Examining the Relationship between General Social Survey (GSS) Measures and Far-Right Ideological Violence: A County-level Analysis

Final Report to START

April 2012

National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism
A Department of Homeland Security Science and Technology Center of Excellence
Based at the University of Maryland

3300 Symons Hall • College Park, MD 20742 • 301.405.6600 • www.start.umd.edu

About This Report

The authors of this report are Amy Adamczyk (John Jay College), Joshua D. Freilich (John Jay College), Steven M. Chermak (Michigan State University), and William S. Parkin (John Jay College). Questions about this report should be directed to Amy Adamczyk at AAdamczyk@jjay.cuny.edu.

About START

The National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism (START) is supported in part by the Science and Technology Directorate of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security through a Center of Excellence program based at the University of Maryland. START uses state-of-the-art theories, methods and data from the social and behavioral sciences to improve understanding of the origins, dynamics and social and psychological impacts of terrorism. For more information, contact START at infostart@start.umd.edu or visit www.start.umd.edu.

Citations

To cite this report, please use this format:

Adamczyk, Amy and Joshua D. Freilich, Steven M. Chermak, William S. Parkin. "Examining the Relationship between General Social Survey (GSS) Measures and Far-Right Ideological Violence: A County-level Analysis," Final Report to START. College Park MD: START, 2012.

Executive Summary

This report examines how county-level characteristics relate to the likelihood that a violent far-right perpetrator (VFRP) resides in a county. This study's novelty is in its creation of independent variables using public opinion data from the General Social Survey (GSS) to measure county-level characteristics over an extended period of time. The GSS is a bi-annual survey of public opinion of the US population. It is one of the most frequently analyzed sources of information in the social sciences, but has rarely been used in studies of terrorism. In this study, we innovatively aggregated responses to individual items included in the GSS to the county level which allowed us to more carefully operationalize conceptual constructs to past research.

While the GSS is available for public use, because of concerns about respondents' privacy the public-use dataset does not include geographical identifiers for where respondents live. However, individual researchers can apply for the geographical identifiers, which we did. Since we were interested in how county characteristics relate to the likelihood that a far-right perpetrator would reside in the county, we utilized the GSS's county-level FIPS codes. To have enough data from counties available to produce the power necessary to detect significant effects, we merged the last four waves (eight years) of the GSS and aggregated to the county-level all of responses from individuals surveyed in a given county that were asked the same questions during multiple years. We selected 35 variables that fit into eight broad categories that were relevant for understanding why a VFRP might reside in a county. From the 35 variables of interest we found nine that were significantly associated with having a VFRP from the county.

Previous research has shown that county population size is highly correlated with the likelihood of a terrorist attack occurring and that terrorists are more likely to live in more urban areas. We, therefore, looked at whether any of our key GSS variables remained significant after population was included in the model. The size of county population is consistently significant, and it does mute the significance of many of the other nine GSS county-level variables. However, the relationship between attitudes concerning whether people can be trusted and a VFRP residing in the county is significant even after controlling for population size. Counties where people feel others can be trusted are less likely to harbor a VFRP. Additional analysis revealed that as the percentage of a county that has moved in the last five years increases, so do the odds that the county had a VFRP in residence.

Our findings raise questions that need to be explored in more detail. The most interesting finding is that trust was found to be a significant and robust negative predictor of having a VFRP residing in the county. Other research that examines crime rates has argued that neighborhoods that are more disorganized are less able to obtain resources from the government and are less able to exercise social control. Thus these areas usually have higher crime rates. Although this is an intriguing finding, future research must explore the effects of other related disorganization measures, like collective efficacy. Social disorganization scholars have consistently found that greater levels of collective efficacy are associated with reduced violence. Intriguingly, our study has similarly found that counties in which people feel more trusting are less likely to be home to a VFRP.

Examining the Relationship between General Social Survey (GSS) Measures and Far-Right Ideological Violence: A County-level Analysis

This report examines how county-level characteristics relate to the likelihood that a violent far-right perpetrator (VFRP) resides in a county. This project's measurement strategy resulted in unique independent and dependent measures and findings that may be relevant to policymakers, analysts and scholars interested in the topic of violent extremism.

