

## **Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Perceived Threats and Their Mental Health Implications Among College Students**

**Dr. Ahmed El-Sayed<sup>1\*</sup>, Dr. Sara Mahmoud<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Omar Khalil<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Behavioral Medicine, Cairo University Hospitals, Cairo, Egypt

<sup>2</sup>Department of Public Mental Health, Alexandria University Hospital, Alexandria, Egypt

### Abstract

No corner of the world is completely safe from terrorist attacks. Both India and the U.S. have suffered horrific acts of terrorist-inspired violence. While views of terrorism vary for different reasons, culture certainly plays a role. A total of 918 undergraduate college students, comprised of 434 Indian students and 484 U.S. students, were surveyed on their views of terrorism, responses to terrorism, and appropriate punishment of terrorists. Ordered ordinal regression results indicated a significant difference on 20 of the 26 items by nationality. Indian participants were more likely to express strong views on the problem of terrorism for society and to see terrorists as more similar to common criminals than their U.S. counterparts. Indian students were also more likely to feel that the government should do whatever was necessary to win against terrorists, while U.S. students were more likely to view winning against terrorists as difficult. Further, Indian respondents were more likely to feel that terrorists needed to be punished harshly and the death penalty would deter them, while U.S. respondents more likely to feel convicted terrorists should be able to appeal their sentences. The results suggest that culture plays a role in shaping terrorism views

**Keywords:** Terrorism Views; Punishment Views; India; U.S.

The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, caused a dramatic change in U.S. public opinion on terrorism and led to numerous changes in public policy to address terrorist threats. These changes included the creation of the Department of Homeland Security at the federal level.

President George W. Bush called for a global “war on terror” (U.S. Department of State, 2009). As noted by West and Orr (2005), public views on terrorism play a crucial role in how the U.S. government responds to the issue. A budding field of research has explored and examined U.S. residents’ views on how to respond to terrorists and terrorism (Davis & Silver, 2004; Gross, Brewer, & Aday, 2009; Lewis, 2005; Sun, Wu, & Poteyeva, 2011; West & Orr, 2005). This line of research provides important information on how U.S. residents view terrorism and efforts to combat it; however, terrorism knows no national borders. A comparison of U.S. citizens’ views on terrorism and the views of citizens in other nations is lacking.

Attitudes toward issues arise due to a multitude of factors, including cultural forces (Chung & Bagozzi, 1997). According to Mayhew and van Kesteren (2002), “with a few exceptions – researchers have explored public opinion within, rather than across, jurisdictions” (p. 63). For both theoretical and practical reasons, understanding cultural differences in terrorism views is important. Using a cross-cultural perspective, a better overall understanding will be gained. As Jowell (1998) pointed out, “the importance and utility to social science of rigorous cross-national measures is incontestable. They help to reveal not only intriguing differences between countries and cultures, but also aspects of one’s own country and culture that would be difficult or impossible to detect from domestic data alone” (p. 168). Exploring views on issues, including terrorism, and comparing them across different cultures provides more information on how we think and how we differ in our views. Additionally, cross-national research helps narrow the gap between different cultures and creates bridges so salient information flows more freely. Likewise, understanding similarities and differences in terrorism views across nations can help with the possible partnerships to combat terrorism. In addition, such information is important for historical purposes. It shows the views at the time and how they vary between different groups and nations (Boussios & Cole, 2010a, 2010b).

How terrorism views differ between the U.S. and other nations is an area that has been little researched. India and the U.S. were selected for comparison for three reasons. First, India and the U.S. are the two most populous democracies in the world (World Factbook, 2020a,

2020b). Democracies should reflect the views of the majority of their citizens; therefore, citizens' views of terrorism are important (Lewis, 2005). As Boussio and Cole (2010a) indicated, "This is central to what is often called 'democratic theory': in which political actors are alert to shifts in public opinion and adjust their behavior accordingly" (p. 210). On the other hand, politicians may not be swayed by public opinion if they feel the response is needed and justified. As Carter and Fay (2019) pointed out, "[b]y design, democracies allow for policy feedback (public signals) in the presence and absence of disruptive shocks as economic crisis, war, and, in this case, terrorism" (p. 6).

Second, both nations have experienced significant and ongoing terrorist attacks and threats in the past several decades. While terrorist attacks can and do result in death and destruction and all nations wish to avoid them, ideas about how to respond to terrorism and terrorists differ across cultures. Public views play an important role in this process. Regardless, research on public opinion and differences in these views is important. There are also scholarly reasons to explore people's views and how they differ. Exploring differences in social views supports a better understanding of the matter as a whole (Houck & Conway, 2013). What needs to be further explored is whether there are differences between nations with different cultures. India and the U.S. have both historical and cultural similarities and differences, and these may influence on how terrorism is viewed.

Third, the authors had access to collect data from both U.S. and Indian college students, who were selected for two reasons. First, college students often become active citizens upon graduation and, therefore, are more likely to influence governmental responses to terrorism. As noted above, the two nations are the most populous democracies in the world, and, in democratic cultures, government responses are partially shaped by public views and sentiments. College

students were also selected because the study had limited funds and college students are easily assessable. In addition, past criminal justice attitudinal studies have surveyed college students (Elechi, Lambert, & Ventura, 2006; Lambert, 2004; Lambert, Khondaker, Elechi, Jiang, & Baker, 2012). This preliminary study was, therefore, undertaken to examine the terrorism views among college students of India and the U.S. to determine whether their views were more similar or more different. The two nations have commonalities between them, but they are unique from one another in terms of their culture and experiences. As this was an exploratory study with limited resources, college students in each nation were surveyed.

The next section is the Literature Review which is divided into two major parts. The first compares and contrasts India and the U.S. generally as nations, and the second specifically discusses terrorism in each nation. A Research Foundation section follows the Literature Review, and it provides the basis for why exploring terrorism views of citizens of India and the U.S. are important and how culture may play a role in shaping terrorism views of people in these two countries. The Method provides an overview of how students at two public universities, one in India and the other in the U.S., were surveyed. This section also provides information about the items used to measure views on terrorism, how to best respond to terrorism, and how to punish terrorists. The findings are presented in the Results section. The Discussion considers the findings and their implications. The paper closes with a short Conclusion.

## **Literature Review**

### **Brief Overview of India and the U.S.**

Both the India and the U.S. were former British colonies. India and the U.S. are currently federal republics with a democratically elected President or Prime Minister, bicameral legislatures, and Supreme Courts; however, the U.S. has been an independent nation far longer

than India. In addition, the U.S. has about three times the land mass of India, but its population is one fourth as large (330 million vs. India's 1.4 billion) (Worldatlas, 2016). Approximately 80% of Indian residents are Hindu, 14.2% are Muslim, 2% are Christian, 2% are Sikh, 2% are other/unspecified (World Factbook, 2020a). Approximately 70% of U.S. residents are Christian (Protestant 47%, Roman Catholic 21%, Mormon 2%, Jehovah's Witness <1%, other Christian <1%), 2% Jewish, <1% Muslim Hindu, <1% Buddhist, 2% other 23% are unaffiliated (World Factbook, 2020b). While Hindi is the most common language spoken in India, English is widely used as well (World Fact Book, 2020a). English is the most frequently spoken language in the U.S., although 20% of U.S. residents speak a language other than English at home (World Factbook, 2020b). India's gross national product (GNP) has grown dramatically recently, and its economy is predicted to be equal to or surpass the U.S. economy by 2050 (Poddar & Yi, 2007). India is a major trading partner with the U.S., increasing from \$19 billion in 2000 to \$97 billion in 2013 (U.S. Department of State, 2014). Raghavan (2004) described the current Indian criminal justice system as a legacy of the colonial British structure that existed before India became an independent country in 1947. As India becomes a hub of the business process outsourcing sector, the value system adopted by many urban people has been influenced by that of the U.S. As such, the influence of the U.S. form of justice is growing in India in recent years (Lambert, Jaishankar, Jiang, Pasupuleti, & Bhimarasetty, 2012).

Currently, India has a federal republic-based government, with a national government, 28 state governments, and 8 union territories (Raghavan, 1999). India's 28 state police agencies and the seven union police forces are largely responsible for preventing and responding to terrorism (Lambert, Qureshi, Hogan, Klahm, Smith, & Frank, 2015; Raghavan, 1999). The central government has some control as Indian Police Services officers are appointed (and removed) at

the upper echelons of police forces by the federal government (Lambert et al., 2015). Terrorism is a growing problem in India; terrorist attacks over the past several decades have changed the Indian police (Gordon, 2008; Sen, 2000). A greater demand for intelligence and control has led to an increase in specialized police agencies (Dhillon, 2005; Raghavan & Shiva Sankar, 2003). There are also various federal law enforcement agencies that deal with terrorism. The Central Industrial Security Force is charged with protecting key installations (e.g., refineries, nuclear power plants, etc.), seaports, and airports. Although originally charged with policing the borders, the Indian Border Security Force is being tasked recently to deal with insurgency and terrorism. The main function of the Central Reserve Police Force is to assist state and territorial union police with major disturbances and to combat terrorism. The National Security Guards were formed in 1984 as a counterterrorism and hostage rescue unit. The National Investigation Agency is the central federal agency assigned to combat terrorism in India. After the 2008 Mumbai terrorist attacks, sometimes referred to as “26/11 or 26 November,” the National Investigation Agency was allowed to investigate and apprehend terrorists without permission of the state or metropolitan police agencies (South Asian Terrorism Portal, 2008).

