

Right-Wing Authoritarianism, Ethnocentrism and War Attitude among University Students of India

George Felix and Nandita Chaube

Gujarat Forensic Sciences University, Gandhinagar

Objective of the study was to study right wing authoritarianism (RWA), ethnocentrism and war attitudes among university students of India. The sample consisted of 245 participants inclusive of 117 males and 128 females. Generalised Ethnocentrism Scale (GENE), Right-Wing Authoritarianism Scale (RWA Scale), and War Attitude Scale (WAS) were used as measures of the study. Results indicated a significant relationship of these three variables in the entire sample. Whereas, males did not show a significant association between RWA and war attitudes. RWA emerged as a significant predictor of both ethnocentrism and war attitude in the overall sample. It is concluded that RWA, ethnocentrism and war attitudes are related to each other, where RWA predicts ethnocentrism and war attitudes.

Keywords: ethnocentrism, right-wing authoritarianism, war attitude, Indian university students, gender differences, university students

Right-wing authoritarians are characterized by conventionalism, submission to authorities, and a desire to punish offenders and others that constitute a threat to law and order (Halkjelsvik & Rise, 2014). The earlier work on this concept can be traced back to the 1950s in the work of Adorno and his associates (1950). Altemeyer (2006a) further clarified that 'right-wing' in right-wing authoritarianism (RWA) does not refer to someone's politics but rather indicates the individual's psychological preferences and personality. Right-wing authoritarian trait denotes the tendency of a person to follow established conventions and authorities in society (Moss, 2016). Their targets would normally be political dissidents and ethnic minorities (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992). Such people have a high degree of submissiveness towards authorities or authority figures that they perceive as established and legitimate (called authoritarian submission). Such groups tend to develop aggressive tendencies and violent behaviours. In past research, tendencies such as war, penal code violence, and corporal punishment have found associations with RWA (Benjamin, 2006) and previous research also supports the relationship between war attitude and RWA (Dupuis & Cohn, 2011).

According to the Global Peace Index (2018), global peace of 163 countries deteriorated by 0.27% from the previous year mainly due to inter-nation conflicts. A study reveals that political affiliation impacts the relationship between peace and war attitudes and conservative people are less likely to find the attitudes incompatible (Bizumic et al., 2013) in this article we argue that they may represent two distinct dimensions. To investigate this idea, we developed and tested a new balanced measure, the Attitudes Toward Peace and War (APW). The available research data indicate the role of culture in such phenomena. Though culture makes the existence of nations, heritage, civilizations, law, and code of conduct possible (Little & McGivern, 2012) foundational scholars, and emerging theories, we have incorporated section reviews with engaging questions, discussions that help students apply the sociological imagination, and features that draw learners into the discipline in meaningful ways. Although this text can be modified and reorganized to suit your needs, the standard version is organized so that topics are introduced conceptually, with relevant, everyday experiences. (Little & McGivern, 2012, it has its commonalities and also the differences prevailing in the society (Little & McGivern,

2012)foundational scholars, and emerging theories, we have incorporated section reviews with engaging questions, discussions that help students apply the sociological imagination, and features that draw learners into the discipline in meaningful ways. Although this text can be modified and reorganized to suit your needs, the standard version is organized so that topics are introduced conceptually, with relevant, everyday experiences. (Little & McGivern, 2012).

Ethnocentrism is one of the concepts that arises from differences in culture within society and intergroup relations (Matsumoto & Juang, 2016). It defines an individual's unique cultural identity (Andersen & Taylor, 2007). Broadly stating, it's a tendency or belief to judge people of other groups, societies, or lifestyles according to the standards of one's own group or culture, and in the process, viewing out-groups as inferior to ingroups(Healey, 2003; Noel, 1968; Sumner, 1906). It is generally viewed in negative terms (Barger, 2018; Choudhury, n.d.; Little & McGivern, 2012). Introduction to Sociology adheres to the scope and sequence of a typical introductory sociology course. In addition to comprehensive coverage of core concepts, foundational scholars, and emerging theories, we have incorporated section reviews with engaging questions, discussions that help students apply the sociological imagination, and features that draw learners into the discipline in meaningful ways. Although this text can be modified and reorganized to suit your needs, the standard version is organized so that topics are introduced conceptually, with relevant, everyday experiences. (Barger, 2018; Choudhury, n.d.; Little & McGivern, 2012 but it may be a normal psychological process to learn certain normed group behaviours (De Dreu, Greer, Van Kleef, Shalvi, & Handgraaf, 2011; Matsumoto & Juang, 2016). Some scholars define it as merely an ingroup positivity instead of outgroup negativity (Bizumic, Duckitt, Popadic, Dru, & Krauss, 2009)with four intergroup expressions of ingroup preference, superiority, purity, and exploitativeness, and two intragroup expressions of group cohesion and devotion. The reconceptualization was supported in Study 1 among 350 New Zealand participants and in Study 2 among 212 US, 208 Serbian,