This study's novelty is in its creation of independent variables using public opinion data from the General Social Survey (GSS) to measure county-level characteristics over an extended period of time. The GSS is a bi-annual survey of public opinion of the US population. It is the largest project funded by the Sociology Program of the National Science Foundation, and with the exception of the US Census, is the most frequently analyzed source of information in the social sciences. But, surprisingly, it has rarely been used in studies of terrorism related issues (but see Eidelson & McCauley 2010). Previous research on terrorism and extremist movements has used data from the Census, the American Religion Data Archive (ARDA) or other sources to measure aggregate population characteristics. This has usually been done at the state level, though, and rarely at the county level. The few studies that examine data at the county level generally only focus on a few states and not the entire country. In this study, we aggregated responses to individual items included in the GSS to the county level which allowed us to more carefully operationalize conceptual constructs (such as disorganization) compared to past research. Once we isolated the most important GSS variables, we examined their relationship with our outcome variable in the context of control variables drawn from the US Census and the ARDA. From the US Census we use measures of county population, and the percentage below the poverty level, female headed households, foreign born, African American, male, and the percentage of the county that has moved in the last 5 years. From the ARDA we use measures of the proportion of religious adherents in counties.

This project also used a novel outcome measure of far-right ideological violence for this analysis: We operationalized far-right ideological violence at the county level based on where VFRPs resided at the time they committed ideologically motivated homicides.[1] Specifically, the dependent variable for this study was whether a county had at least one VFRP in residence. We focus on only violent far-right perpetrators in this report because these are the only ideological homicide data county-coded to date.[2]

For a county to be coded as having a VFRP in residence: (1) there had to be clear evidence that the perpetrator living in the county adhered to a far-right belief system;[3] (2) the VFRP must have committed a homicide between 1990-2008; and (3) the motive for the homicide had to be ideological.

[1] The vast majority of the VFRPs in this study were arrested. However, 14 of the suspects included in the analysis were technically not arrested. Six of these suspects committed suicide before their arrest, and 5 were killed by law enforcement before they could be arrested (For these 11 suspects the police were either in the process of arresting them, or the police had evidence to make an arrest). Three others were in prison at the time of the incident (prison murders). For all 14 of these perpetrators the open source information that we collected specifically discussed their linkage to the homicide at issue and described their extremist activities. Finally, another 3 far-right perpetrators were juveniles, and were never identified. Importantly, these 3 perpetrators were not used in our analysis.
[2] The research team is in the process of county-coding homicides committed by al-Qa'ida-influenced extremists in the United States.
[3] Far-right extremists believe that their personal or national 'way of life' is under attack. Sometimes such beliefs are vague, but for some the threat originates from specific racial or religious groups. They believe that they must be prepared to defend against this attack by participating in paramilitary training or survivalism. These extremists are fiercely nationalistic, anti-global, suspicious of federal authority and reverent of individual liberties, especially their right to own guns and be free of taxes. They believe in conspiracy theories involving imminent threats to national sovereignty or personal liberty and beliefs (Freilich and Chermak 2009; Freilich, Chermak, Belli, Gruenewald and Parkin 2012).

The data on VFRPs were derived from the Extremist Crime Database (ECDB). The ECDB is a national database that includes data about violent, financial, and foiled plots committed by far-right, far-left, and al-Qa'ida-influenced extremists. The information in the ECDB about all events is derived from open sources. We extracted from the ECDB information on homicides that were ideologically motivated and committed by far-right extremists in the United States, and we subsequently coded the county of residence for each perpetrator identified in this subset of the ECDB. We were able to determine county of residence for 89% of the suspects (n=246) in the database. After placing suspects within their county of residence (some counties had more than one suspect in a county), we identified 94 US counties that had been home to at least one VFRP.

Previous research on extremist ideological violence, in contrast, has generally examined the types of acts committed; disaggregating the acts to compare far-right acts to far-left to international and whether the number of these acts have recently increased or decreased (see Hewitt 2003; Smith 1994). Scholars have also looked at variation in where the act occurred. These studies usually investigate variation across states and (on rare occasions) across counties in the United States (see, for instance, Webb and Cutter 2009; LaFree and Bersani 2012). A few studies have investigated the country of origin for some transnational terrorist campaigns (see Berebbi's (2009) review of these studies.

Similarly, although a number of studies have examined individual terrorists, most are qualitative studies that conduct after-the-fact interviews focusing on the suspects' motivations. A few studies have used quantitative methods to examine characteristics of individuals and/or compare terrorists to non-terrorists, but more commonly studies have compared subgroups of terrorists (e.g., far-left, far-right, religious terrorists).

Importantly, no study has focused on individual perpetrators and examined their county of residence inside the United States. This is a significant omission. It is of course important to understand what is different about counties that have experienced ideologically motivated violence (compared to counties that have not). But, it is equally important to understand what is unique about the counties where perpetrators resided at the time they committed these attacks.

