u>Sustainability</u> <u>Endorsement:</u>	45% males. Education mean 14.3 yrs., s.d. 2.9. Sample size below.
Endorsement of public democracy	.43**	383
Endorsement of more democratic forms of government (public democracy versus anarchy, dictatorship, monarchy and tribal democracy).	.54**	383
Warmongering (20-item scale)	-.69**	376
Social disenfranchisement (total score)	-.62	378
Endorsement of anarchy	-.37**	383
Endorsement of military dictatorship	-.48**	383
Endorsement of tribal democracy	-.29**	383

3. **McConochie Positive Foreign Policy Endorsement scale.** This scale measures endorsement of constructive international government policies with 12 items in 5-option Likert scale format as above, such as:

“My national government should...

“Help other countries with peaceful means rather than military ones.

“Support the United Nations.

“Promote student and cultural exchanges and tourism.”

Basic scale statistics:

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Sample size</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard deviation</u>	<u>Alpha reliability</u>
Positive foreign policy endorsement	112	30	60	50.5	7.0	.87

Validity data is evident in positive correlations with several pro-social measures and negative correlations with several anti-social measures, as follow:

Trait	Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. <u>Positive Foreign Policy Endorsement:</u>	Sample characteristics: Age range: 12-91, mean 47.7, s.d.22.8. 32% males. Education mean 16.1 yrs., s.d. 3.3. Sample size below.
Public democracy endorsement	.38**	112
Ecology endorsement	.65**	112
Human Rights endorsement	.65**	111
Kindly Religious Beliefs	.56**	109
Religious Fundamentalism	-.47**	110
Warmongering (10-item scale)	-.74**	112
Anarchy endorsement	-.34**	112
Military Dictatorship endorsement	-.34**	112

Tribal democracy endorsement	-.39**	112
Verbal I.Q.	.06	62

4. **Proportional Public School Budgeting Endorsement scale.** This scale measures endorsement of a proportional versus contract-driven model for managing public school budgets. The contract-driven model puts teacher union contract terms above all other budget considerations. The proportional model earmarks a certain percentage of each budget dollar for each of several essential school system programs such as music, art, wood shop, athletics, counselors, books, utilities, etc. Classroom sizes are kept at 22 students. Teacher salaries and benefits are determined by amount available for salaries and benefits divided by the number of teachers needed. All budget items rise or fall proportionately as available budget dollars go up or down. The respondent is asked in 5-option Likert scale format how strongly he/she endorses the proportional model over the contract-driven model if and as a teacher in the system, as a parent of a child in the system and then as a taxpayer supporting the system. The score is the total across these three items.

Basic scale statistics:

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Sample size</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard deviation</u>	<u>Alpha reliability</u>
Proportional budget system endorsement	383	3	15	10.7	2.45	.63

Validity data is evident in positive correlations with several pro-social measures and negative correlations with several anti-social measures, as follow below. These correlations support the hypothesis that support of a proportional budgeting system is pro-social. In contrast , support of the contract-driven system is, by implication, anti-social, not in the best interests of communities overall. For example, public democracy is specifically defined in the research questionnaires a government serving “the best interests of the community overall, as opposed to any special interest groups”.

Trait	Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. <u>Proportional Budgeting Endorsement:</u>	Sample characteristics: Age range: 13-86, mean 29.7, s.d. 15. 45% males. Education mean 14.3 yrs., s.d. 2.9. Sample size below.
Public democracy endorsement	.28**	383
Endorsement of more democratic forms of government (public democracy versus anarchy, dictatorship, monarchy and tribal democracy).	.39**	383
Sustainable programs endorsement	.37**	383
Big Five Personality trait of Extroversion	.06	383
Big Five Agreeableness	.21**	383
Big Five Conscientiousness	.13*	382
Big Five Emotional Stability	.16**	383
Big Five Openness	-.08	383
Warmongering - 20 items	-.43**	376
Endorsement of anarchy	-.27**	383
Endorsement of military		

dictatorship	-.33**	383
Social disenfranchisement, individual	-.38**	381
Social disenfranchisement, group	-.35**	380
Social disenfranchisement, total	-.40**	378

It should be noted that one study by the author showed that even university students in training to be public school teachers prefer the proportional budgeting system over the contract-driven system.

5. **Pro-Public Democracy Endorsement Scale**. This scale is a measure of endorsement of the public democracy form of government, defined as government serving the best interests of the community overall, as opposed to any special interest groups. It is measured by a combination of five items in Likert scale format which ask the respondent how strongly he/she endorses each of five types of government in turn: anarchy, military dictatorship, monarchy, tribal democracy serving economic tribes or special interest groups, and public democracy. The first four items are reverse-scored. Thus, the higher the score, the stronger the endorsement of non-authoritarian government representing and serving the best interest of citizens as a group, not as members of special interest sub-groups.

Basic scale characteristics:

Scale	Sample size	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard deviation	Alpha reliability
Pro-Public Democracy	383	9	25	19.45	4.19	.56

Validity data is evident in positive correlations with several pro-social measures

and negative correlations with several anti-social measures, as follow below.

Trait	Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. <u>Pro-Public Democracy Endorsement:</u>	Sample characteristics: Age range: 13-86, mean 29.7, s.d. 15. 45% males. Education mean 14.3 yrs., s.d. 2.9. Sample size below.
Proportional public school budgeting endorsement	.39**	383
Big 5 Agreeableness	.25**	383
Big 5 Emotional Stability	.27**	383
Sustainable programs endorsement	.54**	383
Warmongering - 20	-.63**	376
Social disenfranchisement, individual	-.63**	381
Social disenfranchisement, group	-.57**	380
Social disenfranchisement, total	-.65**	378

6. Warmongering-10.
7. Warmongering-12.
8. Warmongering-20.
9. Warmongering-32.

These warmongering scales are groups of similar items used in various studies by the author. By using mean item scores, one can easily compare data across different versions of the scales. Researchers can select the scale length appropriate to their focus of inquiry.

Sample items:

“My national government should do what best serves our nation’s interests, at the expense of other nations, enforced by military action if necessary. It is more honorable to serve one’s nation as a warrior in combat than as an anti-war protester.”

Basic scale statistics for these scales are given in terms of total item response scores and mean item scores across all items in a scale.

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Sample size</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard deviation</u>	<u>Alpha reliability*</u>
Warmongering - 12 items	377	12 (mean item 1.0)	51 (mean item 4.25)	27.9 (2.32)	10.1 (.84)	.86
Warmongering - 20 items (War20506)	376	20 (mean item 1.0)	79 (mean item 3.95)	49.4 (2.47)	14.72 (.74)	.88

*The reliability of the 32-item scale is as high as .95 and of a 10-item scale .93. Reliability of the scales can be expected to vary from study to study, but should be in the neighborhood of .85-.95. All four scales are included in the appendix.

Validity data is evident in positive correlations with several antisocial measures and negative correlations with several pro-social measures, as presented immediately below. This data is from any studies using one or another of the four warmongering scales.

--	--	--

<u>Trait</u>	Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. <u>Warmongering:</u>	Large sample characteristics: Age range: 13-86, mean 29.7, s.d. 15. 45% males. Education mean 14.3 yrs., s.d. 2.9. Sample size below.
Violence-proneness*	.67**	48
Social disenfranchisement, individual	.66**	376
Social disenfranchisement, group	.70**	373
Social disenfranchisement, total	.74**	373
Anarchy endorsement	.46**	376
Military dictatorship end.	.57**	376
Tribal democracy endors.	.37**	376
Religious Fundamentalism	.53**, 60**	110, 31
Claustrophobia	.40*	27
Fear of Heights	.60**	27
Anxious unless busy	.39*	27
Unspecified anxiety	.41*	27
Overall clinical anxiety	.54**	27
Xenophobic	.39*	31
Religiousness	.44*, .53**	31, 27
Anti-Muslim	.80**	31
Fear of terrorism	.54**	31

Fear of small creatures	.37*	31
Fear of evil spirits	.40*	31
Political lying & conniving	.53**	255
Messianic self-image	.18**	255
Propaganda endorsement	.45**	255
Right Wing Authoritarianism**	.59**	40
Social Dominance Orientation***	.46**	40
Public democracy endor.	-.36**	376
Big 5 Agreeableness	-.34**	376
Big 5 Emotional stability	-.26**	376
Sustainability endorse.	-.69**	376
Positive foreign policy endorsement	-.74**	111
Ecology concerns endorsement	-.60**	112
Human Rights endorsement	-.51**	111
Kindly Religious Beliefs	-.51	109

* Violence-proneness was measured by the author's 58-item scale for this, the McConochie At Risk for Violence scale, which is described in a separate manual available on the author's web site.

** Bob Altemeyer's scale.

*** Jim Sidanius and Felicia Pratto's scale.

Additional validity data.

Significant correlations between a warmongering scale and 24 of the items in the Social Disenfranchisement scales provide further insight into the mind of the warmonger. Persons higher on warmongering tend to agree with items that are not marked with an asterisk and disagree with those that are:

- 29. * It is better to combat terrorism with foreign aid and student exchanges than with military action.
- 31. * Patience and peaceful efforts are better than military action to stop strong countries from victimizing weak ones.
- 42. A group I'm in must be prepared to fight other groups before they fight us.
- 46. * I belong to a group or organization that actively works to promote world peace between nations.
- 47. * I think powerful nations should each adopt a weak nation to befriend and help.
- 48. * I think that weak and unusual peoples, ethnic groups and languages should be protected and cherished.
- 49. It is wise to assume that strangers are more dangerous than safe.
- 50. I trust hardly anyone.
- 51. Most people will take unfair advantage of you if they can.
- 52. Very few persons are capable of truly cooperating with others.
- 53. * We should teach children to be kind and helpful to all people and animals.
- 54. * Almost everyone is good and kind inside.
- 55. * People turn out badly only if they are mistreated.
- 57. Many people of other nations are deliberately trying to harm our nation.
- 58. Many leaders of foreign countries cannot be trusted to keep their promises.
- 59. Several other nations are making trouble for us around the world.
- 60. There are nations which are evil to the core and dangerous to our welfare.
- 61. * Almost all common people in all nations are friendly and kind to foreigners.
- 63. Our nation is wise not to trust most of the nations in the United Nations.
- 64. I am a member of a group that has good reason to distrust other groups.
- 77. * I prefer to be in groups that help weaker groups to succeed.
- 78. * I believe all nations should be helped to have power and respect.
- 79. * Powerful nations should not boast and dominate weaker nations.
- 80. * Powerful countries should be willing to give up some of their power so weaker nations can survive.

Thus, we see a foreign policy attitude of warmongers that views other nations as undeserving, untrustworthy and to be dominated, with military might if necessary.

9A. Warmongering-44. This scale is the most advanced, theoretically, of the four warmongering scales developed through 6/07 by the author. It is described in detail in the manual for this instrument, which is listed among the Publications on the author's web site (politicalpsychologyresearch.com). The basic statistics provided below are for two samples of community college students.