and 279 French participants. Ethnocentrism in each country consisted of two correlated second-order factors representing intergroup and intragroup ethnocentrism and six first-order factors representing the six primary expressions. Analyses in Study 2 supported the measurement invariance of the scale and a third-order factor model, with one ethnocentrism factor at the broadest level of generalization. Ethnocentrism was empirically distinct from outgroup negativity and mere ingroup positivity. Intragroup ethnocentrism appeared primarily based on ethnic insecurity, personal self-transcendence, and ethnic identification, whereas intergroup ethnocentrism appeared primarily based on self-aggrandizement, warlikeness, and generally chauvinistic attitudes. Accordingly, although related, the two kinds of ethnocentrism tend to have quite differential implications for group attitudes and behaviors. Copyright © 2008 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. This article was published online on 31 December 2008. Errors were subsequently identified. This notice is included in the online and print versions to indicate that both have been corrected (Bizumic, Duckitt, Popadic, Dru, & Krauss, 2009).

These tendencies are universal. In India, it is termed as Indian Nationalism or Indocentrism which is an ethnocentric perspective referring to the political and cultural expression of patriotism or of pride in the history and heritage of India which regards India to be central and uniquely related to other countries.

Ethnocentrism is reported to be associated with RWA in earlier research (Duckitt, 1991, 1993, 2001; Ray, 1985). Altemeyer(1981) layered the concept of authoritarianism with right-wing authoritarianism (RWA) that better explained the three domains of the authoritarian personality, that are, submission, aggression, and conventionalism. Studies suggest that RWA is a stronger persecutor of political intolerance than ethnocentrism (Duckitt, 2001) that also confirm previous findings (Altemeyer, 1981, 1988). Hence, right-wing authoritarians tend to be more punitive and intolerant. Research suggests a correlation between RWA and stereotyping (Whitley, 1999) and religious fundamentalism in university students and their parents (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992). Others

attributed authoritarianism as a significant and strong positive predictor of prejudice (Laythe, Finkel, & Kirkpatrick, 2001) and social dominance (McFarland, 2010).

The vast literature on RWA has contributed many explanations as to why individuals behave and react differently based on the prevalence of the RWA trait. As discussed, studies have explored the relationship and predictions concerning authoritarianism and ethnocentrism, or authoritarianism and war attitudes. The literature on ethnocentrism in the Indian context has largely focused on consumer trends and business models (Fernandes & Srivastava, 2017).

However, the relationship between RWA, ethnocentrism, and war attitudes remains void, particularly in India. Also, the literature on war in India mainly concerned itself with a history of wars (such as the Indo-Pak war) and not on citizens' attitude towards war. Hence, there is a need for studies to investigate how these attitudes and traits inter-relate in the Indian context. This is one such attempt to bring well-researched concepts of RWA, ethnocentrism, and war attitude from the West to India. Considering previous researches, the current study aims to explore and quantify this phenomenon among Indian university students. It will also determine the significance of RWA as a predictor for ethnocentrism and war attitude.

Based on the literature, following objectives were made to explore the current study:

Objectives

- a) To find the association between ethnocentrism, right-wing authoritarianism, and attitude toward war in university students of India.
- b) To identify significant gender differences in university students of India on ethnocentrism, right-wing authoritarianism, and attitude toward war
- c) To identify significant predictors of right-wing authoritarianism, ethnocentrism and war attitudes.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: There will be a significant positive

association between ethnocentrism, right-wing authoritarianism, and war attitude in the overall sample and also among males and females.

Hypothesis 2: There will be a significant gender-difference on ethnocentrism, right-wing authoritarianism, and war attitudes.

Hypothesis 3: Right-wing authoritarianism will be a significant predictor of ethnocentrism and war attitudes.

Method

Participants

A total of 256 students participated in the study (ninerecords were rejected because of multiple unmarked responses, and two were discarded because they were not presently enrolled in a university). The sample was from the age range of 18 to 34 years. A total of 245 participants (Meanage = 22.4 years) were included in the sample which was consisted of 117 males (47.76%) and 128 were females (52.24%). All participants were Indian citizens with proficient spoken English. Majority of the participants belonged from urban or semi urban residential backgrounds. More than 80 present of the sample had no direct political connections. The data is inclusive of the participants from total 20 states of India out of 29.