The U.S. has a federal government and 50 state governments, along with 16 territories and the District of Columbia (World Factbook, 2020b). While originally based on the British justice model, the U.S. justice system has evolved and is often embraced by U.S. residents as uniquely their own. The U.S. relies far more on official government control structures to provide protection and respond to threats as compared to India (Lambert, Khondaker et al., 2012). While early law enforcement was influenced by the British, four general levels of law enforcement agencies developed in the U.S.: municipal/local, county/sheriff, state, and federal. The Sourcebook (University of Albany, 2013) estimated that there are over 18,000 police agencies in

the U.S. Various law enforcement agencies are called upon to prevent and respond to terrorist threats (Muhlhausen & McNeill, 2011). There are federal agencies (e.g., Department of Homeland Security, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Bureau of Counterterrorism, Central Intelligence Agency, National Counterterrorism Center, National Security Agency, military, etc.), state agencies (e.g., many states have a state-level homeland security agency, state police, etc.), and various county and local agencies are part of the counterterrorism efforts by the U.S. (Kraft & Marks, 2011). Finally, many large local police departments have engaged in counterterrorism efforts in order to deal with possible terrorist threats to U.S. residents (Sun et al., 2011).

### **Major Terrorism Attacks in India and the U.S.**

India subdivides terrorism in four major groups. The first is nationalist terrorism, which focuses on creating an independent state from land currently controlled by India. The second is religious terrorism, which often takes the form of rioting between Hindus and Muslims, but which can also involve Christians, Jews, or Sikhs. The third is left-wing terrorism, which focuses on creating economic changes. The fourth is narcoterrorism, which is conducted by criminal organizations to allow for greater criminal activities, such as drug trafficking, with reduced interference from government units (Second Administrative Reforms Commission, 2008). The South Asian Terror Portal (2016) listed 180 terrorist groups operating at some time in India in the past 25 years. Currently, there are 38 groups listed as banned terrorists groups by the Indian government (South Asian Terrorism Portal, 2015). From 1994 to 2015, 24,661 civilians, 9,689 law enforcement/security personnel, and 30,353 terrorists (for a total of 64,703 individuals) are estimated have died in connection with terrorism (South Asian Terrorism Portal, 2016).

In the last 25 years, major terrorism attacks on Indian soil have been: 1) March 1993: 13 bomb blasts in Bombay (now Mumbai) killing more than 350 and injuring almost 1200; 2) December 1993: a bombing of a train in the State of Assam, killing 33; 3) February 1998: 12 bomb blasts at 11 locations on the State of Tamil Nadu, killing 58 and injuring more than 200; 4) October 2001: car bomb and three suicide bombs at the Jammu and Kashmir Legislative Assembly, killing 38; 5) August 2003: two car bombs in Mumbai, killing 54 and injuring almost 250; 6) October 2005: three bomb blasts in New Delhi, killing 62 and injuring over 200; 7) March 2006: multiple bomb blasts in state of Uttar Pradesh, killing 28 and injuring about 100; 8) July 2006: 7 bomb explosions on trains in Mumbai, killing 209 and injuring more than 700; 9) September 2006: 3 bomb explosions in State of Maharashtra, killing 37 and injuring more 120; 10) February 2007: two bombs on a train killing 66; 11) August 2007: two bomb blasts in Hyderabad killing 42 and injuring more than 50; 12) May 2008: nine explosions in Jaipur, killing 63 and injuring more than 200; 13) July 2008: 9 bomb blasts in Bangalore, killing 2 and injuring 20; 14) July 2008: 21 explosions in State of Gujarat, killing 56 and injuring more than 200; 15) September 2008: five bombings in New Delhi, killing 30 and injuring more than 100; 16) October 2008: 18 explosions in State of Assam, killing 77 and injuring more than 450; 17) November 2008: 10 gunmen launch attacks in Mumbai, killing 164 and injuring more than 308; 18) February 2010: bomb blast in Pune, killing 17; 19) July 2011: 3 bomb blasts in Mumbai, killing 26 and injuring more than 130; 20) September 2011: five bombings in New Delhi, killing 30 and injuring more than 100; 21) February 2013: two explosions in Hyderabad, killing 16 and injuring 119; 22) May 2013: attack in State of Chhattisgarh, killing 27; 23) October 2013: multiple bomb blasts in State of Bihar, killing 6 and injuring 85 (Bora, 2016); 24) April 2014: car bomb in State of Jharkhand, 8 killed and 5 injured (Yadav, 2014); 25) May 2014: attack by

gunmen in State of Assam, 35 killed; 26) May 2014: bomb blast in State of Manipar, 2 killed and 19 injured (E-Pao, 2014); 27) April 2015: attack by gunmen in Kashmir, 5 killed and 7 injured (New York Times, 2014); 28) June 2015: attack by gunmen in State of Manipur, 20 killed and 11 injured (Kumar, 2015); and 29) July 2015: attack by gunmen in State of Punjar, 10 killed and 8 injured (Barry, 2015). In addition to the above occurrences, there have been numerous other terrorist attacks in India in the past 25 years. In addition, Indian citizens have been victims of terrorist attacks in other nations. Furthermore, there have been terrorist attempts that were stopped before they occurred or occurred without fatalities. Finally, terrorists have used the kidnapping of hostages as a weapon for instilling fear, propaganda, and to raise funds (Muhlhausen & McNeill, 2011).

Based on Muhlhausen and McNeill's (2011) analysis of data in the RAND Database of Worldwide Terrorism, 7.8% of worldwide terrorist attacks from 1969 to 2009 were directed against the U.S. Approximately 1.3% of all worldwide terrorism attacks occurred on U.S. soil, while 2.6% of worldwide terrorism attacks occurred on Indian soil (Rand, 2016). Based on the Global Terrorism Database, there were 207 terrorist attacks in the U.S. from 2001 to 2011 (Rogers, 2013). Both domestic and foreign terrorist groups operate in the U.S. (Muhlhausen & McNeill, 2011; Watson, 2002). Earth Liberation, The Animal Liberation, and al-Qa'ida are listed in the Global Terrorism Database as being terrorist groups with the highest number of attacks against U.S. citizens and property (Rogers, 2013). In the past 25 years, approximately 85% of those killed in U.S. terrorist attacks resulted from the attacks on September 11, 2001 (Rogers, 2013).

In the last 25 years, major terrorist attacks on U.S. soil have been: 1) January 1993: attack by gunman outside CIA headquarters, 2 killed and 1 injured; 2) February 1993: bomb explosion

in basement garage of World Trade Center, 6 killed and over 1000 injured; 3) April 1995: bomb blast in Oklahoma City, 168 killed and injured more than 750; 4) July 1996: bombings at the Olympics in Atlanta, 1 killed and over 100 injured; 5) September 2001: two jetliners crashed into World Trade Centers, jetliner crashed into Pentagon, and one jet liner crashed in a field in Pennsylvania, 2,996 killed and over 6,000 injured; 6) June 2009: gunman attacks Memphis military recruiting center, 2 killed and 1 injured; 7) September to November 2001: mailed anthrax to various locations, 5 killed and 17 infected; 8) November 2009: attack by gunman at Fort Hood in Texas, 13 killed and 29 injured; 9) August 2013: Boston, two bomb explosions, 3 killed and over 200 injured; and 10) December 2015: attack by two gunmen in San Bernardino, California, 14 killed and over 20 injured. There have been many other terrorist attacks on U.S. soil. In addition, numerous U.S. citizens have died in terrorist attacks in other nations, and there have been several major attacks which failed or were detected before they could occur, as well as others that resulted in no deaths (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2015; Infoplease, 2016; Johnson, 2016). In fact, the majority of terrorist attacks against U.S. citizens occur in other nations than the U.S. (Muhlhausen & McNeill, 2011). Finally, terrorists have used kidnapping as a weapon to generate fear, propagandize, and to raise money; these kidnappings most often occur in nations other than the U.S. (Muhlhausen & McNeill, 2011).

### **Research Focus**

Both India and the U.S. have experienced numerous terrorist attacks both at home and abroad over the past several decades. Both nations have charged various government agencies to combat terrorism and protect citizens. While counterterrorism in many nations has become a focal concern of government agencies, particularly law enforcement, little is known about citizens' views on terrorism and how they compare across nations, including the U.S. and India.

As previously indicated, views of citizens on terrorism and how to respond to it are theoretically important for democracies (Lewis, 2005; Sun et al., 2011; West & Orr, 2005). As James Madison (1791) wrote, “Public opinion sets bounds to every government, and is the real sovereign in every free one” (p. 1).