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Sample size</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard deviation</u>	<u>Alpha reliability</u>
Warmonger-44	42	46-146	87.11	27.08	.96
Warmonger-44	42	44-220	89.23	36.18	.98

Sample validity data from the above groups (see test manual for detailed statistics):

<u>Trait</u>	<u>Correlation</u>
U.S. Should have a positive, helpful foreign policy.	-.56**
Democratic forms of government better than authoritarian ones	-.38*
Natural resources should be conserved and recycled	-.61**
People should cooperate more than compete with each other	-.67**
Human rights endorsement	-.54
Voted for Kerry in 2004	-.38*
Voted for Bush in 2004	.34*
Religious fundamentalism	.31*
Authoritarianism endorsement	.56**
Terrorism endorsement	.54**
Violence-proneness	.69**

10. Warmongering-Proneness. This scale of 50 items is in Likert scale format

and asked the person doing the rating to indicate whether the trait described is or is not characteristic of the person rated. The rater should be very familiar with the ratee, as through media coverage of a current political figure or through authoritative biographies of historical figures. To further guarantee reliability of the rating, it is recommended that several raters complete the rating independently. The score for each rater, and for each person rated, is computed as the mean item score across the 50 items rated. This score can range theoretically from 1.0 to 5.0.

Then, this score computed by several careful raters should be averaged across the raters to find the final score placing the ratee on the scale of scores. Scores for 2 current and 23 historical leaders are available in the textbook manuscript. The lowest scores are for Nelson Mandela (1.61), Mahatma Gandhi (1.71) and Jimmy Carter (1.73). The highest are for Stalin (4.21), Hitler (4.50) and Saddam Hussein (4.68).

The content of all of the items in the scale are based on significant correlations between warmongering and other traits, as summarized immediately above. Item analysis in the form of correlations between the 50 scale items and the total score for the instrument across 25 rated leaders (112 ratings) confirmed that every item correlates significantly with the total score.

Basic scale statistics for these scales are given in terms of mean item scores across all 50 items in the scale.

Sample items:

“Does the person belong to a group that feels superior to other groups?

Does the person disavow international arms control treaties?

Does the person seem comfortable lying and/or using propaganda?

Does the person think spending for military activities should be increased?”

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Sample size</u>	<u>Minimum (across 112 ratings)</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard deviation</u>	<u>Alpha reliability</u>
Warmongering-proneness	112 ratings of 25	1.12	4.96	2.88	1.07	.98

	leaders					
--	---------	--	--	--	--	--

Validity data. Twenty-two well-educated adults (mean age 60, mean education 16.9 years) rated 20 leaders on a single-item five-option Likert scale measure of warmongering defined as:

“Promoting the development and use, for aggressive purposes, of military weapons and forces”.

A Pearson product-moment correlation was run between this mean score for each of the leaders and their Warmongering-Proneness scale score. The correlation was .90**.

11. Xenophobia. This is a brief measure of xenophobia expressed in terms of preference for living in the interior of the United States and not traveling to foreign countries. It was designed specifically to test the hypothesis that Kansas might be appealing to xenophobic Americans.

Sample item:

“I would rather live in Kansas, the geographical center of the United States, than in California.”

Basic statistics:

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Sample size</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard deviation</u>	<u>Alpha reliability</u>
Xenophobia	31	8	27	15.81	4.83	.73

Validity:

This scale has been used in only one study of 31 community college students. Only one statistically significant correlation was found with the other variables in this study, with warmongering (.39*). Other correlations were in the expected directions but not significant, as follow:

<u>Trait and number of items used to measure it.</u>	<u>Pearson product-moment correlation.</u>	<u>Significance level.</u>
Warmongering (10)	.39*	.05
Anxiety (7 items)	.32	.08
Muslims seen as terrorists. (4)	.34	.06
Religious fundamentalism (5)	.25	.17
Kindly religious beliefs (4)	-.22	.23

Thus, there is evidence in this study that geographical xenophobia is related to the warmongering trait and may also reflect clinical anxiety and prejudice.

12. Political Lying and Conniving Endorsement. This scale consists of 4 items measuring political lying and 8 measuring political conniving. A total score consisting of both is also computed.

Sample items:

“Political leaders should be willing and able to skillfully lie to the public if necessary to promote and defend their actions.

“It is okay for my preferred political party to rig voting machines in their favor.”

Basic statistics:

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Sample size</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard deviation</u>	<u>Alpha reliability</u>
Lying	60	4	12	5.42	1.99	.81
Conniving	58	8	24	10.5	3.39	.84
Total score	58	12	34	16.55	4.98	.89

Validity data. This data is based on a sample of 68 adult churchgoers:

<u>Trait</u>	<u>Pure lie</u>	<u>Pure conniving</u>	<u>Lie/conniving</u>
1. Pure lie	1.00	.77**	.90**
2. Pure conniving	.77**	1.00	.94**
3. Warmongering	.28*	.37**	.36**
4. Rel. Fund. (McC.)	.05	.08	.10
5. Rel. Fund. Altemeyer.*	.26*	.31*	.31*
6. Kindly religion	-.21	-.41**	-.32*
7. Human Rights	-.45**	-.49**	-.51**
8. Sustainability	-.38**	-.49**	-.42**
9. Pos. Foreign Policy.	-.36**	-.42**	-.41**

* Bob Altemeyer's Religious Fundamentalism scale.

13. Propaganda Endorsement. This simple four-item scale consists of general slogans of the sort typical of propaganda campaigns designed to marshal followers in assertive and aggressive campaigns.

Sample item: "If you're not for me you're against me."

Basic statistics:

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Sample size</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard deviation</u>	<u>Alpha reliability</u>
Propaganda endorsement	273	4	20	11.16	3.22	.89

Validity data:

<u>Trait</u>	<u>Propaganda endorsement</u>	
Warmongering	.45**	
Lying	.17**	
Messianic self-image	.35**	

14. Messianic self-image. This scale measures a messianic self image. It was developed to test the hypothesis that some , if not all, warmongers have a messianic self-image.

Sample item:

“I have felt that I may have a special destiny in life.”

Basic statistics:

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Sample size</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard deviation</u>	<u>Alpha reliability</u>
Messianic self-image	273	4	20	11.16	3.22	.81

Validity data:

<u>Trait</u>	<u>Messianic self image.</u>
Warmongering	.18*
Lying	.00
Propaganda endorsement	.35**

15. Religious Fundamentalism Scale.

16. Kindly Religious Beliefs Scale.

These two scales were developed to explore the possible relationship between basic religious beliefs and warmongering. The scales are part of a batch of 32 items which are usually presented together, unless a study wants just a brief measure of each trait to save questionnaire space. The items include two general worldviews, one competitive and one cooperative, 24 items taken from the major world religions: Christianity, Judaism, Buddhism, Islam, Hinduism and Shintoism. These religious items were chosen to reflect a diverse sample of religious beliefs of general nature. The last 6 items were drafted by the author to reflect various possible general definitions of supernatural beings (god). Factor analysis in repeated groups consistently yielded the same two primary factors, one reflecting traditional “fundamentalist” beliefs and the other reflecting beliefs defined by the author as “Kindly Religious Beliefs”. The fundamentalist factor yielded 17 items that make up the Religious Fundamentalism scale. The kindly beliefs factor yielded 13 items.

Sample items:

Fundamentalist:

“The peoples of all nations should compete with each other in business, trade and, if necessary, war, to let the ‘best nation win’.

“There is only one true god (or God) which all people of the world should worship.

“Unquestioning loyalty to superiors, including political leaders, is appropriate.”

Kindly:

“The peoples of all nations should learn to live peacefully together, resolving differences not by economic or military might but by discussion, working together, increasing understanding of one another and compromising.

Violence toward one’s fellow humans is not appropriate.

One should love his neighbor as himself and treat others as he would like to be treated.”

Basic statistics:

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Sample size</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard deviation</u>	<u>Alpha reliability</u>
Religious						

fundamentalism	246	14	73	41.65	12.70	.83
Kindly Religious Beliefs	246	33	65	53.19	5.80	.81

Validity data is provided from a variety of studies. Just the sample sizes of these studies is reported.

<u>Trait</u>	<u>Sample size.</u>	<u>Relig. Fundamentalism</u>	<u>Kindly Religious Beliefs</u>
Saucier Alpha ⁱⁱ (Fundamentalism)	78	.70**	-.10
Saucier Beta (Selfish Materialism)	78	-.03	-.40**
Warmongering	78, 27	.61**, .59**	-.55**
Warmongering	35, 33	.66**, .38*	-.70**, -.49**
Positive Foreign Policy	78	-.42**	.41**
Sustainable programs	78	-.55**	.40**
Human Rights Endorsement	78	-.55**	.49**
Altemeyer's Religious Fundamentalism ⁱⁱⁱ	35, 33	.72**, .68**	-.54** -.42**
Positive Foreign Policy	35, 33	-.38*, -.36*	.54**, .44**
Sustainable programs	35, 33	-.65**, -.47**	.68**, .53**
Human Rights Endorsement	35, 33	-.52**, -.37**	.76**, .56**
Prejudice against Muslims	27	.53*	

Religiousness	27	.72**	
Fears of small creatures	27	.41*	
Claustrophobic	27	.48*	
Fears of fate, evil spirits	27	.55**	
Fears of body weight changes	27	.44**	
Fears of travel	27	.56**	
Fears of heights	27	.67**	
Fears of being alone	27	.61**	

17. Formal Religious Activity. Religiousness Scale (“Religiosity”). This is a 3-item scale designed to measure devotion to religious activities per se, measured in 5-option Likert scale format:

“I am a very religious person.
I go to church or other such holy place almost every week.
I try to say prayers daily.”

Basic statistics:

<u>Scale (Studies 1 and 2)</u>	<u>Sample size</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard deviation</u>	<u>Alpha reliability</u>
1. Religiousness	46	4	20	9.20	4.80	.89
2. Religiousness	40	3	15	7.65	3.50	.80

Validity data:

Study #1: 27 community college students):

Trait	Pearson correlation
Religious fundamentalism	.73**
Kindly Religious Beliefs	(.24) Not significant
Anti-Muslim attitudes	.46*

Clinical anxiety*	.57**
Clinical worry**	.50**
Claustrophobia	.56**
Fear of germs	.49**
Fear of evil spirits	.43**
Free-floating anxiety	.52**
Fear of body weight changes	.47**
Fear of travel	.40*
Fear of heights	.65**
Panic feelings	.46*
Paranoia	.40*
Anxious unless busy	.66**
Warmongering	.53**
Fear of a warring world	.68**

*, **: Clinical anxiety and worry are measured by the author's Anxiety and Worry Scale, which is 100 items long and measures many separate aspects of clinical anxiety, many of which are listed above (germs, claustrophobia, paranoia, etc.). This instrument is described in the manual for it available at the author's web site.

Study #2. 40 Community college students.

<u>Trait</u>	<u>Pearson Product Moment Correlation with Religousness scale.</u>
Religious fundamentalism	.50**
Kindly religious beliefs	.43**
Personal Value of Religion scale (51 items)	.81**
Meta Religion Concept endorsement	.41**

18. Human Rights Endorsement. This 44-item scale measures endorsement of human rights in 5-option Likert scale format. The items cover a variety of content from the United Nations Charter of human rights, and similar charters from the World Religions and the Earth Charter organization. Four ethical principals from Rotary International, the “Four-way Test” are also included. A brief version of 16 of these items is also available.

Sample items:

“We should carefully conserve and manage our extraction and use of nonrenewable resources, such as fossil fuels and minerals.

“Everyone has the right to food, clothing and shelter.

“We should promote local, regional and global civil society, and promote the meaningful participation of all interested individuals and organizations in decision making at the local, regional and global level.