Procedure

Collection of data took place in two modes, offline mode followed by online mode. 179 participants completed printed survey sheets and the remaining submitted their responses on Google Forms circulated on Facebook and WhatsApp. The period for online data collection spanned 2 months (January to February 2019) after which no further responses were accepted. A criterion of "you must currently be a university student" was mentioned in the online survey requests. Course, university, and location were asked to ensure fair participation. All data records were anonymous. Measures were taken to make sure of relatively even participation from different zones of the country. Confidentiality was maintained at the time of writing the report to avoid any local state controversies.

Measures

The data was collected with the help of following measures:

Demographic questionnaire: Participants provided information on gender, age, education, state of residence, religion, religiosity (how strongly religious), residential (urban or rural setting), joint or nuclear family, having a known member serving in the armed forces, a known member martyred in war, political identity of the participant, political party of preference, and whether they have family members in politics.

Generalised Ethnocentrism Scale (GENE; Neuliep, 2012; Neuliep & McCroskey, 2011): This scale is designed to measure the phenomenon of ethnocentrism in groups. It is a 22-item questionnaire, employing a 5-point bipolar Likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. 15 of the 22 items measure ethnocentrism; the remainder are distracters. Scores range from 15 to 75, with a higher score representing higher ethnocentrism. The scale was found appropriate for Indian population due to its global validity, established across a series of studies conducted by Neuliep (2002). Cronbach's alpha was reported to be .82 (Neuliep, 2002) of this scale.

The Right-Wing Authoritarianism Scale (RWA Scale; Altemeyer, 1981, 1998, 2006a). This scale is designed to measure right-wing authoritarianism. There are various versions (Altemeyer, 1981, 1996, 1998, 2006a; Funke, 2005; Rattazzi, Bobbio, & Canova, 2007) 1981, 1988, 1996, however, the current study uses the 24-item questionnaire (Altemeyer, 2006b) because of its item relevance to the Indian understanding and culture. The scale was tested on the population various countries by Duckitt et al (2010). It is a 6-point unipolar Likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. 12 items are reverse scored. Scores range from 24 to 144, with a higher score representing higher RWA. The validity of the scale was well established by Robinson, Shaver, and Wrightsman (1991). The overall reliability of the tool varies from .88 to .90 (Robinson et al., 1991).

The War Attitude Scale (WAS; Dupuis & Cohn, 2011): This scale is designed to measure war attitude. It is a 26-item questionnaire, with

a 6-point unipolar Likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. 11 items are reverse scored. Scores range from 26 to 156, with a higher score indicating favourable war attitude. The words 'United States' on items 1, 13, 14, 17, and 18 were replaced with 'India' (permission granted by authors). The authors have encouraged the use of the scale outside the United States of America (Dupuis & Cohn, 2011, sec. General Discussion: Limitations and Future Directions). Convergent validity was measured and established using the WAS and the Attitudes Towards War Scale (Stagner, 1942). Reliability analysis of the overall WAS reported a Cronbach's alpha of .92 and test-retest reliability was reported to be .93.

Results

To serve objective that is to find the association between ethnocentrism, right-wing authoritarianism, and attitude toward war in university students of India, correlation was employed. To identify the gender differences on these constructs, t test was used and regression analysis was done to find out the predictor variables.

Table 1. Correlation between generalized ethnocentrism (GENE), Right wing authoritarianism (RWA), and war attitudes (WAS)

	GENE	RWA Scale	WAS
GENE	1		
RWA Scale	.250**	1	
WAS	.249**	.283**	1

Note. GENE = Generalised Ethnocentrism Scale, RWA Scale = Right-wing Authoritarianism Scale, WAS = War Attitude Scale. Ncomplete = 245. * = $p \leq .05$, ** = $p \leq .01$

In the complete sample, GENE, RWA, and WAS were significantly positively related to each other such that GENE and RWA were partially positively correlated, $r(243) = .250$, $p < .01$, GENE and WAS were partially positively correlated, $r(243) = .249$, $p < .01$, and WAS and RWA were partially positively correlated, $r(243) = .283$, $p < .01$ (see Table 2).

Table 2. Correlation for GENE, RWA, and WAS in Males

	GENE	RWA Scale	WAS
GENE	1		
RWA Scale	.255**	1	
WAS	.195*	.137	1

Note. GENE = Generalised Ethnocentrism Scale, RWA Scale = Right-wing Authoritarianism Scale, WAS= War Attitude Scale. Nmales = 117. * = $p \leq .05$, ** = $p \leq .01$

In the correlational analysis performed on male sample, GENE and RWA were partially positively correlated, $r(115) = .255$, $p < .01$, GENE and WAS were partially positively correlated, $r(115) = .195$, $p < .05$ and WAS and RWA were insignificantly correlated, $r(115) = .137$, $p = .14$ (See Table 3).