India and the U.S. are the two most populous democracies in the world; however, no published cross-cultural research on terrorism views between Indian and U.S. residents could be located. This preliminary study was therefore undertaken. It is unclear whether views on terrorism would differ between Indian and U.S. residents. Both nations have suffered from terrorist attacks, which could result in similar views. On the other hand, while both nations are former British colonies, each has its own unique culture, which could result in differences in terrorism views. The literature suggests that social orientations influence individuals’ views, attitudes, and perceptions, and distinct cultural groups have their own values, views, and norms (Chung & Bagozzi, 1997; Green, 1982; Yick, 2000).

It has long been recognized that culture shapes attitudes (Bartels, 1967; Hofstede, 1980; Sutherland, 1947). According to learning-oriented theories, a person’s personality, including attitudes, results from both the person’s personal experiences and the culture that surrounds them (Seta, Paulus, & Baron, 2000). Furthermore, attitudes and views are formed through socialization, which is strongly influenced by cultural forces. Socialization may occur via interactions with people, such as family members, teachers, friends, and peers. It also occurs via a person’s exposure to mass media or social media. These socialization process exposes a person to different cultures, including different political, economic, and social values and beliefs. Learning theories of criminology expresses similar ideas. The theories assume that criminal attitudes and behaviors are learned during interactions with other people (Akers & Sellers, 2004).

These interactions expose a person to prosocial or antisocial values and beliefs, including cultural values and views that lead to the development of that person's attitudes toward law and criminal justice systems. In essence, criminal attitudes and behaviors are developed through differential association, differential reinforcement, definitions, imitation, and other learning mechanisms. Institutional theories suggest how culture influences the development of organizational members' views or attitudes. People and organizations are influenced by cultural factors according to the organizational theory (Scott, 1992). These cultural factors shapes views (North, 1990).

A theoretical foundation exists that culture can shape citizens' values and views, in general, and, therefore, attitudes toward terrorism and terrorists, in particular. In fact, culture is a powerful force that shapes people's views on many social issues. How views on terrorism and terrorists differ between India and the U.S. is unknown because views may differ greatly from culture to culture. As both nations have been influenced to a degree by their histories as former British colonies, there may be some similarities in views. As previously noted, both are currently democratic federal republics with a democratically elected President or Prime Minister, bicameral legislatures, and Supreme Courts. On the other hand, India and the U.S. have developed their own unique cultures which probably have led to differences in views. India is an economically developing nation, while the U.S. is a developed nation (World Factbook 2020a, 2020b). India has a lower overall crime rate but a higher rate of terrorism on its soil as compared to the U.S. As pointed out earlier, there are religious differences, with the majority of Indian citizens being Hindu and the majority of U.S. citizens being Christian (World Factbook, 2020a, 2020b). Most people in the U.S. live in urban/suburban areas, while slightly more than half of Indian residents live in rural areas (Trading Economics, 2020).

There are cultural differences between the two nations. For example, formal (government) control is more common in dealing with crime in the U.S., while India tends towards both formal and informal control, with far less formal control and more informal control than compared to the U.S. (Lambert, Jaishankar, et al., 2012). The U.S. also tends to be more punitive. Capital punishment is more common in the U.S. than in India (Lambert, Pasupuleti, Jiang, Jaishankar, & Bhimarasetty, 2008). The U.S. is generally more punitive in terms of sentence lengths and the number of individuals incarcerated as compared to India. The U.S. is generally more punitive in incarcerating criminal offenders as compared to India (Pasupuleti, Lambert, Jiang, Bhimarasetty, & Jaishankar, 2009). With an incarceration rate of 655 per 100,000, the U.S. has the highest rate of people under criminal incarceration in the world; India has a much lower rate of 34 per 100,000 (World Prison Brief, 2020). This suggests U.S. students would be likely more punitive in their views on terrorism, terrorists, and how to respond as compared to Indian students.

Additionally, there are other cultural values which could affect views on terrorism. Hofstede proposed cultural dimensions can affect results, such as masculinity vs. femininity, uncertainty avoidance, individualism vs. collectivism, indulgence vs. restraint, and power distance, with all the scales ranging on a score of 0 to 100, with 50 being the midpoint (Hofstede, 1993; Hofstede & Bond, 1984; Hofstede Insights, 2020). Higher scores on masculinity represent the level a culture values and stresses competition, achievement, and success, while lower scores (i.e., femininity) represent the level of caring for others. The U.S.'s masculinity score was 62 and India's was 56, indicating the U.S. was slightly more driven to compete and be successful on the desired outcome area (Hofstede Insights, 2020). This cultural force could result in greater push to win against terrorists and to be harsher in dealing with terrorists. This suggests that there should

be both some similarities and some differences between the two groups in their terrorism views. Likewise, India and the U.S. are somewhat similar on their score for uncertainty avoidance, with India having a score of 40 and the U.S. having a slightly higher score of 46. Uncertainty avoidance is the level of tolerance of ambiguity in the future, with higher scores representing greater adherence to the rules, while lower scores represent a more willingness to bend or circumvent the rules and adjust if necessary (Hofstede Insights, 2020). The Hofstede scores differ between India and the U.S., indicating a greater willingness to adjust to ensure a given future outcome while there is slightly higher level of accepting uncertainty in the U.S. This may influence views of terrorism and how to respond to terrorism between the two groups of residents by nation.

The U.S. has a very high individualism score of 91, while India has a much lower score of 48 (Hofstede, 2003; Hofstede Insights, 2020). According to Hofstede (1984), India is more of a collectivist culture, as opposed the U.S., which has a much more an individualistic culture. Individuals in collectivist cultures are expected conform to social norms, values, and views (Chang, 1999). In India, the welfare of the community is very important, while the individual is more important in the U.S. culture (Lambert, Jaishankar et al., 2012). As such, Indian students may be more similar to one another in their views on terrorism, terrorists, and how to respond than U.S. students, who may show greater variability in views based on their individualistic perspectives. Indulgence vs. restraint deals with level of socialization of controlling desires and emotions. India's indulgence score was 26 compared the U.S.'s score of 68, indicating that India has a much stronger restraint culture (less indulgence but greater cynicism and pessimism) as compared to the U.S. (Hofstede Insights, 2020). This cultural value area may also influence terrorism views with Indian residents showing a greater cynicism and pessimism on efforts to

respond to terrorism as compared to U.S. students. Finally, power distance deals with cultural differences in accepting unequal power in a society, with India having a score of 77 and the U.S. having a score of 40. This indicates that there is greater deference to those in power in India than is the U.S. (Hofstede, 2011; Hofstede Insights, 2020). This suggests that Indian respondents may view terrorism and how to respond to it differently, accepting unfairness, and may be more likely to yield to the opinions of those in power compared to U.S. participants. In this preliminary study, we explored the views of terrorism, response to terrorism, and punishment of terrorists, while controlling for gender, age, academic level, religious saliency, and nationality, among Indian and U.S. college students.

## **Method**

### **Participants**

A convenience sample of students at an Indian university and a U.S. university were surveyed. The Indian university was a large metropolitan public university in southern India (i.e., the state of Andhra Pradesh), with an enrollment of approximately 100,000 students. The U.S. university was a public institution located in the U.S. Midwest (i.e., Ohio), with an enrollment of slightly more than 20,000. Both universities offered a wide array of undergraduate and graduate/professional degrees. These two universities were selected because 1) both had a diverse student bodies from different parts of each nation and represented students from a wide array of majors and disciplines, and 2) the authors had access to students at each of these universities. As previously indicated, this was a preliminary study with limited resources. The goal was to explore views of terrorism between Indian and U.S. college students. In an ideal world with unlimited resources, we would have randomly surveyed college students and citizens across each nation. We believe that this preliminary study contributes to the literature by

showing whether and how views on terrorism differ among college students, who, in theory, should influence how their respective governments respond to terrorism.

Surveys were pilot tested both in the U.S. and in India. Specifically, before the final surveys were administered, the questions were pilot tested with small groups of students and faculty to help ensure clarity and understanding of the measures. All issues that arose during pretesting were addressed, and the survey was then retested. Surveys written in English were given to both Indian and U.S. students. Although English was not necessarily the native language of the respondents, English was the primary language spoken at both universities. For India, fluent speakers in English and Hindi (official language of India) read the survey and made modifications, which were then reflected in the survey given to U.S. students. At both institutions, the survey was completed during class time. It was emphasized both verbally and in writing that the survey was voluntary and the results would be anonymous. In order to avoid duplication, students were asked not to complete the survey if they had done so in another class.

At the Indian university, the surveys were administered in 20 undergraduate classes. The selected courses represented a wide array of majors and included classes required by all majors at the university. At the U.S. university, the surveys were administered in 18 general education courses that were required by a wide array of majors. A total of 918 surveys were used in the current study, with 434 surveys from the Indian students and 484 surveys were from U.S. students. For Indian participants, 43% were women and 57% were men, the median age was 20 (ranging from 18 to 47), and 43% were freshmen, 22% sophomores, 26% juniors, and 8% seniors. For U.S. participants, 56% were women and 44% were men, the median age was 21 (ranging from 18 to 63), and 19% were freshmen, 20% sophomores, 33% juniors, and 28% seniors.