Basic statistics:

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Sample size</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard deviation</u>	<u>Alpha reliability</u>
Human rights endorsement-44 items	247	85	220	189	22.5	.95
Human rights, 16-item scale	247	17	80	70.08	9.75	.94

Validity data. All based on a sample of 247, except for warmongering, 111:

<u>Trait</u>	<u>Pearson correlation.</u>
Warmongering	-.51
Religious fundamentalism	-.42**
Kindly religious beliefs	.59**

Pro peace	.80**
Ecology endorsement	.86**
Anarchy endorsement	-.19**
Military dictatorship endorsement	-.15*
Monarchy endorsement	.01
Tribal democracy endorsement	-.05
Public democracy endorsement	.35**
The peoples of the world should cooperate and compromise, etc.	.42**
The peoples of the world should compete...let 'best' win, etc.	-.31**

19. At Risk for Violence Test (ARFV).

This test consists of 58 items in 4-option Likert scale format. It generates scores for about a dozen traits that put people at risk for violence, including feelings of academic or career failure, rigid thinking, social rejection, low guilt, hostile pleasure, unresolved anger, homicide endorsement, not being willing to help stop violence, disinterest in counseling for personal problems and lying. Reliability for the total score is about .90 in various studies. Validity details are available in a manual that can be downloaded from the author's web site (Testmasterinc.com). The test validly discriminates between incarcerated and non-incarcerated teens and adults. Violence proneness correlates strongly with warmongering (see above).

Additional validity study:
45 Community college students (6/07).

<u>Trait</u>	<u>Pearson Product Moment Correlation with Violence-Proneness</u>
Warmongering (new 44-item scale)	.71**

Authoritarianism endorsement (McC's scale)	.64**
Terrorism endorsement	.84**

20. Terrorism Endorsement Scale.

This 12-item test is in Likert-scale format and measures interest in terrorism as a personal activity. It has a reliability of about .90 in various studies, even one of church-goers.

Basic statistics example (Community college students, 6/07):

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Sample size</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard deviation</u>	<u>Alpha reliability</u>
Terrorism endorsement	45	12	60	17.07	10.43	.98

Validity data:

Terrorism endorsement correlates strongly with a variety of antisocial measures and negatively with public democracy:

<u>Trait</u>	<u>Correlation with Terrorism Endorsement</u>
Anarchy Endorsement	.80**
Military Dictatorship endorsement	.64**
Tribal Democracy endorsement	.52**
Public Democracy endorsement	-.57**
Social Disenfranchisement (Group)	.42*

Additional validity data (from sample of 45 community colleges students, 6/07):

<u>Trait</u>	<u>Pearson Product Moment correlation with Terrorism Endorsement scale</u>
Warmongering (new 44-item scale)	.54**
Authoritarianism Endorsement (McC's scale)	.42**
Volence-Proneness (ARFV scale)	.84**

21. Government Type Preferences items.

These 5 questionnaire items are presented in 5-option Likert scale format. They provide measures of endorsement of 5 types of government: Anarchy, Military Dictatorship, Monarchy, Tribal Democracy and Public Democracy. The first four tend to be endorsed more frequently by persons with antisocial traits. The last one tends to be endorsed more frequently by persons with pro-social traits.

22. Value of Religion Scale.

This 51-item scale is in 5-option Likert scale format. It measures the value religion has for persons and has been studied only in the United States, presumably with only Christians. The content is somewhat specific to Christianity but it is assumed that the scale could be rather easily adapted to other major faiths and would have similar import in other faiths. The content covers a wide range of subjects, including attendance at religious services, participating in prayer and other personal activities, getting guidance from religious leaders, handling emotional problems and questions about death, and using religion to explain the physical world and how one should live in it.

Sample items:

“I get much comfort from religious services I attend.”.

“Prayer or meditation by myself, is important to me.”

“Religion provides me an explanation of how the world began.”

Basic statistics:

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Sample size</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard deviation</u>	<u>Alpha reliability</u>
Val. of Rel.	46	57	249	152	53.2	.97

Validity data: Pearson product moment correlations with other traits. This data is based on a sample of 46 community college students.

<u>Trait</u>	<u>Sample</u>	<u>Sample Size</u>	<u>Correlation</u>	
Religious fundamentalism	Community college students	46	.71**	
Religiosity	“	46	.80**	
Kindly religious beliefs	“	46	-.04	
Meta religion endorsement	“	46	-.15	
Religious fundamentalism	Unitarian universalists	29	.56**	
Religiosity	“	29	.16	
Kindly religious beliefs	“	29	-.17	
Meta religion endorsement	“	29	-.13	

23. Meta-Religion Endorsement.

This 4-item scale measures endorsement of the idea of a meta religion, represented

by attitudes of universal understanding and cooperation at a spiritual and moral level.

Sample item:

“I would be comfortable with my personal religion including one service each month or so devoted to a theme of universal human concern.”

Study #1:

Basic statistics:

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Sample size</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard deviation</u>	<u>Alpha reliability</u>
Meta Rel. Endorsement.	74	2.00	5.00	3.81	.72	.66

Validity data: Pearson product moment correlations with other traits. This data is based on a sample of 46 community college students and 29 Universalist Unitarians.

<u>Trait</u>	<u>Meta Rel.</u>
Fundamental.	-.45**
Kindly relig. beliefs	.58**
Religious Activity Level (Religiousness)	.30*

Study #2 (6/07):

<u>Scale</u>	<u>Sample size</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard deviation</u>	<u>Alpha reliability</u>
Meta Rel.	40	3	15	10.25	3.14	.83

Endors.						
---------	--	--	--	--	--	--

<u>Trait</u>	<u>Meta Rel.</u>
Relig.Fundamental.	.05
Kindly relig. beliefs	.25
Value of Religion scale	.66**
Religiousness	.41**

24. Authoritarianism Endorsement.

This 30-item scale is described in detail in a manual for it on the author's web site, under "Publications" (politicalpsychologyresearch.com). It measures a trait akin to Altemeyer's Right Wing Authoritarianism scale.

Basic Statistics:

<u>Sample size</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Standard deviation</u>	<u>Alpha reliability</u>
70	40-115	73.2	17.43	.91
42	43-101	76.1	15.91	.90

Validity Data:

<u>Trait</u>	<u>Correlation</u>
Warmongering-44	.56**
Violence-Proneness	.36*
Terrorism endorsement	.03

Section II. Scales.

1. McConochie Social Disenfranchisement scale (McSDS). (Eidelson worldviews).

For each of the statements below, indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with it by circling only one number clearly. Use this code:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

- 1 2 3 4 5 1. I am more special and important than other people are.
- 1 2 3 4 5 2. I deserve more of the good things in life than other people do.
- 1 2 3 4 5 3. I have a right to get more benefits in life than other people do.
- 1 2 3 4 5 4. I should insist that I get and fight for what I want in life.
- 1 2 3 4 5 5. Other people are as worthy of respect as I am.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6. Poor people in poor countries deserve as much as rich people in wealthy countries.
- 1 2 3 4 5 7. All people everywhere should have the same basic human rights.
- 1 2 3 4 5 8. I like to give up some of my wealth to help underprivileged people.
- 1 2 3 4 5 9. I prefer to be a member of a group, religion or nation chosen by fate or other powers to get special treatment.
- 1 2 3 4 5 10. I prefer to be a member of a group of people who are morally superior to other groups.
- 1 2 3 4 5 11. I prefer to be a member of a group which deserves more world resources than other groups.
- 1 2 3 4 5 12. I prefer to be a member of a group which is entitled to special rights that we will fight for, if necessary.
- 1 2 3 4 5 13. I prefer to belong to religious, ethnic or national groups which see themselves as no more favored by fate or other powers than other groups are.
- 1 2 3 4 5 14. I prefer to belong to groups which do not emphasize being superior to others.
- 1 2 3 4 5 15. No groups of people should think of themselves as having privileges at the expense of other groups.

- 1 2 3 4 5 16. I prefer groups of people who promote the basic human rights of other groups as well as their own.
- 1 2 3 4 5 17. I have often been badly mistreated by other people during my lifetime.
- 1 2 3 4 5 18. I have felt betrayed by other people I thought I could count on.
- 1 2 3 4 5 19. Other people are more responsible than I am for most of my problems.
- 1 2 3 4 5 20. I feel like getting even with or retaliating against people who have mistreated me.
- 1 2 3 4 5 21. Other people almost always treat me fairly.
- 1 2 3 4 5 22. I tend to trust most people.
- 1 2 3 4 5 23. People rarely disappoint me.
- 1 2 3 4 5 24. I soon feel safe around strangers I have just met.
- 1 2 3 4 5 25. I have belonged to a group which has been dominated by another stronger group.
- 1 2 3 4 5 26. Another group of people has taken unfair advantage of a group to which I have belonged.
- 1 2 3 4 5 27. Other groups of people have tried to make helpless victims of people in a group I have belonged to.
- 1 2 3 4 5 28. Other groups have used unfair methods to get and keep political power over my group.
- 1 2 3 4 5 29. It is better to combat terrorism with foreign aid and student exchanges than with military intervention.
- 1 2 3 4 5 30. Our nation has been treated justly by other members of the United Nations.
- 1 2 3 4 5 31. Patience and peaceful efforts are better than military action to stop strong countries from victimizing weak ones.
- 1 2 3 4 5 32. A good way to discourage terrorism is to help all people in weaker nations to have opportunity and hope.
- 1 2 3 4 5 33. I often feel threatened by something dangerous or unfortunate.
- 1 2 3 4 5 34. I expect my future will turn out badly.
- 1 2 3 4 5 35. I often feel on guard.
- 1 2 3 4 5 36. Even when things are going well, bad fortune will soon overtake me again.
- 1 2 3 4 5 37. Life almost always goes well for me.
- 1 2 3 4 5 38. I have confidence that my future will bring me more success and happiness.
- 1 2 3 4 5 39. I seldom expect to fail, get hurt or be rejected by people.
- 1 2 3 4 5 40. When things sometimes go badly for me, I know that soon I'll have good fortune again.
- 1 2 3 4 5 41. I belong to at least one group that is often very threatened by other groups.
- 1 2 3 4 5 42. A group I'm in must be prepared to fight other groups before they fight us.
- 1 2 3 4 5 43. A group I'm in has a long history of persecution by other groups.
- 1 2 3 4 5 44. A group I'm in may lose its identity, language or uniqueness because of other dangerous groups.
- 1 2 3 4 5 45. More than ever before, people are tolerant of ethnic diversity.

- 1 2 3 4 5 46. I belong to a group or organization that actively works to promote world peace between nations.
- 1 2 3 4 5 47. I think powerful nations should each adopt a weak nation to befriend and help.
- 1 2 3 4 5 48. I think that weak and unusual peoples, ethnic groups and languages should be protected and cherished.
- 1 2 3 4 5 49. It is wise to assume that strangers are more dangerous than safe.
- 1 2 3 4 5 50. I trust hardly anyone.
- 1 2 3 4 5 51. Most people will take unfair advantage of you if they can.
- 1 2 3 4 5 52. Very few persons are capable of truly cooperating with others.
- 1 2 3 4 5 53. We should teach children to be kind and helpful to all people and animals.
- 1 2 3 4 5 54. Almost everyone is good and kind inside.
- 1 2 3 4 5 55. People turn out badly only if they are mistreated.
- 1 2 3 4 5 56. We can all learn to get along well with each other.
- 1 2 3 4 5 57. Many people of other nations are deliberately trying to harm our nation.
- 1 2 3 4 5 58. Many leaders of foreign countries cannot be trusted to keep their promises.
- 1 2 3 4 5 59. Several other nations are making trouble for us around the world.
- 1 2 3 4 5 60. There are nations which are evil to the core and dangerous to our welfare.
- 1 2 3 4 5 61. Almost all common people in all nations are friendly and kind to foreigners.
- 1 2 3 4 5 62. National leaders in most countries have good intentions and want what's best for all nations.
- 1 2 3 4 5 63. Our nation is wise not to trust most of the nations in the United Nations.
- 1 2 3 4 5 64. I am a member of a group that has good reason to distrust other groups.
- 1 2 3 4 5 65. No matter what I do, my life isn't going to improve.
- 1 2 3 4 5 66. I have given up trying to reach important goals.
- 1 2 3 4 5 67. I am almost powerless to make any real progress.
- 1 2 3 4 5 68. I often feel like a failure.
- 1 2 3 4 5 69. I am always able to make at least a little progress with any of my problems or tasks.
- 1 2 3 4 5 70. I always bounce back and have the energy to try again the next day.
- 1 2 3 4 5 71. I feel strong and effective in accomplishing things.
- 1 2 3 4 5 72. I often enjoy striving toward even quite lofty goals.
- 1 2 3 4 5 73. I belong to a group that always seems to lose out.
- 1 2 3 4 5 74. I am a member of a group which needs but never has had much political power.
- 1 2 3 4 5 75. I am in a group which has little hope of ever improving its fortune.
- 1 2 3 4 5 76. I am in a group which seems convinced that it will always be inferior to

another group.