Currently, there is concern among federal, state, local, and tribal law enforcement personnel that violence by far-right extremists is on the increase (Chermak, Freilich and Simone 2010; Freilich, Chermak and Simone 2009). This study's findings could help inform threat assessments and prevention efforts by identifying the characteristics of counties where perpetrators of far-right terrorism are more likely to reside.

Below we explain how we constructed our county-level measures and present the results of our analyses. Again, we used items from the GSS. The GSS contains a standard 'core' of demographic and attitudinal questions, plus topics of special interest. Many of the core questions have remained unchanged since 1972.

While the GSS is available for public use, because of concerns about respondents' privacy the public-use dataset does not include geographical identifiers—including county of residence—for where respondents live. However, individual researchers can apply for the geographical identifiers, which we did. Since we were interested in how county characteristics relate to the likelihood that a far-right perpetrator would reside in the county, we utilized the GSS's county-level FIPS codes. There are 3,141 counties in the United States, and the GSS only includes approximately 2,000-2,500 respondents in their bi-yearly surveys. To have enough data from counties available to produce the power necessary to detect significant effects, we merged the last four waves (eight years) of the GSS

and then aggregated to the county-level all of the responses from individuals surveyed in a given county and asked the same questions during multiple years.[4]

Table 1 provides a breakdown of the total number of individuals who participated in a GSS from 2002 to 2010, the number of counties these respondents were from, and the number of counties that had at least five or ten survey respondents. Ideally, we would have a minimum of 20 individual-level responses in a county to construct each county-level estimate. However, as the minimum number of people needed to create the county-level estimate increased, the number of counties that could be included in the analysis decreased. There was, therefore, a trade-off between power, as the number of counties decreased, and reliability, as the number of individuals used to create the county-level measure increased. We decided to create county-level estimates for each county that provided a *minimum* of five respondents during this eight-year period, and based our analyses on this subset of US counties. Counties on average had 20 respondents contributing to each county-level estimate. Table 1 shows that there were 308 counties that had survey information from at least five respondents in the county who answered the same question[5] over the eight-year period.

Table 1. Breakdown of GSS County-level Data

GSS	Years 2002-2010
Total respondents	14,154
Total number of counties with respondents	318
Counties with 5 or more respondents	308
Counties with 10 or more respondents	279

Since a larger proportion of the US population lives in cities and suburbs than in rural areas, the counties on which we had information from the GSS tended to be located near cities. Likewise, extremist attacks are more likely to occur near cities and far-right perpetrators are more likely to reside in more populous places, simply given the larger population base. Hence, while our merged dataset of the GSS included only about 10% (N=308) of US counties, it included approximately 43 of the 95 (45%) counties where a violent far-right perpetrator resided, based upon existing data from the ECDB.

363 variables from the GSS appeared in each of the survey waves from 2002 to 2010. We selected 35 variables that fit into eight broad categories that we expected would be relevant for understanding why a VFRP might be in residence in a county. Table 2 presents the 35 variables that we examined, and the full questions are provided in the appendix of this report. From the 35 variables of interest we found nine that were significantly associated with having a VFRP from the county.

[4] While the GSS includes the same module of questions in each survey year, during the 2000s they administered split ballots where only a portion of the people surveyed in a given year were asked the same standard module of questions. They did this to raise the number of questions that they could ask in a given survey year without having to substantially increase the number of individuals that they surveyed. For our study this meant that the number of responses available for analysis differed depending on the GSS variable being examined.

[5] If a survey question was asked of all respondents during all four waves of data collection, then there would be 308 counties with a minimum of five people. Since many questions during the eight-year period were asked on split-ballots, many variables of interest were created for less than 308 counties. In other words, 308 counties are the maximum number of counties examined in this study, but most of our questions relied on fewer counties because many questions were not asked consistently each year or they were asked on split ballots where, for example, only half of the sample for a given year was asked the question.