## **Measures**

Participants were asked 26 items dealing with views on terrorism, views on how to respond to terrorism, and views on punishment of terrorists (see Table 1 for specific items asked). All the items were answered using a five-point Likert-type of response scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. It should be noted that the participants were not provided a definition of terrorism. There is no universally agreed definition of terrorism (Shamir & Shikaki, 2002). In addition, gender, age, academic level, importance of religion in a person's life, and nationality of the respondent were used in the multivariate analysis. All have been linked to views on social issues, including views on terrorism, at least in the U.S. (Lambert, 2003, 2004; Sun et al., 2011). Gender was measured as a dichotomous variable representing whether the respondent was a male (coded 1) or female (coded 0). Age was measured in continuous years. Academic level was an ordinal variable coded as 1 = first year (freshman), 2 = second year (sophomore), 3 = third year (junior), and 4 = fourth year (senior). Participants were asked the extent that religion had played in their lives. Fifteen percent of the respondents indicated not at all (coded as 1), 32% indicated not much (coded as 2), 26% indicated a fair amount (coded as 3), and 27% indicated a great deal (coded as 4). U.S. respondents were more likely than Indian respondents to indicate that religion had played an important role in their lives. Finally, a dichotomous variable for nationality was created measuring whether the participant was from India (coded 1) or the U.S. (coded 0).

## **Results**

The percentage responses for the 26 items are presented in Table 1. In addition, the mean response values and standard deviations are presented in this table. The Independent *t*-test was used to determine whether the two groups significantly differed in their views, and the results are

also presented in Table 1. The bivariate analysis of the Independent *t*-test is was used to determine whether the mean value of the responses for the two groups on each of the 26 items were statistically significant from one another. The Independent *t*-test is also known as the two sample *t*-test or the student's *t*-test. The null hypothesis for the Independent *t*-test is that the population means from the two unrelated groups are equal. As such, the null hypothesis for each of the 26 items would be that there would be no statistically significant difference between Indian students (one unrelated group) and U.S. students (the second unrelated group). The alternative hypothesis is that there is a statistical difference between the two groups on the mean for the variable. The 26 items on terrorism views was the variable of interest and the categorical variable of the nationality of the student was the grouping variable. Levene's Test of Equality of Variances was used. The statistical significance level selected was a probability of  $p=.05$  or lower, which means that rejecting a null hypothesis (Type I error) would occur by random chance approximately five times out of a hundred (Laerd Statistics, 2020). For 19 of the 26 items, there were significant differences in the two groups on their views of terrorism.

\*\*\*\*\* Insert Table 1 about here \*\*\*\*\*

Indian participants were far more likely to feel that terrorism was one of the most serious problems facing their society, that terrorism is easy to define, that there is little difference between terrorist and criminals, that illegal force against innocent people was a form of terrorism, and that terrorism rarely works. U.S. students were more likely to feel that governments can engage in terrorism, that terrorists were criminals (although the majority of both groups agreed with this statement, U.S. students were higher in their level of agreement), that terrorism is a violent act to frighten those in power, that kidnapping innocent people for political reasons is terrorism, that assassination is a form of terrorism, and that terrorism is a

violent act or threat used as a mechanism to promote change. Both groups were similar in their views in terms of terrorism being hard to define, fear of being a victim of terrorism, and whether kidnapping for monetary reasons was a form of terrorism.

There were also significant differences in views on how to respond to terrorism. Indian participants were more likely to agree that government needed to do whatever was necessary to beat terrorists and terrorists should be killed by whatever means possible. U.S. participants were more likely to agree that winning against terrorism was very hard. Both groups were similar in their views that swift and severe action was needed to stop terrorists.

There were also differences and similarities on views of the punishment of terrorists. Indian participants were more likely to agree that convicted terrorists should not be allowed to appeal their sentences, even if they are sentenced to death; in addition, Indian participants were more likely to indicate that they (the respondent) would be angry if a terrorist was not sentenced to death. U.S. students were more likely to feel that terrorists must pay for their acts, that terrorists who kill deserve the death penalty, and that terrorists should be punished harshly. Finally, both groups were similar in their views that sentencing terrorists to death will not deter future terrorist attacks, that nothing but death will stop terrorists, and that most terrorists will kill if they are not executed or killed first.

To determine whether the two groups were significantly different in their views independent of the effects of gender, age, academic standing, and importance of religion, Ordered Ordinal Regression was utilized. This form of regression was selected because the items were answered using ordinal level five-point Likert scale. Each of the 26 items presented in Table 1 were entered into a regression model as the dependent variable and gender, age, academic standing, importance of religion, and nationality were entered in as the independent

variables. The results are reported in Table 2, with the regression coefficients for independent variables and the R-Squared statistic reported in the columns and the dependent variables presented in the rows.

\*\*\*\*\* Insert Table 2 about here \*\*\*\*\*

As shown in Table 2, there was a significant difference between Indian and U.S. students in their views on terrorism, responses to terrorism, and punishment of terrorists, even when controlling for gender, age, academic level, and importance of religion. In fact, all 19 of the significant differences for nation observed in the bivariate analyses were also found in the multivariate analyses. In addition, in the regression analyses, nationality was a significant predictor of one additional item than was the case with the *t*-test. Indian students were more likely to feel that terrorism rarely produced the changes wanted by the terrorists. On the 14 items under the grouping of views on terrorism, there was a difference on 12 measures between Indian and U.S. respondents in the multivariate regression analysis. In general, Indian students indicated greater agreement that terrorism was a serious social issue, the group was threatened by terrorism, terrorists were similar to criminals – items that illustrate the higher levels of collective culture and restraint found in India. U.S. respondents were more likely to agree that it was hard to define terrorism and terrorism threatened those in power rather than the social group, kidnapping was a form of terrorism, and that governments can engage in terrorism. These items illustrate the higher levels of individualism and indulgence and lower power distance found in the U.S. as compared India and help support the contention that cultural differences between the two nations partially help explain the observed differences in views on terrorism observed in the current study.

For the three of the four response to terrorism views, there was a difference between Indian and U.S. students. Indian respondents were more likely to support government efforts to stop terrorists at all costs, and U.S. students felt winning against terrorist would be difficult. The differences on the response to terrorism group of items support that the cultural forms of individualism/collectivism, masculinity vs. feminism, indulgence vs. restraint, and power distance may be playing a role in shaping these views. There was a statistically significant difference on five of the eight items in the punishment of terrorists group. U.S. students were more likely to feel that terrorists needed to be punished, while Indian participants were higher on being emotionally upset on what should happen to terrorists and felt terrorists should have fewer rights. These differences illustrate the differences between the level of punitiveness in each culture and the cultural values of individualism/collectivism, masculinity, indulgence, and uncertainty avoidance.

Of the independent variables, the nationality of the respondent had the most significant relationships – 20 of the 26 items in the regression analyses. Overall, the results support the contention that views on terrorism vary between cultures. In this case, there were significant differences on views for 77% of the items by nationality, suggesting that culture played a role – in fact, a larger role than any other independent variable. Gender had the next highest number of significant associations with 13 (50% of the items), suggesting that gender plays some role in shaping terrorism views, but to a lower level than cultural forces. Age, academic level, and religious saliency had 5, 3, and 2 significant associations, respectively. This indicates that these variables play a far lower role in shaping the terrorism views of the respondents than did culture as evident that nationality accounted differences in views on more than three-fourths of the items. Finally, it is important to note that for many of the items, the R-Squared value was low.

Across the 26 items, the independent variables accounted for approximately 1% to 23% of the observed variance in responses.

### **Discussion**

As the United Nations Office of Counter-Terrorism (2019) indicated, “[t]errorism poses a grave threat to national security and the lives of individuals around the world” (p. 1). The most effective way to respond to terrorism and terrorists, however, is often debated. People have varying views of terrorism and how to respond to it, and these views differ across nations. Attitudes toward issues, including terrorism, arise due to a multitude of factors, including cultural forces (Chung & Bagozzi, 1997). The current results support this contention. Our results also indicate that the terrorism views of the surveyed Indian and U.S. students are complex and varies. In other words, there were intra-differences and inter-differences in terrorism views.

Within the two groups, views differed. Within each group there were differing views to most of the statements presented in Table 1. For example, there was no majority of view on whether terrorism is a violent act used to promote change among the Indian students. Likewise, among U.S. students, there was no overwhelming view on whether assassination is a form of terrorism. Similarly, there were diverse views among Indian and U.S. students about whether convicted terrorists should be able to appeal their sentences, even if sentenced to death. Views on terrorism are likely similar to views on crime and criminals in a given culture. The views are not monolithic and there is not complete agreement on the best way to respond to crime and criminals in a country. The same appears to be the case for terrorism and how to respond and deal with terrorists. There was also consistency on some terrorism views in each nation. The majority of respondents in each nation felt that kidnapping a person for political reasons was a form of terrorism. The reason for this agreement may be because kidnapping is seen as a *mala in*

*se* (wrong in itself) rather than a *mala prohibita* crime (wrong because it prohibited) (Davis, 2006). Likewise, there was a consistent agreement that terrorists needed to pay for their acts and be punished within each country. It is likely emotions, such as anger, resulted in many people feeling terrorists need to be stopped and held accountable for their acts. There was, however, less agreement on the best course of action of how to do this. For example, Indian respondents were more likely to express anger if terrorists were not sentenced to death as compared to their U.S. counterparts. The results indicate that there were differences in terrorism views within each group.