- 1 2 3 4 5 77. I prefer to be in groups that help weaker groups to succeed.
- 1 2 3 4 5 78. I believe all nations should be helped to have power and respect.
- 1 2 3 4 5 79. Powerful nations should not boast and dominate weaker nations.
- 1 2 3 4 5 80. Powerful countries should be willing to give up some of their power so weaker nations can survive.

Scale	Items	Reverse-scored items
Superiority - Individual level	1-8	5,6,8
Superiority - Group level	9-16	12,14,15
Injustice - Indiv.	17-24	21,22,23,24
Injustice - Grp.	25-32	29,30,31,32
Vulnerability - Individual	33-40	37,38,39,40
Vulnerability - Group	41-48	45,46,47,48
Distrust - Ind.	49-56	53,54,55,56
Distrust - Grp.	57-64	61,62
Helplessness - Ind.	65-72	65,69,70,71,72
Helplessness - Grp.	73-80	77,78,79,80

Total Individual score	Total across the five individual scale scores.
Total Group score	Total across the five group scale scores.
Grand total score	Total Individual plus Total Group scores.

To score, first compute reverse item scores. Then add across each scale. Then compute the total scores.

2. McConochie Sustainability Endorsement scale. (McSusEnd scale). 12 items in five-option Likert format. No reverse-scored items. The score is the sum of raw scores across the items.

My national government should support...

1. ...international treaties and efforts to reduce greenhouse gasses and global warming.
2. ...international treaties and efforts to reduce nuclear weapons and missiles that deliver them.
3. ...the United Nations with money and cooperation.
4. ...replacement of gasoline and diesel fuels with non-polluting fuels.
5. ...replacement of gas and coal-fired generators with non-polluting nuclear and solar generators.
6. ...restriction of harvesting from forests and fisheries to levels that are sustainable for generations (forever).
7. ...use of prime agricultural land for agricultural use only (forever).
8. ...restriction of use of fresh water resources (rivers and wells) to sustainable levels (forever).
9. ...development of reasonable population limits and helping communities maintain them.
10. ...a national health care system that provides basic, affordable care.
11. ...local community rights to restrict the broadcasting or marketing of products that have been shown by research to promote violent thinking and behavior.
12. ...local community rights to restrict the marketing or broadcasting of products that have been shown by research to promote criminal sexual behavior.

3. McConochie Positive Foreign Policy Endorsement scale. (McPFP scale).

In 5-option Likert scale format. Items 1-4 are reverse-scored. The score is the sum of raw scores across the 12 items.

“Regarding Foreign Policy, how our nation relates to other nations, how strongly do you agree or disagree with each of the following foreign policy positions?”

In foreign policy, our nation should:

1. Get as much natural resources from other countries as we can afford.
2. Buy as much inexpensive products as we can, even if it means some U.S. adults

are unemployed as a result.

3. Control the world with military power.
4. Ignore how much pollution of air and water we cause by our use of natural resources such as oil and coal.
5. Set limits on our consumption so resources are available for other nations.
6. Help other countries with peaceful means rather than military ones.
7. Promote prosperity, stability and peace in other nations by student exchanges, cultural and sport exchanges and tourism.
8. Help other countries by medical aid to fight AIDS and other diseases.
9. Help other countries by supporting the United Nations.
10. Fight civil wars in and terrorism from other countries by helping other countries provide opportunities, jobs, education and better standards of living.
11. Help other countries develop and maintain sustainable communities and economies by population control, agricultural development, education, women's rights promotion, etc.
12. Agree to international arms control and pollution control treaties to reduce the dangers from wars, global warming and destruction of forests, ocean fisheries, etc.

4. McConochie Proportional Public School Budgeting endorsement scale. (McPPSB scale).

This scale is introduced in questionnaires with two definitions and then presented as three questions, as follows:

“For the next three questions, consider these two possible types of local public school budgeting systems:

A. Contract-driven budgeting: School budget allocations are dictated by contracts, such as between teacher unions and school boards, such that the salaries and benefits of tenured, long term teachers take priority over all other aspects of the budget (supplies, utilities, buildings, ball fields, club and sport programs, etc.). If budgets are cut, tenured teachers' salaries and budgets are not cut. All other program budgets are reduced and classroom sizes go up. If budgets go up, the first priority is given to increasing teacher salaries and benefits. Then other budget items are considered.

B . Proportional budgeting: A proportion of each school dollar is always protected

and used only for a specific portion of the budget. Classroom sizes are constantly at 22 students. Teacher salaries are determined by a formula involving the amount of money available for salaries divided by the number of classes (22 students per class) etc. When budgets decrease, all aspects of the budget are reduced proportionally, but no teachers or programs are eliminated. Classroom sizes stay the same. When budgets increase, all portions of the budget increase proportionally. All programs get more money. Classroom sizes stay the same.

Answer these questions using this code:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

1. If I were a public school teacher, I would prefer to work under system B rather than system A.
2. If I were a parent, I would prefer to have my child educated under system B rather than system A.
3. If I were a taxpayer, I would prefer to support system B rather than system A.”

The score is the sum of scores across the three items. None are reverse scored.

5. McConochie Pro-Public Democracy endorsement scale. (McPPD).

This scale is the sum of scores across five items, as presented below. The first four items are reverse-scored. In many studies, correlations are simply run between other traits and each of the five government type items themselves, with interesting results.

“Please rate the five forms of government below as to how desirable you think they are. Use this code

1	2	3	4	5
Very undesirable	Undesirable	Neutral	Desirable	Very desirable

1. Anarchy. No government at all, just roving bands of armed bandits who rob,

kill and do whatever they want.

2. Military dictatorship, headed by a powerful military leader who controls everything and everyone in the country and prevents anyone else from replacing him.
3. Monarchy, headed by a king or queen, with a supportive parliament of elected representatives. They run the country as they “benevolently” see fit.
4. Tribal democracy. Elected officials run the government to serve the short-term economic interests of the special interest groups (“economic tribes”) which helped them get elected.
5. Public democracy. Elected officials run the government to serve the current and long-term best interests of the community overall, including sustainable programs such as conservation of resources and control of pollution and global warming. No one special interest group or groups are favored.”

6. Mc Conochie Warmongering-10 scale. (McWar-10).

7. Warmongering-12.

8. Warmongering-20.

9. Warmongering-32

These four scales vary in number of items but basically are the same items in different size clusters. As for virtually all scales developed by the author, items are retained in these scales only if they have correlated strongly and significantly with the total score for the scale. Scores are computed as the mean item score across the number of items used. Thus, theoretically, mean items scores on each scale can range from 1.0 to 5.0. The items are presented in 5-option Likert scale format, from 1 representing “Strongly Disagree” to 5 representing “Strongly Agree”.

Researchers can make up their own scales simply by selecting those items from any of the scales that best fit their situation. For example, item 2 in the Warmongering-10 scale below would not be appropriate for use in Iraq. Sometimes, because of a need for economy, researchers need very brief measures of traits. You could build a scale of as few as five items, if they are good ones, and still probably get a reliable measure. To aid you in selecting items, if you wish to, the correlation between each item and the total score for the 20-item scale is presented in the list below. All of these correlations are significant at the .01 level on a sample of 376 persons. In building a scale, choose items with high correlations but which are different from each other in content. This will help

maximize reliability.

Warmongering-10:

1. My national government should do what best serves our nation's interests, at the expense of other nations, enforced by military action if necessary.
2. President Bush was justified in attacking Iraq and tracking down Saddam Hussein.
3. It is more reasonable to spend money for a stronger military force than for a national health care program.
4. It is wiser to spend more money for a strong military than for non-military peace-promoting foreign aid, trade, student exchanges and tourism.
5. It is more honorable to serve one's nation as a warrior in combat than as an anti-war protester.
6. The United States should have stuck it out in South Vietnam until it won the war.
7. The United States was justified in killing off Native American Indians and taking control of their land.
8. Centuries ago, the Spaniards were justified in killing natives in Central and South America to get their silver and gold.
9. A good reason for our nation going to war is to kill enemy soldiers and civilians in order to reduce population numbers so there are more resources for the people of our nation.
10. A good reason for our nation going to war is to assure access to whatever raw materials, such as oil, we need from other nations."

Warmongering-12 (Omitted because the 10 and 20-item scales can be used.)

Warmongering-20

Reverse-scored items: 120, 127, (133), 134, 136

- | | | |
|------|-----|--|
| 117. | .59 | I would like to fly a military jet fighter plane and shoot its cannons. |
| 118. | .54 | When I select a car to buy, I do not think much about how many miles per gallon it will get. |
| 119. | .56 | President Bush was justified in attacking Iraq and tracking down Saddam Hussein. |
| 120. | .45 | Abraham Lincoln was justified in freeing the slaves. |
| 121. | .64 | I admire Adolf Hitler, Chancellor of Germany during World War II. |
| 122. | .34 | I prefer to associate only with people much like myself. |
| 123. | .56 | If I were President, I would want to have a good supply of nuclear weapons and |

- powerful military forces that could deliver them at my command.
124. .55 If I were the leader of a nation, I would be willing to take strong measures to repress persons in my country who opposed my leadership.
125. .56 I would rather own a pit bull terrier than a golden retriever dog.
126. .63 Nazi Germany was justified in invading other countries in World War II.
127. .30 Our country should avoid going to war at all costs.
128. .61 Our country should go to war whenever we think our access to resources in other countries is threatened.
129. .54 I like to watch war movies.
130. .61 I like to play combat video games.
131. .55 I would like to learn how to make home-made bombs.
132. .32 I support the National Rifle Association fight to protect our right to have firearms.
133. (.12) (I would resent being drafted to fight in almost any kind of war for my nation.)
(This item is not included in the War-20 scale because of the low correlation.)
134. .34 Military leaders who start wars that kill many civilians indiscriminately should be tried as war criminals.
135. .60 Ethnic cleansing, to rid the world of undesirable types of people, is a justified aspect of wars.
136. .33 If questionnaires like the one I have just taken could reliably identify persons who are interested in starting wars, then candidates for national political office in my country should have to pass them to make sure they do not get elected.
137. .72 Military battles are a noble and glorious activity.