Table 2: GSS Variable Names, Descriptions and Categories

Marginalization/integration	
Attend	How often respondent (r) attends religious services
Helpful	People are helpful or looking out for selves?
Socommun	How often r spends evening with neighbor
Visitors	Number of visitors in household
Economic factors	
Class	Subjective class identification
Finrela	Opinion of family income
Social capital/Trust	
Confed	Confidence in Executive Branch of federal government
Conjudge	Confidence in United States Supreme Court
Conlegis	Confidence in Congress
Fair	People are fair or try to take advantage of others
Fear	Afraid to walk at night in neighborhood
Trust	People can be trusted
Social support services	
Helpnot	Should government do more or less?
Helppoor	Should government improve standard of living?
Helpsick	Should government help pay for medical care?
Civil liberties/Under siege	
Colath	Allow anti-religionist to teach
Colhomo	Allow homosexual to teach
Colrac	Allow racist to teach
Librac	Allow racist books in library
Spkath	Allow anti-religionist to speak
Spkcom	Allow communist to speak
Spkhomo	Allow homosexual to speak
Spkmil	Allow militarist to speak
Spkrac	Allow racist to speak
Religion	
Prayer	Bible prayer in public schools should be allowed
Religen	Strength of religious affiliation
Fund	How fundamentalist is respondent currently
Bible	Feelings about the Bible
Postlife	Belief in life after death
Pray	How often respondent prays
Attitudes	
Grass	Should marijuana be made legal
Homosex	Homosexual sex relations
Premarsx	Sex before marriage
Abany	Abortion if woman wants for any reason
Fefam	Better for man to work, woman tend home

Table 3 presents correlations between the nine significant county-level variables and the likelihood that a violent far-right perpetrator resided in the county. Within counties, higher levels of religious attendance are associated with a lower likelihood of a VFRP residing in the county. Counties where people have more confidence in the Supreme Court are more likely to have had a VFRP in residence. Likewise, counties where people have less confidence in Congress are less likely to have a VFRP. Counties where people are not afraid to walk at night are less likely to have a VFRP in residence. Counties where more people are trusting are less likely to have a VFRP.

Counties where people are less likely to take the bible literally are more likely to include a VFRP. Counties where religious affiliation is weaker are more likely to include a VFRP. Counties where people are more likely to feel that the US gives too much foreign aid are less likely to have a VFRP. Finally, in counties where more people are likely to have foreign born grandparents are more likely to have a VFRP.

Table 3. Correlations between Key GSS Variables and a VFRP Living in County

	Correlation	N
How often r attends religious services (0=never; 8=more than once a week)	-0.1412 *	307
Confidence in United States Supreme Court (1=hardly any; 3=a great deal)	0.1349 *	255
Confidence in Congress (1=a great deal; 3=hardly any)	-0.1352 *	257
Afraid to walk at night in neighborhood (1=yes; 2=no)	-0.0983 *	258
Can people be trusted (1=no; 3=yes)	-0.1252 *	261
Feelings about the Bible (1=word of God; 3=book of fables)	0.1159 *	282
Strength of religious affiliation (1=strong; 4=no religion)	0.0994 *	308
Foreign aid (1=too little; 3=too much)	-0.1021 *	268
How many grandparents born outside US (0=all born in US; 4=all four born outside US)	0.1992 *	306

Only counties that had five or more respondents are included.
*=.05 p-value

Previous research has shown that county population size is highly correlated with the likelihood of a terrorist attack occurring in that county and that terrorists are more likely to live in more urban areas. We, therefore, looked at whether any of the key GSS variables presented in Table 3 remained significant after population was included in the model. Table 4 presents the logit regression coefficients of the relationship between the GSS variables identified in Table 3 and the odds of a VFRP residing in the county, with and without controlling for population size.

Table 4. Logit Regression of the Relationship between Key GSS Variables and a VFRP Living in the County

	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M7	**M8**
How often r attends religious services	-0.500 *	-0.284						
People fair or try to take advantage			-0.778	-0.646				
Confidence in congress					-1.904 *	-1.758		
Confidence in US Supreme Court							1.968 *	**2.471 ***
County Population / 1,000		0.002 **		0.002 **		0.002 **		**0.002 ****
Observations	304	304	254	254	254	254	252	**252**
	M9	M10	M11	M12	M13	M14	M15	**M16**
Afraid to walk at night in neighborhood	-1.548 +	0.623						
Strength of affiliation			0.978 +	0.080				
Feelings about the bible					1.186 +	0.087		
Can people be trusted							-1.129 *	**-1.426***
County Population / 1,000		0.002 **		0.002 **		0.002 **		**0.002 ****
Observations	256	256	305	305	279	279	258	**258**
	M17	M18	M19	M20				
How many grandparents born outside US	0.717 **	-0.303						
Foreign aid			-1.227 +	0.574				
County Population / 1,000		0.002 **		0.002 **				
Observations	303	303	265	265				

Logit regression coefficients (untransformed) are reported; * =<. 05; + =<. 10

The size of county population is consistently significant across models in which it is included, and it does mute the significance of many of the other GSS county-level variables. Model 16 in Table 4 shows, however, that the relationship between attitudes concerning whether people can be trusted and a VFRP residing in the county is significant even after controlling for population size. For this variable higher numbers indicate that people can be trusted. Hence, the negative coefficient indicates that counties where people feel others can be trusted are less likely to harbor a VFRP.