The results also show there were differences in views between the two groups of students. Nation, a proxy measure for culture, appears to play an important role in shaping views on terrorism. In fact, as illustrated in Table 2, nation was the best predictor on the vast majority of terrorism views. Cultural orientation and values play a role in shaping views on different social issues, including terrorism as illustrated by the results of the current study (Peterka-Benton & Benton, 2014). Indian students were much more likely to feel that terrorism was a pressing social problem than the responding U.S. students. This is likely due to the extent and longer history of terrorist attacks in India (Unnithan, 1995) compared to the U.S.. People tend to feel an issue is a pressing social problem when it is common or has happened recently. The U.S. terrorist attack of 9/11 happened a while back in the lives of the U.S. respondents, so they may not vividly remember this horrible terrorist attack on U.S. soil as might older U.S. citizens. If this study was done in 2002 or 2003, the U.S. students may have felt that terrorism was a major pressing social issue as was the case for Indian respondents. For Indian respondents, there have been many more recent major terrorist domestic attacks than is the case for the U.S. students.

Indian respondents were much more likely to feel that terrorism is an easily defined act as compared to U.S. students. It is important to note that there is no universally accepted definition of terrorism. According to Guiora (2007), “one of the greatest hindrances to a cogent discussion of terrorism and counterterrorism has been that the terms lack clear, universal definitions. Even different government agencies within the United States use different definitions of terrorism” (p. 2). There may have been less discussion of what terrorism is and how hard it is to define in India compared to the U.S. After the 9/11 the attacks, there was a discussion in the media and the public of what is terrorism and how to respond to it in the U.S. As such, U.S. students may be more aware of the difficulty in defining terrorism. There also was a major difference between Indian and U.S. students in feeling there are no differences between criminals and terrorists. Indian respondents were far more likely to agree with this view than were U.S. students. This may be a difference in how government defines and responds to terrorists. In the U.S., terrorists are treated differently than criminals, with many of our counterterrorism efforts in other nations being carried out by the military. In India, terrorists and criminals are generally seen as threats to society. Interestingly, U.S. students were much more likely to agree that governments can engage in terrorism than were their Indian counterparts. This could be the result of the long history of the U.S. and Western media portraying government wrongdoings, including those by the U.S.

There were also differences in how to respond to terrorism. Indian students were more likely to feel that government must take whatever course of action to win against terrorists, including killing them. This could be the result of India experiencing far more small scale terrorists attacks when compared to U.S. Psychological feelings, such as fear or a connection with victims, could have resulted in Indian participants more supportive of winning against

terrorism at all costs (Houck & Conway, 2013). In addition, many terrorist attacks against the U.S. have been on foreign soil, while the vast majority of India's terrorist attacks have been on its own soil. On the other hand, U.S. participants were more likely to agree that winning against terrorists would be very hard. This could be the result of having politicians and experts indicating that while it is necessary to fight terrorists, winning will take major effort and time. This discussion has not been as intense in India, which also faces other major social problems. There were also differences by nation on the punishment of terrorists. U.S. students were more likely to feel terrorists need to pay for their acts and need to be punished harshly, including being put to death. This could be the result of punitive notions that are part of the U.S. culture, which has one of the highest incarceration rates in the world and is only Western industrial countries to still actively practice capital punishment (Elechi et al., 2006). On the other hand, Indian respondents were more likely to agree that convicted terrorists should not be able to appeal their sentences even if sentenced to death as compared to U.S. participants. This could be the result of frustration of Indian students on the progress (or lack of) of effective counterterrorism efforts and the due process nature of justice in the U.S.

Of the 7 items on which there was no statistical significance difference between Indian and U.S. participants, there was no discernable pattern. Three items were in grouping one (views of terrorism), another item was in grouping two (response to terrorism) and three items were part of grouping three (punishment of terrorism). Overall, there was a significant difference on the vast majority of the items across the three groupings between the two groups of students. Nation appears to play a role in shaping the terrorism views of those surveyed. For example, as indicated in Table 2, the best predictor of views of terrorism was nation. In fact, nation was a significant predictor than any other variable in the multivariate analyses. Nation, which was significant

predictor on 19 of the 26 items, was a much more consistent predictor than was gender (predictor on 13 items), age (predictor on 5 items), academic level (predictor on 2 items, and importance of religion in a person's life (predictor on 2 items). The significant differences can be attributed in part to cultural differences between the two nations. Culture is a powerful force that shapes individual's views on many social issues, including terrorism as the current results suggest.

Overall, nationality was the best predictor of views on terrorism and indicates there are differences between Indian and U.S. cultures. As indicated earlier, the U.S. is a far more punitive in its dealing of crime and criminals than India, and this appears in many of the terrorism views. This may be due to the major cultural differences, including masculinity vs. femininity, uncertainty avoidance, individualism vs. collectivism, indulgence vs. restraint, and power distance proposed by Hofstede (Hofstede, 1993, 2003, 2011; Hofstede & Bond, 1984; Hofstede Insights, 2020). In masculine cultures, which U.S. was higher than India, there is a greater desire to be successful (Hofstede Insights, 2020). This explains the overall higher view among Indian students to win against terrorism at all costs. The difference in views could also be explained by the cultural force of uncertainty avoidance, which when low, allows for the bending or circumventing of rules for a given outcomes. Again, India was slightly lower on this area as compared to U.S. This helps explain why Indian respondents had a higher desire to win against terrorist and willing to deny rights to terrorists. It could be that they were less willing to tolerate uncertainty and had a greater desire for a given outcome to protect the group.

There is a difference between India and the U.S. on the individualism vs. collectivism cultural area; India is more of a collectivist culture than the U.S. (Hofstede Insights, 2020), which led to differing views on terrorism and terrorists. U.S. students tended to be more likely to express individualistic views, such as feeling terrorism was meant to frighten those in power and

to be more punitive in the response to terrorists, such as the death penalty. Individualism generally holds the offender solely responsible and therefore punishes the individual offender to deter future behavior, while collectivism generally supports the response which best protects the group rather than punishing a particular individual (Lambert, 2003; Lambert et al., 2008).

Overall, collectivism explains some of the differences for Indian respondents. Indian students appeared more concerned about society when they indicated terrorism was a major social problem since it threatens society (group), is easy defined (group rather than an individual definition), that criminal and terrorists were the same (both threaten the group), and government needs to do whatever is needed to win against terrorism.

Some of the differences in views appear to be linked to the indulgence vs. restraint cultural area, which deals with the need to control desires and emotions. As previously indicated, India is seen as having a more restrained culture than the U.S. (Hofstede Insights, 2020). This cultural force helps explain why U.S. students had a greater desire for revenge against terrorists. Interestingly, Indian students were more likely to express anger if a terrorist was not sentenced to death, which was not be expected under this cultural paradigm, because anger is not a restrained emotion. The cultural force of power distance may have also influenced the views. As indicated previously, there is greater deference to those in power in India as compared to the U.S. (Hofstede, 2011; Hofstede Insights, 2020). This may explain why Indian respondents were more likely to agree that government needs to do whatever it takes to win against terrorist and why U.S. students were more likely to feel assassination was a form of terrorism and that governments could engage in terrorism. While it appears that cultural forces influenced the differences in observed terrorism views among the two groups of respondents, it cannot be

empirically demonstrated. Future studies should measure how differences in cultural forces and values shape the terrorism views of citizens in nations across the globe.

Of the other variables included in the multivariate analysis, gender was the second most common predictor after nation. There was a gender difference in terrorism views on half of the items. In general, male respondents were more likely to feel that terrorism was a very serious problem, more likely to agree that the government needs to take whatever steps necessary to combat terrorism, and were punitive in their views of what should happen to terrorists. Female respondents were broader in their definition of terrorism, more likely to feel governments could engage in terrorism, and were less punitive in their views of what should happen to terrorists. The finding that gender was a significant predictor was the next best predictor after nation is consistent with what has been reported in the literature. A gender gap has been found in other areas. For example, a gender difference on war and aggressive military actions has been observed (Boussios & Cole, 2010a, 2010b). Additionally, a gender gap on crime and criminal justice issues has been reported (Applegate, Cullen, & Fisher, 2002; Whitehead & Blankenship, 2000). Women in general tend to be less punitive and more treatment-oriented as compared to men, who tend to be more punitive and more likely to hold offenders responsible for their actions (Applegate et al., 2002; Grasmick & McGill, 1994; Whitehead & Blankenship, 2000). The findings from the current study suggest that there may be a gender gap not only for views of crime but for terrorism as well. The current findings are in line with the work of Gilligan (1982), who contended that women and men operate on different social values that influence what they see as a justice sanction for offenders. According to Gilligan (1982), women are more concerned with the well-being of the group, sensitivity to others, and trying to change the individual so that the group benefits (morality of care) rather than punish offenders. Gilligan indicated that men are

generally more oriented towards the desire to punish those who break the law and hold individuals accountable (hierarchy of authority). Hurwitz and Smithey (1998) pointed out that women are concerned about crime prevention because of “a larger concern for protecting the vulnerable and making sure no one is hurt” (p. 107). Applegate et al. (2002) contended that “women, more so than men, seem to hold a general view that the government should not simply be an instrument of punishment and accountability but also should provide assistance to people with needs” (p. 98). In the current study, gender is the next best predictor of the terrorism items after nation. While it suggests a gender gap on terrorism views, this needs to be explored before it can be confirmed and understood.