Warmongering-32

This 32-item warmongering scale is presented in five-option Likert scale format. The respondent indicates his/her degree of agreement or disagreement for with each item along a 5-point scale. Reverse-scored items are indicated by an asterisk, *. The score is the mean item score across all 32 items. This scale is highly reliable (alpha of .95).

1. I feel like getting even with or retaliating against people who have mistreated me.
2. My national government should do whatever best serves the interests of our nation's interests, at the expense of other nations, enforced by military action if necessary.
3. Our nation should be guided by the principle: "Might makes right; survival of the fittest."
4. * Our nation should be guided by the principle: "Cooperate, compromise and help others; survival of the kindest."
5. If my government asked me to, I would be willing to reduce my consumption of gasoline or other transportation budget by 10 percent to help reduce greenhouse gasses and global warming.
6. I would like to fly a military jet fighter plane and shoot its cannons.
7. President Bush was justified in attacking Iraq and tracking down Saddam Hussein.
8. I admire Adolf Hitler, Chancellor of Germany during World War II.
9. If I were President, I would want to have a good supply of nuclear weapons and powerful

military forces that could deliver them at my command.

10. If I were the leader of a nation, I would be willing to take strong measures to repress persons in my country who opposed my leadership.

11. Nazi Germany was justified in invading other countries in World War II.

12. * Our country should avoid going to war at all costs.

13. Our country should go to war whenever we think our access to resources in other countries is threatened.

14. I like to watch war movies.

15. * I would resent being drafted to fight in almost any kind of war for my nation.

16. * Military leaders who start wars that kill many civilians indiscriminately should be tried as war criminals.

17. Ethnic cleansing, to rid the world of undesirable types of people, is a justified aspect of wars.

18. * If questionnaires like the one I have just taken could reliably identify persons who are interested in starting wars, then candidates for national political office in my country should have to pass them to make sure they do not get elected.

19. Military battles are a noble and glorious activity.

20. I would rather have an ex-military general for President of our nation than a non-military person.

21. In war, it is reasonable to kill many enemy civilians by bombing cities to lower morale.

22. It is reasonable to let prisoners of war starve if food is scarce.

23. It is more reasonable to spend money for a stronger military force than for a national health care program.

24. It is wiser to spend more money for a strong military than for non-military peace-promoting foreign aid, trade, student exchanges and tourism.

25. It is reasonable to use prisoners of war as slave laborers during time of war.

26. If a nation has problems due to a growing population it is more reasonable for them to conquer other nations by war for more space and resources than to control the size of their population.

27. If a citizen refuses to fight in his nation's war because he is a pacifist, he should be considered a traitor.

28. It is more honorable to serve one's nation as a warrior in combat than as an anti-war protester.

29. The United States should have stuck it out in South Viet Nam until it won the war.

30. The United States was justified in killing off Native American Indians and taking control of their land.

31. Centuries ago, the Spaniards were justified in killing natives in Central and South America to get their silver and gold.

32. Centuries ago, the Romans were justified in invading and conquering Europe and Great Britain to expand the Roman Empire.

9-A. Warmongering-44. No reverse-scored items.

Please click on one number for each item below to indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement. Use this code:

--	--	--	--	--

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral, or between 2 and 4	Agree	Strongly agree

1. I would like to be the leader of a nation with much military power.
2. I endorse organizations that fight for civilians= rights to have guns.
3. If I were the leader of a nation, I would be willing to take strong measures to repress persons in my country who opposed me.
4. I think I would enjoy flying a military jet airplane or tank and shooting its cannons.
5. President Bush was justified in attacking Iraq and tracking down Saddam Hussein.
6. The Roman Empire was justified in invading neighboring countries to expand its power.
7. Using captured enemies for slave labor in time of war is a wise strategy.
8. My national government should do what best serves our nation=s interests, at the expense of other nations, enforced by military action if necessary.
9. I admire Adolph Hitler, Chancellor of Germany during World War II.
10. I would enjoy being a military commander, designing battle plans.
11. Some industries of a nation should always stay strong by building and selling military weapons even in times of peace.
12. Military leaders who start wars that kill many civilians should not be tried as war criminals.
13. I like to read or hear true stories of military battles.
14. A nation is justified in invading other nations to stop them from building up powerful weapons.
15. Centuries ago, the Spaniards were justified in killing natives in Central and South America to get their silver and gold.
16. Ethnic cleansing to rid the world of undesirable types of people is a justified aspect of war.
17. War is God=s and nature=s best way of deciding who should survive.
18. I admire ancient military leaders, such as Genghis Kahn, Attila the Hun, and Alexander the Great.
19. It is more honorable to serve one=s nation as a warrior in combat than as an anti-war protester.
20. It is more reasonable to spend money for a stronger military force than for a national health care program.
21. If necessary to maintain my power as a leader, I would be willing to imprison and execute anyone I thought was a traitor.
22. I like to watch war movies.
23. Nazi Germany was justified in invading Russia in World War II.
24. The ancient Inca and Aztec nations were justified in invading neighboring countries to build their power.

25. During war, killing civilians in enemy countries to lower morale is a reasonable military action.
26. It is wiser to spend more money for a strong military than for non-military peace-promoting foreign aid, trade, student exchanges and tourism.
27. I admire powerful and clever persons such as Osama Bin Laden and persons who have assassinated political leaders to promote their causes.
28. The military is the most important aspect of any government.
29. A strong military leader must be ruthless in demanding obedience from his subordinates.
30. I like to play military games, such as video games involving shooting enemies.
31. The United States was justified in killing off Native American Indians and taking control of their land.
32. The United States should have stuck it out in South Vietnam until it won the war.
33. Our country should go to war whenever we think our access to resources in other countries is threatened.
34. I admire military subordinates who carry out their orders to kill and exterminate prisoners and civilians, even if breaking some international conventions or laws.
35. I find military parades exciting and inspiring.
36. A good reason to promote athletic competition and scouting programs in youth is to ready them for military combat.
37. I admire powerful national leaders who eliminated others in their nation on their way to power.
38. I would like to learn more about how to make bombs and how military weapons work.
39. Japan was justified in invading the Philippines in World War II.
40. The government should keep the importance of a strong military on civilian minds, as by sponsoring daily television programs that feature victorious war films and programs.
41. Military forces in Israel and Palestine have been well justified in invading and killing each other and civilians.
42. A good reason for our nation going to war is to kill enemy soldiers and civilians in order to reduce population numbers so there are more resources for the people of our nation.
43. War is a noble and glorious activity.
44. A good reason for our nation going to war is to assure access to whatever raw materials, such as oil, we need from other nations.

10. McConochie Warmongering-Proneness scale (McWap).

This scale is presented in questionnaires without a questionnaire title indicating what overall trait is being measured, so as not to “prime” or bias the rater, as follows:

“Circle one number for each of the items below to rate the person, thinking carefully of the

specific objective evidence that supports your rating. Consider statements made by the person or behaviors while seeking leadership or acting as a leader. Consider friendships, favors accepted or given and overt affiliations or group memberships. For historical figures, mentally translate each item into the past tense. For example, read item 1 as “Did the person belong to a group....etc.”

“Use this code:

1	2	3	4	5
Strong evidence against the trait.	Some evidence against the trait.	Neutral. A position between 2&4, or not sure.	Some evidence for the trait.	Strong evidence for the trait.

- 1 2 3 4 5 1. Does the person belong to a group, organization or social class that feels helpless?
- 1 2 3 4 5 2. Does the person belong to a group that feels a sense of injustice?
- 1 2 3 4 5 3. Does the person belong to a group that feels distrust in other groups?
- 1 2 3 4 5 4. Does the person belong to a group that feels vulnerable?
- 1 2 3 4 5 5. Does the person belong to a group that feels superior to other groups?
- 1 2 3 4 5 6. Is it likely that the person feels like a failure in careers longed for or engaged in?
- 1 2 3 4 5 7. Does the person tend to think rigidly, inflexibly, unable to consider alternative points of view, alternative courses of action?
- 1 2 3 4 5 8. Does the person seem to have a lack of guilt for wrongdoing either by him/herself or by persons with whom he/she closely identifies?
- 1 2 3 4 5 9. Does the person seem preoccupied with or frequently concerned about being rejected by others?
- 1 2 3 4 5 10. Does the person engage in activities that suggest pleasure from hostile acts, such as participating in or watching violent sports, or recreational activities?
- 1 2 3 4 5 11. Does the person seem to have a reservoir of unresolved anger. For example, does he/she bear grudges? Are there persons or groups with which he/she seems constantly at odds?
- 1 2 3 4 5 12. Does the person have gun skill and access to guns? (Or to other common combat weapons.)
- 1 2 3 4 5 13. Does the person seem unwilling to ask for help with personal or business problems, to carefully consider helpful suggestions or other offers of assistance?
- 1 2 3 4 5 14. Does the person show an unwillingness to help reduce violence in the community?
- 1 2 3 4 5 15. Does the person seem comfortable lying and/or using propaganda?
- 1 2 3 4 5 16. Does the person seem interested in dominating other individuals or groups?
- 1 2 3 4 5 17. Does the person seem to think it is his/her position, right or duty to dominate others?
- 1 2 3 4 5 18. Does the person hold membership in groups or organizations who advocate dominating other groups?
- 1 2 3 4 5 19. Does the person maintain an authoritarian stance vis a vis other persons or

- groups?
- 1 2 3 4 5 20. Does the person associate with or endorse groups that advocate authoritarian views, opinions or actions?
- 1 2 3 4 5 21. Does the person hold fundamental religious beliefs, e.g. that there is only one true God and that anyone that disagrees with this belief is wrong?
- 1 2 3 4 5 22. Does the person disavow kindly religious beliefs, e.g. that all peoples should strive to cooperate and compromise to get along together?
- 1 2 3 4 5 23. Does the person advocate or condone anarchy forms of government?
- 1 2 3 4 5 24. Does the person advocate or support military dictatorship forms of government?
- 1 2 3 4 5 25. Does the person advocate government serving special interest groups rather than citizens in general?
- 1 2 3 4 5 26. Does the person have a messianic self-image, a sense of personal destiny or duty to achieve great things?
- 1 2 3 4 5 27. Does the person lack a college education? (Or other advanced education typical of his/her time and culture.)
- 1 2 3 4 5 28. Does the person lack verbal intelligence? Be careful in rating this one. Don't assume that a person is not intelligent just because they have done a few "stupid" things. High verbal intelligence is often reflected in traits and activities such as sophisticated conversation, good memory, comprehensive awareness of relevant information, high grades in school, high levels of formal education, significant achievement in career activities, etc. Don't assume the person has high verbal intelligence just because they have a college degree.
- 1 2 3 4 5 29. Does the person disavow endorsement of human rights, e.g. prisoner of war rights and equal status for women?
- 1 2 3 4 5 30. Does the person disavow international global warming treaties? (Or similar international accords.)
- 1 2 3 4 5 31. Does the person disavow international arms control treaties? (Or similar international accords.)
- 1 2 3 4 5 32. Does the person disavow endorsement of fossil fuel conservation and eventual replacement with renewable, non-polluting fuels? (Or similar conservation and sharing internationally of fuel resources of his/her time and culture.)
- 1 2 3 4 5 33. Does the person disavow conservation of forests and fresh water fisheries?
- 1 2 3 4 5 34. Does the person disavow public democracy, direct participation by the public in government policy decision-making?
- 1 2 3 4 5 35. Does the person disavow a kindly foreign policy, e.g. fighting terrorism with non-military means more than military ones?
- 1 2 3 4 5 36. Does the person disavow a kindly foreign policy helping other nations achieve their goals?
- 1 2 3 4 5 37. Does the person disavow support of the United Nations organization? (Or for other similar efforts to promote international cooperation and peace.)
- 1 2 3 4 5 38. Does the person have a disagreeable personality, being oppositional, irritable, contrary, argumentative or unsupportive of others?
- 1 2 3 4 5 39. Does the person have tendencies toward anxiety, depression or other signs of

- emotional instability?
- 1 2 3 4 5 40. Does the person have strong trust in top government leaders and cabinet members?
- 1 2 3 4 5 41. Does the person advocate unquestioning loyalty to such leaders?
- 1 2 3 4 5 42. Does the person think spending for military activities should be increased?
- 1 2 3 4 5 43. Does the person disavow the idea of his/her national budget being determined by direct vote of the citizens?
- 1 2 3 4 5 44. Does the person think his/her nation should try to control the world with military power?
- 1 2 3 4 5 45. Does the person advocate retaliation against wrongdoers?
- 1 2 3 4 5 46. Does the person advocate access to and use of nuclear weapons or other very destructive weapons, if needed to achieve military ends?
- 1 2 3 4 5 47. Does the person have interest in military activities, manufacturers, armed forces, weapons?
- 1 2 3 4 5 48. Does the person enjoy war movies, war stories, hostile video games? (Or other such theatrical entertainment of a bellicose theme.)
- 1 2 3 4 5 49. Does the person think war is a noble and glorious activity?
- 1 2 3 4 5 50. Does the person think that powerful nations in the past have been justified in killing peoples in underdeveloped countries to get control of their gold, silver, land or other resources?"