Table 3: Correlation for GENE, RWA, and WAS in Females

	GENE	RWA Scale	WAS
GENE	1		
RWA Scale	.259**	1	
WAS	.318**	.372**	1

Note. GENE = Generalised Ethnocentrism Scale, RWA Scale = Right-wing Authoritarianism Scale, WAS= War Attitude Scale. Nfemales = 128. * = $p \leq .05$, ** = $p \leq .01$

In the female sample, GENE, RWA, and WAS were significantly positively related to each other. GENE and RWA were partially correlated, $r(126) = .259$, $p < .01$, GENE and WAS were partially correlated, $r(126) = .318$, $p < .01$, and WAS and RWA were partially correlated, $r(126) = .372$, $p < .01$ (see Table 4).

Table 4: Gender differences on generalized ethnocentrism (GENE), Right wing authoritarianism (RWA), and war attitudes (WAS)

	Gender		t-value	p	df
	Males	Females			
GENE	34.5 (7.16)	36 (8.72)	.96	.340	240.3
RWA Scale	85.8 (11.03)	83.9 (11)	1.35	.179	243
WAS	92.2 (13.2)	84.6 (16.54)	3.96*	.001	238.8

Note. Standard Deviations appear in parentheses below means.

Table 4 shows independent samples t-test for gender differences. There was no significant difference in the mean of GENE scores ($t=96$). Similarly, there was no significant difference in the mean of RWA scores ($t=1.35$). However, a significant difference was found on WAS ($t=3.96$).

Table 5 : Generalized ethnocentrism and war attitudes as predicted by right wing authoritarianism

Predictor	Generalized Ethnocentrism			
	β	R ²	F	p
Right Wing Authoritarianism	.250	.058	16.14	.000
War Attitudes				
Right Wing Authoritarianism	.283	.076	21.14	.000

Table 5 shows the summary of simple linear regression used to test significant prediction of ethnocentrism and war attitude based on right wing authoritarianism. Analysis revealed right wing authoritarianism contributes 5.8 % and 7.6% variance in explaining generalized ethnocentrism and war attitudes.

Discussion

It is evident from the correlation results that in the entire sample ethnocentrism, right wing authoritarianism and war attitudes are significantly related with each other. However, a gender wise correlation is different from the

overall findings, wherein, males were found to have no significant correlation between war attitudes and right wing authoritarianism and females showed correlation amongst all three constructs. These findings were partially approved the hypothesis that there will be a significant positive association between ethnocentrism, right-wing authoritarianism, and war attitude in the overall sample and also among males and females.

Benjamin (2006) found associations between RWA and attitude towards violence establishing a significant relationship of RWA with attitudes regarding authoritarian aggression. Another study supports the relationship of RWA with war attitude using structural equation modelling. Among RWA and Social Dominance Orientation, only RWA predicted support for military aggression against Iraq (Crowson, 2009) and two sets of attitudes related to the War on Terror: endorsement of restrictions on human rights/civil liberties and support for the US military invasion of Iraq in 2003. Dangerous and competitive world beliefs significantly predicted RWA and SDO, respectively, during structural equation modeling. Whereas both RWA and SDO predicted endorsement of human rights/civil liberties attitudes, only RWA predicted support for military aggression against Iraq. Tests of indirect effects suggested that RWA mediated the effects of dangerous world beliefs on attitudes toward human rights/civil liberties and support for military aggression, whereas SDO mediated the effects of competitive world beliefs on attitudes toward human rights/civil liberties only. (PsycINFO Database Record (c.

No significant gender differences were seen in these three variables, completely rejecting the hypothesis that there would be a significant gender difference in ethnocentrism, right-wing authoritarianism (RWA), and war attitude. These findings contradict previous findings where war attitudes among the US population were found to be greater amongst males in comparison to females. Furthermore, Wilcox (1991) suggested that these results may lack inferentiality towards the results of other countries. A European study concluded that females are more supportive in nature than males (Jelen, Thomas, & Wilcox, 1994; Vaus &