The other variables of age, academic level, and importance of religion were overall not predictors of terrorism views. Only on 5 of the 26 terrorism view items was age a significant predictor. Older students were more likely to feel that terrorism was a pressing social issue. Interestingly, older students were more likely to feel that kidnapping people for money was a form of terrorism. Older respondents were also more likely to feel that winning against terrorists is hard and were less fearful of being victims of terrorism. It could be that as they age, they gain more information, and this shapes their terrorism views. Except for a few items, there was not much difference in views by age. In the current study, age was likely not a powerful predictor of the terrorism view items because there was not a great deal of variance in age. Most of the participants were young. Academic level was only a significant predictor on two items. Higher level students were more likely to agree that governments could engage in terrorism and were less fearful of being a terrorist victim. It could be that their studies exposed them to the low probability of being a victim of terrorism and that governments can engage in wrongdoing. In the end, academic level did not explain much in terms of variation in views. This is not to say

education plays no role in shaping views on terrorism. Rather it is likely in this study that all the participants were college students. Future research needs to examine whether there are differences in terrorism views between non-college and college educated individuals. Finally, the importance of religion in a person's life was not a significant predictor. Only on two items was there a difference. The more importance religion played in a person's life, the more likely the person was to feel that swift and severe action is needed against terrorists and only death will stop terrorists. On the other 24 items, this variable had a nonsignificant association. It could be that rather than importance of religion, the denomination of religion matters. Future studies should examine whether different religious denominations differ in their terrorism views. The results suggest that while nationality plays a role in shaping terrorism views, they are complex and likely shaped by both intra- and inter-variables.

As with many studies, the current study has limitations. It was a single preliminary study based on survey of college students. Additional research is needed to determine whether the results can be replicated. In addition, exploration of terrorism views among the general population should be undertaken. A random sample of Indian and U.S residents would allow the results to be generalized to the overall population in each nation. Additionally, the measures for views on terrorism were limited. In the current study, single item measures rather than indexes were used. More detailed measures should be developed and used. Items measuring other areas of terrorism views should be developed and asked. There has been little cross-cultural research in this area. Furthermore, studies are required to test empirically the postulations of why terrorism views differed between Indian and U.S. participants. It is important to realize that the explanations offered for the results in this study have not been tested. In the current study, between 1% to 23% of the variance in views was explained. Research is needed to identify the

additional variables that help shape terrorism views. Studies should not only explore the variables which account for inter-differences (i.e., cross-national) but also intra-differences (i.e., within a nation). It is likely that there will be differences in views of social control among different groups within a nation. Future studies should explore how political affiliation influences views on terrorism (Boussios & Cole, 2010a, 201b). Future studies should examine the level of support for torture of suspected terrorists and if the level of support varies between nations (Homant & Witkowski, 2011). Political identity was not measured and may be a factor that shapes views on terrorism and should be tested in future research (Boussios & Cole, 2010a, 2010b). As previously indicated, even after controlling for nationality, there appeared to be a difference between men and women on many of the terrorism items. Future studies should not only explore whether there is a gender gap in terrorism views but why. Continuing research is needed to determine whether views evolve as both nations continue to change and experience new terrorist attacks. Finally, research is needed on terrorism views among residents in other nations. Terrorism occurs across a wide array of nations across the globe. What is not known is what residents of these nations think of terrorism, terrorists, and how to respond.

### **Conclusion**

In closing, Angel and Thoits (1987) contended that views and attitudes of different groups are windows to the salient values of their particular culture. The current exploratory study examined the differences in terrorism views between Indian and U.S. residents. Both nations have experienced major terrorist attacks, yet many views regarding terrorism differed between the two cultures. The current study indicates that terrorism views are not invariant but differ between Indian and the U.S., as well within each nation. The results suggest that while nationality plays a role in shaping terrorism views, they are complex and likely shaped by both

intra- and inter-variables. This study raised more questions than it answered. Research is needed to explore why terrorism views differ. More cross-national research is clearly needed, especially in light of the potential sociological and political factors that surround the issues in question. Future cross-cultural research will not only provide a better understanding of terrorism views, but how and why they differ across cultures. No nation has a monopoly over dealing with terrorism or how to best respond to it. The authors hope that this study will spur further cross-cultural studies of terrorism and other criminological topics. In any event, we hope that this study provided a bit more light on the largely unexplored area of terrorism views.

## References

- Akers, R., & Sellers, C. (2004). *Criminological theories*, 4<sup>th</sup> edition. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Company.
- Angel, R., & Thoits, P. (1987). The impact of culture on the cognitive structure of illness. *Culture, Medicine, and Psychiatry*, 11, 465-494.
- Applegate, B. K., Cullen, F. T., & Fisher, B. S. (2002). Public views toward crime and correctional policies: Is there a gender gap? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30, 89-100.
- Barry, E. (2015, July 27). Gunmen in Indian army uniforms attack bus and police station. *New York Times*, A9. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2015/07/28/world/asia/gunmen-in-punjab-india-attack-bus-and-police-station.html?ref=topics>.
- Bartels, R. (1967). A model for ethics in marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 31, 20-26.
- Bora, K. (2016, December 13). Major terrorist attacks in India over the last 25 years: A timeline. *International Business Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.ibtimes.com/major-terrorist-attacks-india-over-last-20-years-timeline-1752731>.
- Boussios, E., & Cole, S. (2010a). Americans' attitudes toward war: Trend analysis of public opinion for the Iraq war. *Journal of Applied Security Research*, 5, 208-226.
- Boussios, E., & Cole, S. (2010b). Do individual characteristics matter? An analysis of Americans' opinions toward the Korean, Vietnam, Persian Gulf, and Iraq wars. *Journal of Applied Security*, 5, 279-305.
- Carter, B., & Fay, E. (2019). Responding to terror: An empirical analysis of U.S. military activity, public opinion, and transnational terrorism. *Journal of Applied Security Research*, 14, 140-168.

- Chang, L. (1999). Gender role egalitarian attitudes in Beijing, Hong Kong, Florida, and Michigan. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 30*, 722-741.
- Chung, W., & Bagozzi, R. (1997). The construct validity of measures of the tripartite conceptualization of punishment attitudes. *Journal of Social Service Research, 22*, 1-25.
- Davis, M. (2006). Crimes mala in se: An equity-based definition. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 17*, 270-289.
- Davis, D., & Silver, B. (2004). Civil liberties vs. security: Public opinion in the context of the terrorist attacks on America. *American Journal of Political Sciences, 48*, 28-46.
- Dhillon, K. (2005). *Police and politics in India - Colonial concepts, democratic compulsions: India police 1947-2002*. New Delhi: Manohar Publishers.
- Elechi, O. O., Lambert, E. G., & Ventura, L. (2006). An examination of death penalty views of Nigerian and U.S. college students: An exploratory study. *African Journal of Criminology and Justice Studies, 2*(2), 101-147.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation (2015). *Major terrorism cases: Past and present*. Retrieved from [https://www.fbi.gov/about-us/investigate/terrorism/terrorism\\_cases](https://www.fbi.gov/about-us/investigate/terrorism/terrorism_cases).
- E-Pao. (2014). *Two killed, 19 hurt in Sinjamei blast*. Retrieved from <http://www.e-pao.net/GP.asp?src=20..300514.may14>.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gordon, S. (2008). Policing terrorism in India. *Crime, Law, and Social Change, 50*, 111-124.
- Grasmick, H., & McGill, A. (1994). Religion, attribution style, and punitiveness toward juvenile offenders. *Criminology, 32*, 23-46.
- Green, J. (1982). *Cultural awareness in the human services*. Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Gross, K., Brewer, P., & Aday, S. (2009). Confidence in government and emotional responses to terrorism after September 11, 2001. *American Politics Research*, 37, 107-128.
- Guiora, A. N. (2007). *Global perspectives on counterterrorism*. New York: Aspen Publishers.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Motivation, leadership and organization: do American theories apply abroad? *Organizational Dynamics*, 9, 42-63.
- Hofstede, G. (1984). National cultures revisited. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 2, 22-28.
- Hofstede, G. (1993). Cultural constraints in management theories. *The Executive*, 17, 81-94.
- Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. *Online readings in psychology and culture*. Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/orpc/vol2/iss1/8/>.
- Hofstede, G., & Bond, M. H. (1984). Hofstede's culture dimensions: An independent validation using Rokeach's value survey. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 15, 417-433.
- Hofstede, G. (2003). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede Insights. (2020). *Country comparison*. Retrieved from <https://www.hofstede-insights.com/product/compare-countries/>.
- Homant, R., & Witkowski, M. (2011). Support for coercive interrogation among college students: Torture and the ticking bomb scenario. *Journal of Applied Security Research*, 6, 135-157.
- Houck, S., & Conway, L. (2013). What people think about torture: Torture is inherently bad . . . unless it can save someone I love. *Journal of Applied Security Research*, 8, 429-454.
- Hurwitz, J., & Smithey, S. (1998). Gender differences on crime and punishment. *Political Research Quarterly*, 51, 89-115.