Alternatively, answers can be put on a machine-scorable answer sheet. The score is the mean item score across all 50 items. Averaging ratings across several careful, well-informed raters is recommended.

11. McConochie Xenophobia scale (McX).

This is an 8-item scale in 5-option Likert format designed to measure xenophobia (fear of foreigners) expressed in terms of a preference for living in the interior of the United States, as represented by Kansas. Item 6 is reverse scored. Items 6 and 8 did not correlate significantly with the total score, so were eliminated in scoring. If they do not hold up in subsequent studies, they should be eliminated.

1. I would rather live in the interior of my country than near the border.
2. I would rather live in Kansas, the geographical center of the United States, than in California.
3. I would rather live in Kansas than in Minnesota.
4. I would rather live in Kansas than in Texas.
5. I would rather live in Kansas than in New York.
6. I would feel safer living on the East Coast or West Coast than in the Midwest.
7. I prefer not to travel outside the United States.
8. In a few important ways, United States citizens are better than citizens from other nations.

12. Political Lying and Conniving Endorsement.

With data for 68 churchgoers, items 6, 8 and 9 did not correlate significantly with the total score for all 15 items, so they were omitted from the calculations. It is possible that these items would correlate with the total score with other samples of persons. However, in my studies three scales were created and studied, a Political Lying scale consisting of items 1, 4, 5 and 11, a Political Conniving scale consisting of items 2, 3, 7, 10, 12, 13, 14 and 15 and a total scale combining the two.

Scale items:

138. Political leaders should be willing and able to skillfully lie to the public if necessary to promote and defend their actions.
139. An effective politician must be willing to accept money from lobbyists or others in return for for political favors that the politician can provide.
140. Effective politicians must be willing to take and pay occasional bribes, though they may not be termed as such.
141. If I were a politician I would be willing to lie to win votes in elections.
142. If I were a politician I would be willing to make promises to voters at times, even if I knew I couldn't keep them.
143. I have respected national politicians even after they lied to the press or public.
144. If I were a politician, I would be willing to vote for legislation that wasn't necessarily good for the people in return for votes on legislation that I wanted to pass.
145. It does not bother me that money buys political power.
146. Politicians must be willing to provide jobs, government contracts and other favors to supporters of their election campaigns.
147. If I were a politician, I would feel comfortable paying money to a news reporter to keep him or her quiet about a fact that would hurt my reputation.
148. It is okay for my preferred political party candidates to lie to win votes.
149. It is okay for my political party to rig voting machines in their favor.
150. It is okay for my political party candidates to accept secret campaign money contributions.
151. It is okay for my party elected politicians to break rules to pass legislation.
152. It is okay for my elected politicians to accept bribes and favors.

13. McConochie Propaganda Endorsement scale (McPEnd).

The four propaganda slogan items are:

“If you're not for me you're against me.”

“Lead, follow or get out of the way.”

“When the going gets tough, the tough get going”

“It’s a nasty job, but somebody has to do it.”

The score is simply the sum of scores across the items, which are presented in Likert scale format, five options, 1 being “Strongly disagree, 5 “Strongly agree.”

14. McConochie Messianic Self-image scale (McMS-IS). This 5-item scale is also presented in Likert scale format, as for the propaganda endorsement scale. It is scored in the same manner as well.

“I have sometimes felt a sense of mission to do something important for humankind.”

“I have felt that I may have a special destiny in life.”

“I have felt that I may have been chosen by fate for some certain role.”

“I believe that I may have a unique religious calling of some sort.”

“I believe that I am qualified to fulfill some higher duty in the service of humankind.”

15. McConochie Religious Fundamentalism scale (McRFun).

16. McConochie Kindly Religious Beliefs scale (McKRel).

These two scales are usually presented in research studies together in the form below. Scoring is the sum of scores across items in each scale after reverse scoring some items, indicated by “R” in the following item lists. The correlations with the total score for the respective scale are given to facilitate creation of briefer scales as needed by research projects. Correlations with scale total scores are presented for the items in each scale. There are 17 Religious Fundamentalism items and 13 Kindly Religious beliefs items.

<u>Scale item</u>	<u>Religious Fundamentalism scale items (17).</u>	<u>Kindly Religious Beliefs scale items (13).</u>
1	-	.42
2	.25	-
3.	.66	-
4.	.69	-
5.	-	.73

6.	-	.61
7.	-	.62
8.	-	-
9.	R .47	.37
10.	R .65	-
11.	-	.68
12.	-	.50
13.	-	.48
14.	-	.41
15.	-	.51
16.	-	.49
17.	.44	-
18.	.42	-
19.	.28	-
20.	-	.43
21.	R .53	.35
22.	-	-
23.	R .41	-
24.	-	-
25.	.25	-
26.	R .40	-
27.	.46	-
28.	.-	-
29.	.39	-

30.	R .46	-
31.	R .45	-
32.	R .74	-

The scale items are presented in questionnaires as follows:

“Basic Ethical Principles:

Please circle one number to indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each item, using this code:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

As the world becomes smaller through improvements in communications, transportation and trade, we face challenges between ideologies, both religious and other ideologies. How strongly do you agree with these general statements?

- 1 2 3 4 5 Ge1. The peoples of all nations should learn to live peacefully together, resolving differences not by economic or military might but by discussion, working together, increasing understanding of one another and compromising.
- 1 2 3 4 5 Ge2. The peoples of all nations should compete with each other in business, trade and, if necessary, in war, to let the “best nation win”.

Which source of ethics should guide the peoples of the world in relating to each other? If we know which ethics people prefer, perhaps we can form a “world ethic” to guide all peoples who choose to work cooperatively with each other.

There are different sources of social ethics one can turn to, including those embodied in religions, those embodied in universal charters and those that guide international organizations. Consider the ethical principles below, selected from various sources. Indicate how strongly you agree with each as an ethical principle or value that should guide interactions between nations.

From various world religions:

- 1 2 3 4 5 1. There is only one true god (or God) which all people of the world should worship.
- 1 2 3 4 5 2 All religions which do not ascribe to this belief (#3, above) are wrong.
- 1 2 3 4 5 3 Violence toward one’s fellow humans is not appropriate.

- 1 2 3 4 5 4. Stealing from one's fellow humans is not appropriate.
- 1 2 3 4 5 5. Lying, slander and tattling are not appropriate.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6. We should strive for good and stop bad.
- 1 2 3 4 5 7. Meditating on feelings of personal inner serenity is appropriate.
- 1 2 3 4 5 8. *Any* specific personal religious beliefs are appropriate and acceptable as long as they respect human dignity and welfare.
- 1 2 3 4 5 9. Killing other people is not appropriate.
- 1 2 3 4 5 10. One should love his neighbor as himself and treat others as he would like to be treated.
- 1 2 3 4 5 11. One should not treat others the way he would not want to be treated.
- 1 2 3 4 5 12. Using a god's name as an excuse for or justification of evil against one's fellow man is inappropriate.
- 1 2 3 4 5 13. One should forgive rather than retaliate against wrongdoers.
- 1 2 3 4 5 14. One should help others who are less fortunate or are suffering.
- 1 2 3 4 5 15. One should submit to the will of god (or God).
- 1 2 3 4 5 16. One should submit to the will of religious or political leaders who say they know what god (or God) wants.
- 1 2 3 4 5 17. Unquestioning loyalty to superiors, including political leaders, is appropriate.
- 1 2 3 4 5 18. Feeling envy or jealousy is inappropriate.
- 1 2 3 4 5 19. Experiencing life as a good person is more important than practicing rituals or believing certain ideas or obeying any code of fixed rules, "dos" and "don'ts".
- 1 2 3 4 5 20. One should joyfully accept nature.
- 1 2 3 4 5 21. One cannot and should not own the land.
- 1 2 3 4 5 22. Practicing rituals and taboos is appropriate.
- 1 2 3 4 5 23. Honoring and respecting parents and elders is appropriate.

- 1 2 3 4 5 24. Worshiping the spirits of dead ancestors is appropriate.
- 1 2 3 4 5 25. Honoring and respecting parents and elders is appropriate.
- 1 2 3 4 5 26. Worshiping the spirits of dead ancestors is appropriate.

What features do you think an ideal god (or God) should have?

- 1 2 3 4 5 27. Is vengeful, punishes wrongdoers.
- 1 2 3 4 5 28. Is kind and forgiving of wrongdoers.
- 1 2 3 4 5 29. Is the creator of the universe and everything in it, including people.
- 1 2 3 4 5 30. Is an abstract concept, a creation of humans to help them live constructively with each other.
- 1 2 3 4 5 31. Can be well-defined simply as the spirit of human kindness and love.
- 1 2 3 4 5 32. Takes many forms that guide the religious lives of many different peoples around the world.”

17. McConochie Religiousness scale (McRelScl) (Religiosity). The three items in this scale are presented in the earlier discussion, above.

18. McConochie Human Rights Endorsement scale. (McHRts).

This scale consists of 44 items. None are reverse-scored. The score is the sum of the individual item scores. The items are presented as follows below. The score is simply the sum across the 44 items.

The 16-item version consists of items 10, 11, 12, 14, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 34, 35, 36, 37, 40 and 42.

“Please indicate how strongly do you agree or disagree with the following principles... from the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

www.unhcr.ch/udhr/lang/eng_print.htm

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree
-------------------	----------	---------	-------	----------------

- 1 2 3 4 5 1. All people of all nations should have the same basic human rights, such as life and liberty.
- 1 2 3 4 5 2. Slavery is wrong.
- 1 2 3 4 5 3. No one should be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile from his/her nation.
- 1 2 3 4 5 4. Everyone should have the right to travel within his country and between countries.
- 1 2 3 4 5 5. Everyone should have the right to own property, alone or with others.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6. Everyone should have the right to freedom of opinion and expression.
- 1 2 3 4 5 7. Everyone should have the right to take part in the governance of his country.
- 1 2 3 4 5 8. The will of the people should be the basis of the authority of government, expressed in periodic elections.
- 1 2 3 4 5 9. The people should have the right to vote on government policy, not just on persons running for government office.
- 1 2 3 4 5 10. Everyone should have the right to work for a living in a job freely chosen and for a reasonable wage.
- 1 2 3 4 5 11. Everyone should have the right to a free basic education which, among other things, promotes understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations and all racial and religious groups.