McAllister, 1989) which is endorsed by Bendyna et al (1996). However, other studies support the current results, reporting no significant gender differences (Adorno et al., 1950; Feather, 1998; Nagoshi, Terrell, & Nagoshi, 2007; Peterson & Lane, 2001) but no significant difference between Protestants and Catholics. There is a low but significant negative relation of intelligence and education to ethnocentrism. Interviews threw light on parental relations, childhood, conception of self, and dynamics and organization of personality. Projective techniques are described and results analyzed. 63 interviews are analyzed qualitatively for prejudice, political and economic ideas, religious ideology and syndromes among high and low scorers. The development of two contrasting cases is given. Criminality and antidemocratic trends in prison inmates and a study of clinic patients complete the investigation of the authoritarian personality pattern. 121 references. (PsycINFO Database Record (c. However, in the current sample, the contrasting results may be attributed to entirely different and rapidly instantaneous changes in the social and political scenario of India (Lee, 2018), confirming the findings of Gusfield(1967) where he studied social changes in the Indian society in terms of modernity. The previous literature endorses vast social and cultural changes, attributing many factors including the spread of television (Johnson, 2001). In another study, authoritarianism was correlated positively with attitudinal support for the Vietnam War (Adorno et al., 1950).

The notion that men would support war more than females is challenged by some reverse findings which suggest that women support war as enthusiastically as men when an appeal is made based on empathy, or when group cohesion and strengthening of community relationships is emphasised during war (Zur, 1985). Gender inequality, religious upbringing, and societies pushing for unquestionable obedience towards elders are noteworthy in higher RWA and support for war. Authoritarianism has been predicted to be prevalent among women in societies where there is a higher level of gender inequality. Women in such areas experience more psychological threats associated with submissive female

gender roles (Brandt & Henry, 2012) Duckitt & Fisher, 2003; Henry, 2011. Further observation of the male university sample suggests underlying factors that could influence the relationship between authoritarianism and war attitude. RWA, however significant, could be clouded by factors of independence, students living away from home environment, rebellious attitude towards authority obedience (refer Sartaj & Aslam, 2010), or adherence to male gender roles. Further investigation may provide a better understanding of this relationship.

Evolutionary pressure also explains higher war attitude in males. Greater the number of same-sex members already engaging in warfare at any given point affect sexual competition for mates with other people of the same sex (Micheletti, Ruxton, & Gardner, 2018). During conflicts and war-like situations, women think in terms of empathy and community harmony and are more likely than men to endorse war when the appeal is consistent with female moral concerns. Conversely, men justify war according to rationality and legal criteria, support acts of violence during war, and endorse the notion of traditional sex roles (Zur, 1985).

The findings of the current research also point towards RWA as a predictor of war attitudes and ethnocentrism. This finding conforms to the hypothesis that RWA would be a significant predictor of ethnocentrism and war attitudes and also endorses the available literature where authoritarianism has been found to intensify the fear of in-group disunity and increased blind-patriotism (McFarland & Mathews, 2005). Authoritarianism is suggested as one of the constructs having a strong role in the formation of support for war. Altemeyer (1988) in his initial investigations found that authoritarianism will strengthen support for war which was further endorsed by Izzett (1971).

In a study concerning the Gulf War of 1990 (Doty, 1997), authoritarianism emerged as a significant predictor of the support for war (before and after war). These findings were in accordance with that of Duncan and Stewart (1995) that high authoritarianism predicted pro-Gulf War attitudes and activism and low authoritarianism predicted anti-war attitudes and

activism. Therefore, authoritarianism is found to be a predictor of war support at an international level which included countries like the Soviet Union (McFarland, Ageyev, & Abalakina-Paap, 1992). Similarly, in Germany, authoritarianism was seen to enhance students' support for NATO's military intervention in Yugoslavia (Cohrs, Moschner, Maes, & Kielman, 2002). The results were also supported by one of the fundamental postulates in the authoritarian personality theory stating that cultural orientation, which favours ethnocentrism, is a distinctive feature of the authoritarian personality type (Scheepers, Felling, & Peters, 1990).

Keith (2013) also reported that in-groups' outcomes in a conflict predict their out-group violence in terms of ethnocentrism. In a competing situation, if the outcomes of both, the in-group and the out-group are similar, then there would be low outgroup negativity and hostility. However, if the outgroup's outcomes defy those of the in-group's or the outcomes of the out-group outnumber those of the in-group's, the ethnocentric in-group may show hostility towards the outgroup (Pratto & Glasford, 2008) the authors examined how much participants valued lives of conationals and enemy civilians. Using decisions made under risk, Experiment 1 showed that Americans valued Iraqi and American lives equally when outcomes for those nations did not compete but valued American lives more under outcome competition. Experiments 2 and 3 extended this finding by illustrating ethnocentric valuation even when large numbers of lives were at stake: The number of lives at stake mattered less for enemy civilians than it did for conational combatants. Experiment 4 provided additional evidence of this ethnocentric indifference to magnitude, regardless of combatant status of the conationals' lives. In all experiments, individual difference measures associated with prejudice (e.g., group identification and prejudice, empathy, social dominance orientation, social attitudes).