- Infoplease. (2016). *Terrorist attacks in the U.S. or against Americans*. Retrieved from <http://www.infoplease.com/ipa/A0001454.html>.
- Johnson, W. (2016). *Terrorist attacks and related incidents in the United States*. Retrieved from <http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/terrorism/wrjp255a.html>.
- Jowell, R. (1998). How comparative is comparative research? *American Behavioral Scientist*, 42, 168-177.
- Kraft, M., & Marks, E. (2011). *U.S. government counterterrorism: A guide to who does what*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Kumar, H. (2015, June 4). 20 Indian soldiers killed in ambush in Manipur. *New York Times*, A6. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2015/06/05/world/asia/20-indian-soldiers-killed-in-ambush-in-manipur.html>.
- Laerd Statistics. (2020). Independent t-test using SPSS statistics. Retrieved from <https://statistics.laerd.com/spss-tutorials/independent-t-test-using-spss-statistics.php>.
- Lambert, E. (2003). The views of women and men on terrorism and the punishment of terrorists: A preliminary study among Midwestern college students. *Criminal Justice Studies: A Critical Journal of Crime, Law, and Society*, 16, 217-321.
- Lambert, E. (2004). Assessing the crime and punishment views of criminal justice majors: How different are they from other majors? *Criminal Justice Studies: A Critical Journal of Crime, Law, and Society*, 17, 245-257.
- Lambert, E., Jaishankar, K., Jiang, S., Pasupuleti, S., & Bhimarasetty, J. (2012). Correlates of formal and informal social control on crime prevention: An exploratory study among university students, Andhra, Pradesh, India. *Asian Journal of Criminology*, 7, 239-250.

- Lambert, E., Khondaker, M., Elechi, O., Jiang, S., & Baker, D. (2012). Formal and informal crime control views in Bangladesh and the United States. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice, 10*, 199-222.
- Lambert, E., Pasupuleti, S., Jiang, S., Karuppanan, J., & Bhimarasetty, J. (2008). Death penalty views among college students in India. *Punishment and Society, 10*, 207-218.
- Lambert, E, Qureshi, H., Hogan, N., Klahm, C., Smith, B., & Frank, J. (2015). The association of job variables with job involvement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment among Indian police officers. *International Criminal Justice Review, 25*, 194-213.
- Lewis, C. (2005). The clash between security and liberty in the U.S. response to terror. *Public Administration review, 65*, 18-30.
- Madison, J. (1791). Public opinion, chapter 2, document 26. In W. Hutchinson, W. Rachel, & R. Rutland (Eds.), *The papers of James Madison*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Retrieved from <http://press-pubs.uchicago.edu/founders/documents/v1ch2s26.html>.
- Mayhew, P., & van Kesteren, J. (2002). Cross-national attitudes to punishment. In J. Roberts & M. Hough (Eds.), *Changing attitudes to punishment: Public opinion, crime, and justice* (pp. 63-92). Portland, OR: Willan Publishing.
- Muhlhausen, D., & McNeill, J. (2011). *Terror trends: 40 years' data on international and domestic terrorism*. Washington, DC: The Heritage Foundation.
- New York Times. (2014, April 3). India: Gunmen attack security forces. *New York Times*, A10. Retrieved from [http://www.nytimes.com/2015/04/03/world/asia/india-gunmen-attack-security-forces.html?ref=topics&\\_r=0](http://www.nytimes.com/2015/04/03/world/asia/india-gunmen-attack-security-forces.html?ref=topics&_r=0).
- North, D. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change, and economic performance*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Pasupuleti, S., Lambert, E., Jiang, S., Bhimarasetty, J., & Jaishankar, K. (2009). Crime, criminals, treatment, and punishment: An exploratory study of views among college students in India and the United States. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 25, 131-147.
- Peterka-Benton, D., & Benton, B. (2014). Effects of cultural collectivism on terrorism favorability. *Journal of Applied Security Research*, 9, 17-40.
- Poddar, T., & Yi, E. (2007). *Global economics paper number 152: India's rising growth potential*. New York: Goldman Sachs.
- Raghavan, R. (1999). *Policing a democracy: A comparative study of India and the US*. New Delhi, India: Manohar Publishers and Distributors.
- Raghavan, R. (2004). *India*. Retrieved from <http://nicic.org/Library/019426>.
- Raghavan, R., & Shiva Sankar, A. (2003). A community policing approach to crime prevention: The case of India. In S. Lab & D. Das (Eds.), *International perspectives on community policing and crime prevention* (pp. 113-126). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Rand. (2016). *Database of worldwide terrorism incidents*. Retrieved from [http://smapp.rand.org/rwtid/search\\_form.php](http://smapp.rand.org/rwtid/search_form.php).
- Rogers, S. (2013, April 17). Four decades of U.S. terror attacks listed and detailed. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/news/datablog/2013/apr/17/four-decades-us-terror-attacks-listed-since-1970>.
- Scott, W. (1992). *Organizations: Rational, natural, and open systems*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Second Administrative Reforms Commission. (2008). *Combatting terrorism: Protecting by righteousness, 8<sup>th</sup> report*. New Delhi: Government of India.

- Sen, S. (2000). *Police in democratic societies*. New Delhi: Gyan Publishing House.
- Seta, C., Paulus, P., & Baron, R. (2000). *Effective human relations*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Shamir, J., & Shikaki, K. (2002). Self-serving perceptions of terrorism among Israelis and Palestinians. *Political Psychology*, 23, 537-557.
- South Asian Terrorism Portal. (2008). *The National Investigation Agency Bill, 2008*. Retrieved from <http://www.satp.org/satporgtp/countries/india/document/papers/75-c1.htm>.
- South Asian Terrorism Portal. (2015). *India – terrorist, insurgent, and extremist groups*. Retrieved from <http://www.satp.org/satporgtp/countries/india/terroristoutfits/index.html>.
- South Asian Terrorism Portal. (2016). *Indian fatalities: 1994-2016*. Retrieved from <http://www.satp.org/satporgtp/countries/india/database/indiafatalities.htm>.
- Sun, I., Wu, Y., & Poteyeva, M. (2011). Arab American's opinion on counterterrorism measures: The impact of race, ethnicity, and religion. *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, 34, 540-555.
- Sutherland, E. (1947). *Criminology*, 4<sup>th</sup> edition. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott University Press.
- Trading Economics. (2020). India – rural population. Retrieved from [https://tradingeconomics.com/india/rural-population-percent-of-total-population-wb-data.html#:~:text=Rural%20population%20\(%25%20of%20total,compiled%20from%20officially%20recognized%20sources](https://tradingeconomics.com/india/rural-population-percent-of-total-population-wb-data.html#:~:text=Rural%20population%20(%25%20of%20total,compiled%20from%20officially%20recognized%20sources).
- United Nations of Counter-Terrorism. (2019). *Terrorism – Interpol*. Retrieved from <https://www.un.org/counterterrorism/ctitf/en/terrorism-interpol>.
- University of Albany. (2013). *Sourcebook of criminal justice*. Retrieved from <http://www.albany.edu/sourcebook/index.html>.

- Unnithan, N. P. (1995). Explaining collective violence in India: Social cleavages and their consequences. *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* 18, 93-109
- U.S. Department of State. (2009). *The global war on terrorism: The first 100 days*. Retrieved from <http://2001-2009.state.gov/s/ct/rls/wh/6947.htm>.
- U.S. Department of State. (2014). *U.S.-India trade and economic cooperation*. Retrieved from <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2014/09/232339.htm>.
- Watson, D. (2002, February 2). Testimony before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. Retrieved from <https://www.fbi.gov/news/testimony/the-terrorist-threat-confronting-the-united-states>.
- West, D., & Orr, M. (2005). Managing citizen fears: Public attitudes toward urban terrorism. *Urban Affairs Review*, 41, 1-13.
- Whitehead, J., & Blankenship, M. (2000). The gender gap in capital punishment attitudes: An analysis of support and opposition. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 25, 1-13.
- Worldatlas. (2016). *Countries of the world*. Retrieved from <http://www.worldatlas.com/aatlas/populations/ctypopls.htm>.
- World Factbook. (2020a). India. Retrieved from <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/in.html>.
- World Factbook. (2020b). United States. Retrieved from <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/us.html>.
- World Prison Brief. (2020). World Prison Brief data. Retrieved from <https://www.prisonstudies.org/world-prison-brief-data>.

Yadav, A. (2014, April 25). Eight killed in blast of last day of polling in Jharkland. *The Hindu*.

Retrieved from <http://www.thehindu.com/todays-paper/tp-national/eight-killed-in-blast-on-last-day-of-polling-in-jharkhand/article5945685.ece>.

Yick, A. (2000). Domestic violence beliefs and attitudes in the Chinese American community.

*Journal of Social Service Research*, 27, 29-51.