From the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the World's Religions:
www.gerforum.org/human.html

- 1 2 3 4 5 12. Everyone has the right to food, clothing and shelter.
- 1 2 3 4 5 13. Everyone has the duty to support and sustain life, longevity and livability of the environment of all people.
- 1 2 3 4 5 14. Everyone is equal before the law and entitled to equal protection before the law without discrimination on grounds of race, religion, caste, sex or sexual orientation.
- 1 2 3 4 5 15. Everyone has the right *not* to have one's religion denigrated by public media or education professors.
- 1 2 3 4 5 16. It is the duty of everyone to extend special consideration to mothers and children.
- 1 2 3 4 5 17. Everyone has the right to own property, whether material, intellectual aesthetic or spiritual.
- 1 2 3 4 5 18. Everyone has the right to choose his own religion and the duty to promote peace and tolerance among different religions and ideologies.

- 1 2 3 4 5 19. Everyone over the age of 18 has the right to vote or be elected to the governance of their community.
- 1 2 3 4 5 20. Everyone has the right to join or not join a trade union for the protection of worker interests.
- 1 2 3 4 5 21. Everyone has the right to health and to universal medical insurance.
- 1 2 3 4 5 22. Everyone has the right to work and to rest, including the right to support while seeking work and the right to periodic holidays with pay.
- 1 2 3 4 5 23. Everyone has the right to share scientific advances and their benefits and the duty to disseminate them, and, wherever possible, to contribute to such advances.
- 1 2 3 4 5 24. Everyone is duty-bound, when asserting one's rights, to take into consideration the rights of other human beings and of past, present and future generations, and the rights of nature and the earth.

From the Earth Charter: (www.eathcharter.org/files/charter/charterpdf)

- 1 2 3 4 5 25. All beings are interdependent and every form of life has value regardless of its current worth to human beings.
- 1 2 3 4 5 26. Everyone has the duty to prevent environmental harm.
- 1 2 3 4 5 27. With increased freedom, knowledge and power comes increased responsibility to promote the common good.
- 1 2 3 4 5 28. We should adopt at all levels sustainable development plans and regulations that take into consideration environmental conservation and rehabilitation.
- 1 2 3 4 5 29. We should manage the use of renewable resources, such as water, soil, forests and marine life, in ways that do not exceed rates of regeneration and that protect the health of ecosystems.
- 1 2 3 4 5 30. We should carefully conserve and manage our extraction and use of non-renewable resources, such as fossil fuels and minerals.
- 1 2 3 4 5 31. We should prevent and minimize pollution in any part of the environment.
- 1 2 3 4 5 32. We should reduce, recycle and reuse materials used in production and consumption.
- 1 2 3 4 5 33. We should promote the active participation of women in all aspects of economic, political, civil, social and cultural life.
- 1 2 3 4 5 34. We should affirm the right of indigenous (native) peoples to their spirituality, knowledge, lands and resources and to their related practices of sustainable livelihoods.
- 1 2 3 4 5 35. We should promote local, regional and global civil society, and promote the meaningful participation of all interested individuals and organizations in decision making at the local, regional and global level.
- 1 2 3 4 5 36. We should encourage and support mutual understanding, solidarity and cooperation among all peoples and within and among nations.
- 1 2 3 4 5 37. We should implement comprehensive strategies to prevent violent conflict and use collaborative problem solving to manage and resolve environmental conflicts and other disputes.

- 1 2 3 4 5 38. We should demilitarize national security systems to the level of a non-provocative defense posture and dedicate money saved to constructive uses, such as restoring damaged environments or national health care systems.
- 1 2 3 4 5 39. We should eliminate nuclear, biological and toxic weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.
- 1 2 3 4 5 40. We should strive for a sustainable global community, honoring the efforts of the United Nations and supporting appropriate international treaties.

From Rotary International:

One's behavior in business, personal life and other areas should:

- 1 2 3 4 5 41. ... be based on truthful statements.
- 1 2 3 4 5 42. ... be fair to all concerned.
- 1 2 3 4 5 43. ... be beneficial to all concerned.
- 1 2 3 4 5 44. ... build good will and better friendships.

19. At Risk for Violence Test.

This test is available over the author's web site, with versions for both teens and adults. Scoring is done automatically via the site. This is a commercial product for which there is a fee for reports showing scores for subscales. A total score can be used for research purposes. First, reverse score these items: 7, 9, 16, 19, 27, 30, 33, 36, 39, 41, 45, 52, 54 and 58

The adult version is presented below. When using the Internet version over the Internet, getting reports with subscale scores, be sure to download and use the version off the web site, as the item order is slightly different from that below.

At Risk for Violence test (ARFV). Adult version.

Name _____ Date: _____

Male ____ Female ____ Age: _____

Stress Response Questionnaire
ARFV - Adult

To help us understand how you handle stress, please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements. Circle one number 1 through 4 below for each item, using this code.

1	2	3	4
---	---	---	---

Strongly disagree.	Disagree	Agree.	Strongly agree.
--------------------	----------	--------	-----------------

- 1 2 3 4 1. When I am in arguments with others, I try to have the last word and win.
- 1 2 3 4 2. When I have a problem with another person, there is just one best way to solve it.
- 1 2 3 4 3. I know better how the world should be than most of the adults I know.
- 1 2 3 4 4. A lot of the people I have to deal with seem really stupid to me.
- 1 2 3 4 5. I think often about something I might do when very angry that would make everyone pay attention to me.
- 1 2 3 4 6. The grades I got in school were much lower than I could have gotten.
- 1 2 3 4 7. I know one or more adults who care a lot about how I do on my job.
- 1 2 3 4 8. I think I will probably not achieve some of my main goals in my life.
- 1 2 3 4 9. All the adults who know me best think my career progress is just fine.
- 1 2 3 4 10. I don't see much point in reading or learning new things.
- 1 2 3 4 11. When it comes to reaching personal goals, I feel like a failure most of the time.
- 1 2 3 4 12. I often fall asleep feeling mad or angry.
- 1 2 3 4 13. I would like to be a dictator and be able to tell everybody what to do.
- 1 2 3 4 14. I feel angry more often than most people I know.
- 1 2 3 4 15. Sometimes I feel mad at the whole world.
- 1 2 3 4 16. If I often wanted to hurt other people, I would want to talk to a professional counselor about it.
- 1 2 3 4 17. I often fall asleep thinking about getting even with someone I'm mad at.
- 1 2 3 4 18. I feel very rejected by at least one adult whom I want to accept me.
- 1 2 3 4 19. When a person my age rejects me, I get over it right away.
- 1 2 3 4 20. Recently I felt upset because I was rejected by someone I want to like me.
- 1 2 3 4 21. I have been rejected by several persons about my age by whom I wanted to be accepted.
- 1 2 3 4 22. If someone rejects me, I feel like rejecting them totally.
- 1 2 3 4 23. I feel disowned (rejected) by most or all of my family and relatives.
- 1 2 3 4 24. I like to watch movies of people shooting each other.
- 1 2 3 4 25. I like to play video games where I get to shoot at people, planes, etc.

1	2	3	4
Strongly disagree.	Disagree	Agree.	Strongly agree.

- 1 2 3 4 26. I would like to learn more about how to make bombs.

- 1 2 3 4 27. When working, I would want all the workers in my workplace to be screened for violence tendencies and given help if needed.
- 1 2 3 4 28. During the past year, I have enjoyed destroying someone else's property.
- 1 2 3 4 29. I enjoy daydreaming about killing other people.
- 1 2 3 4 30. I am a happy person.
- 1 2 3 4 31. I tend to interrupt others, speaking when it is not my turn.
- 1 2 3 4 32. I often make decisions so quickly that I get in trouble.
- 1 2 3 4 33. It is wrong to kill other people for any reason.
- 1 2 3 4 34. Most people just do what they want to do, even if it angers others.
- 1 2 3 4 35. I have enjoyed starting dangerous fires.
- 1 2 3 4 36. If I killed another person in a fit of rage, I would feel very guilty.
- 1 2 3 4 37. I often fly off the handle, losing my temper.
- 1 2 3 4 38. Most of my problems are caused by other people, not me.
- 1 2 3 4 39. I feel very ashamed when I lose my temper.
- 1 2 3 4 40. I think I would enjoy shooting someone I feel angry with.
- 1 2 3 4 41. I feel sad for enemy soldiers our nation has killed in wars.
- 1 2 3 4 42. I think it is stupid for employers to try to reduce violence in companies.
- 1 2 3 4 43. I think a lot of adults these days think about killing someone they're mad at.
- 1 2 3 4 44. I would enjoy making a plan to kill someone.
- 1 2 3 4 45. I feel very badly when I hurt another person's feelings.
- 1 2 3 4 46. Employees who have shot other workers and supervisors at their companies probably had good reasons to do so.
- 1 2 3 4 47. I would be willing to help an employee who had shot others at their place of work to escape from the police.
- 1 2 3 4 48. I admire employees who have shot others at their companies.
- 1 2 3 4 49. It would be very easy to get my hands on a gun and bullets during the next week without anyone else knowing about it.
- 1 2 3 4 50. I know how to load and shoot a pistol, rifle or shotgun.
- 1 2 3 4 51. I have given false answers to one or more of the questions on this form.
- 1 2 3 4 52. If I felt like hurting other people at work, I think I would want to talk to a human resource manager about it.
- 1 2 3 4 53. I have enjoyed slapping or punching other people when mad at them.
- 1 2 3 4 54. Once each year I would be willing to fill out a form such as this one to help make my workplace safe.
- 1 2 3 4 55. I will never forgive some people at whom I am mad.
- 1 2 3 4 56. With just a little more stress I think I could lose control and hurt someone right now.
- 1 2 3 4 57. I can think of at least one person I know that I would like to kill if I was sure I would get away with it.

1 2 3 4 58. I was able to read and understand most or all of the words in this test.

20. Terrorism Endorsement Scale.

This scale is scored by adding the scores for the 12 items. None are reverse-scored.

T-12 Scale

William A. McConochie, Ph.D.

Copyright 2001 William A. McConochie

For each item below circle only one number to indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with it using the following code:

1	2	3	4	5
Disagree	Strongly disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

- 1 2 3 4 5 1. If people refused to help you with your problems, you might be justified in killing them.
- 1 2 3 4 5 2. If you are mad at the whole world, then it makes sense to destroy the whole world.
- 1 2 3 4 5 3. The United States deserved the September 11, 2001 destruction of the World Trade Center buildings in New York City.
- 1 2 3 4 5 4. I have the courage to die in committing an act of terrorism.
- 1 2 3 4 5 5. I would be willing to join a terrorist organization.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6. A good way to bring down a corrupt government is to kill its civilians in terrorist acts.
- 1 2 3 4 5 7. People who feel very mistreated by a country have the right to commit terrorist acts against that country.
- 1 2 3 4 5 8. I would enjoy steering a big plane into the Pentagon building, or another military headquarters, to destroy it.
- 1 2 3 4 5 9. If I were wealthy, I would be willing to donate money to a terrorist organization.
- 1 2 3 4 5 10. I would feel honored if I were invited to join a terrorist group.
- 1 2 3 4 5 11. I want to learn more about how to become a terrorist.