However, some contrasting studies indicate RWA to be a significant predictor of restricting human rights and support for the U.S. military involvement in Iraq (Crowson, Debacker, & Thoma, 2006). Another finding supports the positive effect of RWA on increased surveillance measures (Cohrs, Kielmann, Maes, & Moschner,

2005). Although such studies are few, they orient readers toward further investigation.

Conclusion

It is concluded that RWA, ethnocentrism and war attitudes are correlated with each other when studied in totality, however this correlation is slightly different when studied independently in terms of gender, where war attitudes and RWA do not relate among males, whereas in females RWA, war attitudes and ethnocentrism are related to each other. But both the genders do not significantly differ on any of these constructs. However, RWA is a significant predictor of ethnocentrism and war attitudes among Indian students. The findings of this study will provide a better understanding in anthropology, political science, personality and social psychology, towards youth with respect to their extreme behaviours, political suggestibility, and cultural identity crisis. This will also help psychologists and social workers to plan and contribute strategies of social and personal relevance for this population and help in forming a better nation with positive youth strength.

Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Few states of India could not be included in the sample due to less approachability, Hence, studies involving proportionate distribution across different states could increase the external validity of the results. Considering India's cultural and ethnic diversities and various political choices, different results could have been surface when targeted for analysis. This could not be explicitly presented in the current study due to the social, political and legal sensitivity. Future researchers can incorporate variables of upbringing, attachment styles, and religion for a broader understanding of studied measures. The study had a majority of urban participants living in a nuclear configuration. Future studies can focus on rural and joint family configurations which would be relevant due to differences in upbringing, belief systems, or culture.

References

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. The authoritarian personality. Oxford, England: Harpers.
- Altemeyer, B. (1981). *Right-Wing Authoritarianism*. Michigan: University of Manitoba Press, 1981.
- Altemeyer, B. (1988). *Enemies of Freedom: Understanding Right-Wing Authoritarianism* (1st ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Altemeyer, B. (1996). *The Authoritarian Specter*. 1996. Harvard University Press. Harvard University Press.
- Altemeyer, B. (1998). The Other "Authoritarian Personality." *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(08\)60382-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60382-2)
- Altemeyer, B. (2006a). *The Authoritarians*. University of Manitoba. Winnipeg, Canada: University of Manitoba Press, 1981. Retrieved from <http://ir.obihiro.ac.jp/dspace/handle/10322/3933>
- Altemeyer, B. (2006b). *The Authoritarians*. Winnipeg, Canada: University of Manitoba Press.
- Altemeyer, B., & Hunsberger, B. (1992). Authoritarianism, Religious Fundamentalism, Quest, and Prejudice. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327582ijpr0202_5
- Andersen, M. L., & Taylor, H. F. (2007). *Sociology: Understanding a Diverse Society* (4th ed.). Wadsworth Publishing.
- Barger, K. (2018). Ethnocentrism. Retrieved March 14, 2019, from <http://www.iupui.edu/~anthkb/ethnocen.htm>
- Bendyna, M. E., Finucane, T., Kirby, L., O'Donnell, J. P., & Wilcox, C. (1996). Gender differences in public attitudes toward the Gulf War: A test of competing hypotheses. *The Social Science Journal*, 33(1), 1–22. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0362-3319\(96\)90002-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0362-3319(96)90002-6)
- Benjamin, A. J. (2006). The Relationship Between Right-Wing Authoritarianism and Attitudes Towards Violence: Further Validation Of The Attitudes Toward Violence Scale. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 34(8), 923–926. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2006.34.8.923>
- Bizumic, B., Duckitt, J., Popadic, D., Dru, V., & Krauss, S. (2009). A cross-cultural investigation into a reconceptualization of ethnocentrism. *European Journal of Social Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.589>
- Bizumic, B., Stubager, R., Mellon, S., Van der Linden, N., Iyer, R., & Jones, B. M. (2013). On the (In)