Table 1

*Views on Terrorism and How to Respond for Indian and U.S. Participants*

Statement	India					U.S.					India Mn/SD	U.S. Mn/SD	t-value
	SD	D	U	A	SA	SD	D	U	A	SA			
<b>Views of Terrorism</b>													
Terrorism is one of the most serious problems facing society	2%	3%	6%	33%	56%	6%	25%	19%	35%	16%	4.36 / 0.92	3.33 / 1.16	-15.12**
Terrorism is an easily defined act upon which all people can agree	9%	15%	16%	40%	21%	16%	39%	21%	20%	4%	3.50 / 1.22	2.57 / 1.10	-11.98**
It is difficult to define terrorism	4%	22%	19%	37%	18%	2%	18%	13%	49%	17%	3.43 / 1.14	3.60 / 1.04	2.36*
Terrorism is a violent act or threat used as a mechanism to promote change	5%	25%	23%	32%	14%	3%	13%	26%	51%	6%	3.25 / 1.14	3.44 / 0.91	2.84**
Terrorism is a violent act to frighten those in power and their supporters	9%	16%	19%	44%	12%	1%	5%	15%	64%	15%	3.35 / 1.15	3.89 / 0.72	8.59**
Any illegal use of force against innocent people to achieve whatever objectives is terrorism	9%	20%	11%	39%	20%	4%	27%	32%	33%	5%	3.40 / 1.28	3.09 / 0.96	-4.20**
Kidnapping innocent people for political reasons is terrorism	10%	19%	13%	42%	16%	1%	11%	19%	55%	13%	3.34 / 1.24	3.68 / 0.88	4.86**
Kidnapping innocent people for economic (money) reasons is terrorism	6%	27%	14%	36%	17%	1%	16%	33%	40%	9%	3.31 / 1.20	3.40 / 0.91	1.30
There is little difference between terrorists and criminals	6%	23%	11%	48%	12%	8%	49%	21%	20%	2%	3.36 / 1.15	2.60 / 0.96	-10.88**
Terrorists are criminals	6%	18%	14%	37%	26%	1%	5%	12%	34%	49%	3.60 / 1.21	4.25 / 0.90	9.31**
Any assassination is terrorism	14%	37%	18%	21%	10%	4%	27%	29%	32%	7%	2.76 / 1.22	3.10 / 1.02	4.54**
Terrorism rarely works in producing the desired change	6%	20%	18%	40%	17%	2%	17%	33%	40%	7%	3.43 / 1.15	3.32 / 0.92	-1.47

I have little fear about potential attacks by terrorists	11%	21%	25%	34%	8%	5%	28%	17%	42%	7%	3.06 / 1.15	3.19 / 1.08	1.73
Governments can engage in terrorism	13%	23%	20%	28%	15%	1%	5%	14%	57%	23%	3.10 / 1.28	3.95 / 0.83	11.95**
<b>Response to Terrorism</b>													
The government should do whatever it takes to win against terrorists	10%	14%	13%	35%	28%	8%	21%	25%	34%	11%	3.57 / 1.30	3.20 / 1.13	-4.61**
Terrorists should be killed by any means possible	10%	24%	17%	30%	19%	7%	33%	28%	21%	10%	3.24 / 1.28	2.94 / 1.12	-3.62**
Swift and severe action must be taken to stop terrorists.	5%	13%	13%	40%	28%	1%	9%	19%	51%	20%	3.84 / 2.32	3.81 / 0.88	-0.30
Winning against terrorists is very hard	6%	22%	14%	38%	20%	1%	9%	17%	54%	20%	3.44 / 1.21	3.84 / 0.86	5.80**
<b>Punishment of Terrorists</b>													
We need to make terrorist pay for their acts	7%	10%	10%	40%	32%	1%	3%	7%	55%	34%	3.78 / 1.20	4.18 / 0.77	5.75**
Terrorists should be punished harshly	4%	15%	12%	30%	40%	1%	7%	12%	49%	31%	3.86 / 1.20	4.01 / 0.90	2.16*
Terrorists who kill deserve the death penalty	7%	24%	10%	27%	32%	7%	12%	16%	29%	36%	3.55 / 1.33	3.75 / 1.24	2.39*
I will become angry if terrorists who kill are not sentenced to death	11%	24%	12%	26%	26%	6%	36%	19%	23%	16%	3.32 / 1.38	3.06 / 1.22	-3.04**
Nothing but death will stop terrorists	16%	30%	18%	22%	15%	9%	32%	29%	19%	10%	2.90 / 1.32	2.88 / 1.12	-0.20
Most terrorists will kill if they are not executed or killed first	9%	19%	18%	36%	18%	3%	19%	40%	22%	16%	3.36 / 1.22	3.28 / 1.03	-1.02
Sentencing terrorists to death will not deter future terrorist attacks	6%	18%	15%	36%	25%	4%	11%	15%	49%	20%	3.57 / 1.30	3.20 / 1.13	1.76
Convicted terrorists should not be allowed to appeal their sentences, even if they are sentenced to death	10%	22%	19%	30%	19%	12%	33%	19%	19%	17%	3.25 / 1.28	2.96 / 1.29	-3.43**

*Note.* SD stands for strongly disagree, D stands for disagree, U stands for uncertain, A stands for agree, SA for strongly agree, Mn for mean, and SD for standard deviation. Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding. For the Independent *t*-test, the responses were coded as SD = 1, D = 2, U = 3, A = 4, and SA = 5. The number of Indian participants was 434 and the number of U.S. participants was 484. A positive *t*-value indicates U.S. participants were higher in their agreement for the item, and a negative *t*-value indicates Indian participants were higher in their level of agreement for the item.

\*  $p \leq .05$ ,      \*\*  $p \leq .01$

Table 2

*Ordered Ordinal Regression Results of the Association of Gender, Age, Academic Level, Religious Saliency, and Nationality on Terrorism Views*

Statement	Gender	Age	Level	Relig.	Nation	R <sup>2</sup>
<b>Views of Terrorism</b>						
Terrorism is one of the most serious problems facing society	.32**	.04**	-.06	.03	-1.86**	.23
Terrorism is an easily defined act upon which all people can agree	.11	.04	-.06	-.05	-.91**	.08
It is difficult to define terrorism	-.09	-.02	.04	-.11	.38*	.04
Terrorism is a violent act or threat used as a mechanism to promote change	-.05	.02	-.03	-.02	.28*	.06
Terrorism is a violent act to frighten those in power and their supporters	-.06	.03	.13	.06	.83**	.08
Any illegal use of force against innocent people to achieve whatever objectives is terrorism	-.41**	.01	-.10	-.11	-.51**	.04
Kidnapping innocent people for political reasons is terrorism	.16	.06	-.09	-.08	.58**	.04
Kidnapping innocent people for economic (money) reasons is terrorism	-.30*	.05**	-.10	-.10	.23	.03
There is little difference between terrorists and criminals	-.14	.03	-.08	.06	-1.38**	.13
Terrorists are criminals	-.05	.02	-.01	-.11	1.18**	.10
Any assassination is terrorism	-.28*	.00	.08	-.04	.44**	.03
Terrorism rarely works in producing the desired change	.01	.04*	-.05	.12	-.36*	.04
I have little fear about potential attacks by terrorists	.11	.04*	-.14*	-.02	.22	.02
Governments can engage in terrorism	-.34**	.01	.15*	-.07	1.32**	.15
<b>Response to Terrorism</b>						
The government should do whatever it takes to win against terrorists	.43**	.01	-.09	.09	-.63**	.05

Terrorists should be killed by any means possible	.82**	-.01	-.10	-.02	-.27*	.07
Swift and severe action must be taken to stop terrorists.	.57**	.02	.01	.17*	.14	.03
Winning against terrorists is very hard	.22	.04**	.16*	-.09	.49**	.05
<b>Punishment of Terrorists</b>						
We need to make terrorist pay for their acts	.07	.01	-.01	.07	.51**	.03
Terrorists should be punished harshly	.48**	.01	-.01	-.01	.29*	.02
Terrorists who kill deserve the death penalty	.79**	.01	-.04	-.11	.44**	.06
I will become angry if terrorists who kill are not sentenced to death	.77**	.00	-.05	-.07	-.31*	.06
Nothing but death will stop terrorists	1.18**	.01	-.02	.13*	.04	.10
Most terrorists will kill if they are not executed or killed first	.62**	-.01	.02	-.02	-.08	.03
Sentencing terrorists to death will not deter future terrorist attacks	-.19	.00	.06	-.03	.19	.01
Convicted terrorists should not be allowed to appeal their sentences even if they are sentenced to death	.12	-.02	-.04	-.02	-.49**	.07

*Note.* Gender was measured as 0 = females and 1 = males. Age was measured in continuous years. Level represented the academic level of the respondent and was measured as 1 = 1st year, 2 = 2<sup>nd</sup> year, 3 = 3<sup>rd</sup> year, 4 = 4<sup>th</sup> year. Relig stands for the importance religion played in a person=s life and was measured where 1 = not at all, 2 = not much, 3 = a fair amount, and 4 = a great deal. Nation represented the location of the respondent and was measured as 1 = U.S. and 0 = India. R<sup>2</sup> represents the Nagelkerke pseudo R-squared value.

\* p ≤.05      \*\* p ≤.01