1 2 3 4 5 12. I admire terrorists who die for their cause.

21. Government Type Preferences items.

These questionnaire items measure endorsement of five basic types of national government. Other such items can be easily written by researchers, who can define their terms as they deem most appropriate for their specific studies. Instructions can be modified to fit machine-scored answer sheets, e.g. "On your separate answer sheet, darken the letter, A-E, for each item to indicate..."

Questionnaire items:

"For each of the following items, indicate how strongly you agree that it is a desirable form of government by circling one number, using this code:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

- 1 2 3 4 5 1. Anarchy. No government at all, just roving bands of armed bandits who rob, kill and do whatever they want.
- 1 2 3 4 5 2. Military dictatorship, headed by a powerful military leader who controls everything and everyone in the country and prevents anyone else from replacing him.
- 1 2 3 4 5 3. Monarchy, headed by a king or queen, with a supportive parliament of elected representatives. They run the country as they "benevolently" see fit.
- 1 2 3 4 5 4. Tribal democracy. Elected officials run the government to serve the short-term economic interests of the special interest groups ("economic tribes") which helped them get elected.
- 1 2 3 4 5 5. Public democracy. Elected officials run the government to serve the current and long-term best interests of the community overall, including sustainable programs such as conservation of resources and control of pollution and global warming. No one special interest group or groups are favored."

22. Value of Religion Scale.

Reverse scored items: 2, 27, 28, 31, 32, 34, 35, 37, 38, 42, 48, 49, 50.
Score is sum of item scores after reverse-scoring items above.

18-item brief version consists of items 6, 8, 12, 14, 15, 16, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 30,

37, 38, 39, 42. (Alpha of brief version is .82).

Researchers can ask subjects to circle a number, 1-5 format (left column) or have answers put on an optically-scanned answer sheet, e.g. A-E.

Value of Religion Scale

In the place given by your researcher, enter your name, gender, age and years of education.

On this form or on the separate answer sheet, circle or mark one number or letter to indicate your answer for each item. Use this code:

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree.
1 or A	2 or B	3 or C	4 or D	5 or E

- 1 2 3 4 5 1. I get much comfort from religious services I attend.
 1 2 3 4 5 2. I don't think religion provides me much of any value at all.
 1 2 3 4 5 3. Religion provides me much of value on a regular basis.

How important are each of the following as aspects of church activities you participate in?
 Use this code:

Not at all important	Not important	Neutral	Important	Very important
1 or A	2 or B	3 or C	4 or D	5 or E

- 1 2 3 4 5 4. Reminders from church leader(s) to be a good person.
 1 2 3 4 5 5. Statements of encouragement and comfort from church leader(s).
 1 2 3 4 5 6. Reminders from sermons, hymns, etc. to feel humble before a supernatural being.
 1 2 3 4 5 7. Explanations from church leaders about how to understand and react to current events, such as community disasters or problems, national problems, world problems.
 1 2 3 4 5 8. An opportunity to pray and ask for things, support and comfort that I need.

How important (valuable and meaningful) are each of the following aspects of religion to you in your personal life?

- 1 2 3 4 5 9. Prayer or meditation by myself.
 1 2 3 4 5 10. Prayer or meditation with others, such as saying grace at mealtimes.
 1 2 3 4 5 11. Reading religious or spiritual writings.

1 2 3 4 5 12. Attending religious or meditative services.

How important is each of the following for you personally as to what religion provides you that you find helpful...

- 1 2 3 4 5 13. An explanation of how the world began.
 1 2 3 4 5 14. An explanation of how life on earth began.
 1 2 3 4 5 15. An explanation of how the universe began.
 1 2 3 4 5 16. An explanation of what will happen to me after I die.
 1 2 3 4 5 17. An explanation of the meaning or purpose of my personal life, as by giving me goals, helping me discover or clarify goals, etc.
 1 2 3 4 5 18. An explanation of the meaning or purpose of human life in general.
 1 2 3 4 5 19. Answers to questions about free will.
 1 2 3 4 5 20. An explanation of how supernatural beings are defined.
 1 2 3 4 5 21. An explanation of my relationship to such a being or beings.

How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following items?

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree.
1 or A	2 or B	3 or C	4 or D	5 or E

Religion provides me helpful...

- 1 2 3 4 5 22. Guidance in handling death.
 1 2 3 4 5 23. Guidance and strength in handling intense or chronic personal problems.
 1 2 3 4 5 24. Guidance in handling unpleasant feelings and emotions, such as depression, anger, fear and guilt.
 1 2 3 4 5 25. Guidance and strength of willpower in handling addictive urges.
 1 2 3 4 5 26. Guidance and strength of willpower in handling temptations, such as for sexual indiscretions, theft, cheating, etc.
 1 2 3 4 5 27. Rather than religious guidance, I would prefer mental health counseling or psychotherapy for help in understanding and dealing with personal, family, and emotional problems.
 1 2 3 4 5 28. Rather than religion, I prefer the findings of science to explain how the world and life began.

What would you like more of from your present religion or one that you might consider?

- 1 2 3 4 5 29. More and better guidance about how to handle weekly personal problems and worries.

What are your thoughts and opinions about the relationship between science and

religion?

- 1 2 3 4 5 30. Religion is more important than science.
- 1 2 3 4 5 31. Science is more important than religion.
- 1 2 3 4 5 32. Science is better than religion as a source of information about how the world works.
- 1 2 3 4 5 33. Religion is a better source of spiritual and social comfort and guidance than science.
- 1 2 3 4 5 34. Psychotherapy and counseling is a better source of personal, social and emotional guidance than religion.
- 1 2 3 4 5 35. I believe the universe is about 13.7 billion years old, as the sciences of astronomy and physics explain.
- 1 2 3 4 5 36. I believe that such scientists are wrong and that the universe is only about 5,000 years old, as stated in the Bible.
- 1 2 3 4 5 37. I believe that dinosaurs lived for about 180 million years and died out about 65 million years ago, as science explains.

Opinions about definitions of God:**God is...**

- 1 2 3 4 5 38. ...a human concept, created by humans.
- 1 2 3 4 5 39. ...a supernatural being that created itself or was created by some force beyond itself.
- 1 2 3 4 5 40. ...appears or exists in only one correct or true form.

The power of the supernatural.

- 1 2 3 4 5 41. God, (a supernatural being), causes everything to happen.
- 1 2 3 4 5 42. Nature, without any God or gods involved, causes all physical world things, such as the movement of the planets, volcanic eruptions and storms, to happen.
- 1 2 3 4 5 43. God causes even bad things, like storms and wars.
- 1 2 3 4 5 44. Both God and humans cause some good and some bad things to happen.
- 1 2 3 4 5 45. If the weather is nice and sunny on a day I wanted to have a picnic, then God caused the good weather.
- 1 2 3 4 5 46. If the weather on this picnic day is bad, then I caused it by behaving badly and I am being punished.
- 1 2 3 4 5 47. If the weather on this picnic day is good, then I caused it, by being good and I am being rewarded.
- 1 2 3 4 5 48. The weather on this picnic day is caused simply by nature and it has nothing to do with my past behavior.
- 1 2 3 4 5 49. The weather is caused simply by nature, independent of a supernatural being=s influence.
- 1 2 3 4 5 50. Some things, such as clouds, can be beautiful without anybody or a god or God designing them to be the way they are.
- 1 2 3 4 5 51. Because a flower is beautiful, God had to design it rather than it developing simply by natural evolution.

End.

23. Meta-Religion Endorsement Scale.

No items are reverse-scored.

1. I believe each person in the world who has religious interest should be encouraged to think about the welfare of all humans everywhere, even in the future.
2. I am curious about what religious beliefs and activities may be common across persons of all countries and religions, such as enjoyment of sermons or other guiding talks by religious leaders, and enjoyment of relating to other persons of faith.
3. I would be comfortable with my personal religion including one service each month or so devoted to a theme of universal human concern.
4. I like the idea of each church, synagogue, mosque, etc. holding one service each month or so that is of a universal nature, practiced in the same general form by people in all faiths everywhere in the world.

24. Authoritarian Endorsement Scale.

Third version of AUT, 30 items 6/14/07. Reverse-scored items are: 3, 4, 6, 9, 16, 19

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 1. I feel reassured by parades of soldiers and induction ceremonies of Presidents or other national leaders. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 2. I often feel comforted by thinking about persons in authority whom I trust. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 3. I usually feel disappointed by major public speeches by top government leaders, such as Presidents. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 4. Most religious sermons I hear are boring and uninspiring. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 5. Persons in positions of authority should be respected and honored more than doubted and challenged. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 6. Journalists should be free to criticize and make fun of politicians and other leaders. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 7. Military personnel should obey their officers under all circumstances. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 8. I find comfort in frequent reminders of what is right and wrong. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 9. Persons should learn to trust their own judgment more than depend on rules given by authorities. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 10. Society will completely fall apart if everyone does not know and obey laws and regulations. |
| 1 2 3 4 5 | 11. Some groups of people are almost all good and righteous while other groups |

- are almost all bad and unrighteous.
- 1 2 3 4 5 12. I am a member of a group that is almost all good and righteous.
- 1 2 3 4 5 13. Citizens should obey leaders who tell them to reject or wage war against a bad group.
- 1 2 3 4 5 14. I prefer a simple, clear explanation of the world and my place in it rather than a complex, incomplete explanation.
- 1 2 3 4 5 15. I often look to persons in authority for reassurance and guidance.
- 1 2 3 4 5 16. I trust intellectuals and scientists more than top government and military leaders.
- 1 2 3 4 5 17. I trust elected state representatives and Governors for whom I vote to always do the right thing.
- 1 2 3 4 5 18. On foreign policy, I trust the top political leader of my country (e.g. the President) more than my own opinions.
- 1 2 3 4 5 19. We should carefully question persons in positions of authority rather than take them at their word.
- 1 2 3 4 5 20. In conversations with others, I prefer the clear guidelines of rules and doctrine to the uncertainties of personal opinions.
- 1 2 3 4 5 21. Punishment is a more appropriate response to rule-breaking than forgiveness is.
- 1 2 3 4 5 22. Rewards should only be given to persons who do what is right.
- 1 2 3 4 5 23. High school and college students should respect and trust their teachers without question.
- 1 2 3 4 5 24. Teenage children should respect and obey their parents without question.
- 1 2 3 4 5 25. I get comfort and reassurance from religious rituals and ceremonies.
- 1 2 3 4 5 26. Divine authority sanctions wars against the unjust.
- 1 2 3 4 5 27. The world would be a safer place if some bad people did not exist.
- 1 2 3 4 5 28. Most world problems are caused by bad people in far away lands..
- 1 2 3 4 5 29. For handling everyday problems I trust religious authority more than I trust my own judgments.
- 1 2 3 4 5 30. Top leaders in government, the military and religion are more important to a nation than are their followers.

Foreign Language Scales.

Four of my primary scales are available in Spanish, French and German. The translated scales are the Violence-proneness scale, The Terrorism endorsement scale, the Warmongering-32 scale, and the Warmongering-proneness scale.

References.

1. Eidelson, Roy and Judy, (2003). Dangerous Ideas, *American Psychologist*, Vol. 58, No. 3, pp. 182-192.

2. Hunsberger, Bruce, (1996). Religious Fundamentalism, Right-Wing Authoritarianism, and Hostility Toward Homosexuals in Non-Christian Religious Groups, Bruce Hunsberger, *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 6(1), 39-49.
 3. Saucier, G. (2000). Isms and the structure of social attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 366-385.
-