- compatibility of attitudes toward peace and war. *Political Psychology*, 34(5), 673–693. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12032>
- Brandt, M. J., & Henry, P. J. (2012). Gender Inequality and Gender Differences in Authoritarianism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38(10), 1301–1315. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167212449871>
- Choudhury. (n.d.). No Title. Texas. Retrieved from <http://people.tamu.edu/~i-choudhury/culture.html>
- Cohrs, J. C., Kielmann, S., Maes, J., & Moschner, B. (2005). Effects of Right-Wing Authoritarianism and Threat from Terrorism on Restriction of Civil Liberties. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 5(1), 263–276. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-2415.2005.00071.x>
- Cohrs, J. C., Moschner, B., Maes, J., & Kielman, S. (2005). Personal values and attitudes toward war. *Peace and Conflict*, 11(3), 293–312. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327949pac1103_5
- Crowson, H. M. (2009). Right-Wing Authoritarianism and Social Dominance Orientation. *Social Psychology*, 40(2), 93–103. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335.40.2.93>
- Crowson, H. M., Debacker, T. K., & Thoma, S. J. (2006). The Role of Authoritarianism, Perceived Threat, and Need for Closure or Structure in Predicting Post-9/11 Attitudes and Beliefs. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 146(6), 733–750. <https://doi.org/10.3200/SOCP.146.6.733-750>
- De Dreu, C. K. W., Greer, L. L., Van Kleef, G. A., Shalvi, S., & Handgraaf, M. J. J. (2011). Oxytocin promotes human ethnocentrism. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(4), 1262–1266. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1015316108>
- Doty, R. L. (1997). Aporia: *European Journal of International Relations*, 3(3), 365–392. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066197003003004>
- Duckitt, J. (1991). Book Review: Stereotyping and prejudice: Changing conceptions. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 21(2), 129–130. <https://doi.org/10.1177/008124639102100212>
- Duckitt, J. (1993). Right-Wing Authoritarianism Among White South African Students: Its Measurement and Correlates. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 133(4), 553–563. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1993.9712181>
- Duckitt, J. (2001). A dual-process cognitive-motivational theory of ideology and prejudice. In *Advances in experimental social psychology*, Vol. 33. (pp. 41–113). San Diego, CA, US: Academic Press.
- Duckitt, J., Bizumic, B., Krauss, S. W., & Heled, E. (2010). A Tripartite Approach to Right-Wing Authoritarianism: The Authoritarianism-Conservatism-Traditionalism Model. *Political Psychology*, 31(5), 685–715. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2010.00781.x>
- Duncan, L. E., & Stewart, A. J. (1995). Still Bringing the Vietnam War Home: Sources of Contemporary Student Activism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21(9), 914–924. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167295219006>
- Dupuis, E. C., & Cohn, E. S. (2011). A New Scale to Measure War Attitudes : Construction and Predictors. *Journal of Psychological Arts and Sciences*, 14. Retrieved from https://scholars.unh.edu/psych_facpub/14
- Feather, N. T. (1998). Attitudes toward High Achievers, Self-Esteem, and Value Priorities for Australian, American, and Canadian Students. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 29(6), 749–759. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022198296005>
- Fernandes, S., & Srivastava, M. (2017). Impact of Ethnocentrism on Indian Consumers' Brand Preferences for Domestic Vs Foreign Products: An Empirical Study. *International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research* (Vol. 15).
- Funke, F. (2005). The Dimensionality of Right-Wing Authoritarianism: Lessons from the Dilemma between Theory and Measurement. *Political Psychology*, 26(2), 195–218. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2005.00415.x>
- Gusfield, J. R. (1967). Tradition and Modernity: Misplaced Polarities in the Study of Social Change. *American Journal of Sociology*. <https://doi.org/10.1086/224334>
- Halkjelsvik, T., & Rise, J. (2014). Social Dominance Orientation, Right-Wing Authoritarianism, and Willingness to Help Addicted Individuals: The Role of Responsibility Judgments. *Europe's Journal of Psychology* (Vol. 10). <https://doi.org/10.5964/ejop.v10i1.669>
- Healey, J. (2003). Race, ethnicity, gender, and class : the sociology of group conflict and change (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks ; London ; New Delhi : Pine Forge Press, an imprint of Sage Publications, Inc., [2003].
- Institute for Economics and Peace. (2018). Global Peace Index. Institute for Economics and Peace. Sydney.

- Izzett, R. R. (1971). Authoritarianism and attitudes toward the Vietnam war as reflected in behavioral and self-report measures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 17*(2), 145–148. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0030391>
- Jelen, T. G., Thomas, S., & Wilcox, C. (1994). The gender gap in comparative perspective. *European Journal of Political Research, 25*(2), 171–186. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6765.1994.tb00416.x>
- Johnson, K. (2001). Media and social change: the modernizing influences of television in rural India. *Media, Culture & Society, 23*(2), 147–169. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016344301023002001>
- Keith, K. D. (2013). Ethnocentrism. In *The Encyclopedia of Cross-Cultural Psychology* (First Edit, pp. 1–4). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Laythe, B., Finkel, D., & Kirkpatrick, L. A. (2001). Predicting prejudice from religious fundamentalism and right-wing authoritarianism: A multiple-regression approach. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 40*(4), 829–844. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0021-8294.00033>
- Lee, A. (2018). Ethnic Diversity and Ethnic Discrimination: Explaining Local Public Goods Provision. *Comparative Political Studies, 51*(10), 1351–1383. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414017740604>
- Little, W., & McGivern, R. (2012). Introduction to Sociology-1st Canadian edition. BC Open Textbook (1st ed.). <https://doi.org/10.1021/ja0469378>
- Matsumoto, D., & Juang, L. (2016). *Culture and Psychology* (6th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- McFarland, S. (2010). Authoritarianism, Social Dominance, and Other Roots of Generalized Prejudice. *Political Psychology, 31*(3), 453–477. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2010.00765.x>
- McFarland, S. G., Ageyev, V. S., & Abalakina-Paap, M. A. (1992). Authoritarianism in the former Soviet Union. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63*(6), 1004–1010. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.63.6.1004>
- McFarland, S., & Mathews, M. (2005). Who Cares About Human Rights? *Political Psychology, 26*(3), 365–385. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2005.00422.x>
- Micheletti, A. J. C., Ruxton, G. D., & Gardner, A. (2018). Why war is a man's game. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 285*(1884), 20180975. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2018.0975>
- Moss, S. (2016). Right wing authoritarianism. Retrieved March 13, 2019, from <https://www.sicotests.com/psyarticle.asp?id=388>
- Nagoshi, J. L., Terrell, H. K., & Nagoshi, C. T. (2007). Changes in authoritarianism and coping in college students immediately after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. *Personality and Individual Differences, 43*(7), 1722–1732. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2007.05.010>
- Neuliep, J. (2002). Assessing the reliability and validity of the generalized ethnocentrism scale. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 31*, 201–215.
- Neuliep, J. W. (2012). *Intercultural communication : a contextual approach*. Los Angeles, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Neuliep, J. W., & McCroskey, J. C. (2011). The development of a U.S. and generalized ethnocentrism scale. *Communication Research Reports, 14*(4), 385–398. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08824099709388682>
- Noel, D. L. (1968). A Theory of the Origin of Ethnic Stratification. *Social Problems, 16*(2), 157–172. <https://doi.org/10.2307/800001>
- Peterson, B. E., & Lane, M. D. (2001). Implications of Authoritarianism for Young Adulthood: Longitudinal Analysis of College Experiences and Future Goals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*(6), 678–690. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167201276004>
- Pratto, F., & Glasford, D. E. (2008). Ethnocentrism and the Value of a Human Life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*(2), 400–412. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012636>
- Rattazzi, A. M. M., Bobbio, A., & Canova, L. (2007). A short version of the Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) Scale. *Personality and Individual Differences, 43*(5), 1223–1234. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2007.03.013>
- Ray, J. J. (1985). The Psychopathology of the Political Left. *The High School Journal, 68*(4), 415–423. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40364959>
- Robinson, J. P., Shaver, P. R., & Wrightsman, L. S. (1991). Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA). In *Contributors Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Attitudes* (p. 753). https://doi.org/10.1300/J103v11n02_05

- Sartaj, B., & Aslam, N. (2010). Role of Authoritative and Authoritarian Parenting in Home, Health and Emotional Adjustment. *Journal of Behavioural Sciences*, 20(1), 47–66.
- Scheepers, P., Felling, A., & Peters, J. (1990). Social conditions, authoritarianism and ethnocentrism: A theoretical model of the Early Frankfurt School updated and tested. *European Sociological Review* (Vol. 6). <https://doi.org/10.2307/522356>
- Stagner, R. (1942). Some Factors Related to Attitude toward War, 1938. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 16(1), 131–142. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1942.9714109>
- Sumner, W. G. (1906). *Folkways: A Study of the Sociological Importance of Usages, Manners, Customs, Mores, and Morals*. Ginn.
- Vaus, D., & McAllister, I. (1989). The changing politics of women: gender and political alignment in 11 nations. *European Journal of Political Research*, 17(3), 241–262. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6765.1989.tb00193.x>
- Whitley, B. E. (1999). Right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.77.1.126>
- Wilcox, C. (1991). Support for gender equality in West Europe. *European Journal of Political Research*, 20(2), 127–147. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6765.1991.tb00260.x>
- Zur, O. (1985). Men, Women and War: Gender Differences in Attitudes towards War. In Annual Meeting of the Western Psychological Association (San Jose, CA, April 18-21, 1985).

George Felix, Institute of Behavioural Science, Gujarat Forensic Sciences University, Gandhinagar, India

Nandita Chaube, Assistant Professor, Institute of Behavioural Science, Gujarat Forensic Sciences University, Gandhinagar, India