Model 8 shows that the relationship between confidence in the Supreme Court and a VFRP residing in the county is also significant. This model shows that counties where people have more confidence in the Supreme Court are more likely to be home to a VFRP. In a separate analysis we found that the results for the trust variable changed in consistent ways when the number of responses needed to create the county-level trust measure decreased to one or increased to ten.[6] However, the measure for confidence in Supreme Court did not change in consistent ways, suggesting that the variable may be unstable and for this reason we decided not to conduct additional analyses with it.

Since the trust variable appeared to be stable and remained significant even after factoring in population size, we conducted additional analyses with it. Table 5 presents a multivariate logit regression analysis of county-level trust for explaining the presence of a VFRP. The first model includes only population size, which, as expected, is significant. The second model includes several variables from the US Census and the Association of Religion Data Archives (ARDA) that previous research has suggested may be useful for understanding violent extremist activities. County population remains significant in Model 2, as does the percentage of the county that has moved in the last five years, which is positively associated with having a VFRP in residence ($p<.05$). As the percentage of a county that has moved in the last five years increases, so do the odds that the county had a VFRP in residence. In other words, VFRPs are more likely to reside in counties that have higher population turnover. This finding is consistent with research by LaFree and Bersani (2012, p. 26), which found that a terrorist attack is less likely in more residentially stable counties. Model 3 includes the trust variable, which remains negative and significant even in the midst of all the control variables. Model 4 includes variables on religious adherence in a county[7] (i.e., Muslim, Evangelical, and Catholic), none of which is significantly related to having a VFRP in residence in this analysis.

[6] With the county-level analysis there is a trade-off between power and reliability. We can increase the sample size by relying on fewer individuals to produce the county-level estimate. Hence, if we use just one individual per county, we increase the number of counties in the study, but the reliability decreases. Conversely, if we rely on 10 individuals to produce a county-level estimate, then the reliability of the county-level estimate increases, but the number of counties in the study decrease and we have less power to detect significant effects. With the trust variable as the number of individuals used to create the county measure increased, the variable would consistently increase and was significant until the sample size became so small that the power was no longer available to detect significant effects. The strength of the Supreme Court variable did not change incrementally with increases and decreases in reliability and power. Rather, the changes appeared almost random, which made us suspicious of the variable.

[7] In a separate analysis we also found that proportion of mainline Protestant was also unrelated to the presence of an extremist. We would have included this variable in the model, but mainline Protestants are a large group in the US and as the proportion of mainline Protestants increase the proportion of other adherents significantly decrease. Including all of the large religious groups (i.e., Catholics, Evangelicals, and mainline Protestants) in America in the same model could have led to problems with interpreting the coefficients. We also considered including Jews and Hindus in the analysis, but we did not have a lot of theoretical rationale for why counties with a higher proportion of these religions would be associated with VFRP. Additionally, these are very small groups, limiting the amount of power to detect significant effects. We decided instead to present a more parsimonious model.

Table 5. Logit Regression of the Relationship between Trust, Other Variables and a VFRP Living in the County (N=257)

	M1	M2	M3	M4
County Population per 1,000	0.002**	0.003**	0.003**	0.003**
Social vulnerability index percentile		-0.002	0.001	0.000
Percentage of county below poverty level		-0.125	-0.139	-0.155
Percentage of female headed households		0.395	0.287	0.345
Percentage of the county that has moved in last 5 years		0.131**	0.150**	0.149**
Percentage foreign born		-0.061+	-0.043	-0.038
Percentage Black/African American		-0.058	-0.066+	-0.069+
Percentage male		-0.233	-0.299	-0.333
Mean trust in people (higher numbers=more trust)			-2.437**	-2.288**
Muslims present in county (yes/no)[8]				-0.356
Evangelical - rates of adherence per 1000				0.001
Catholic - rates of adherence per 1000				-0.000
Pseudo R-squared	0.23	0.32	0.36	0.37

Logit coefficients are reported; + =< .10, * =< .05, ** =< .01

Conclusions

Our findings raise important questions that need to be explored in more detail. The most interesting finding is that trust was found to be a significant and robust negative predictor of having a VFRP residing in the county. The US Census and other readily available datasets (including ARDA) can provide variables (population turnover, proportion of female headed households) that may capture some of the processes (e.g., social disorganization) that contribute to trust amongst community members. However, having a direct county-level measure of trust as we did in this study provides, we think, better evidence, for disorganization models in that counties where there was more trust- and thus are more integrated- are less likely to have VFRP.

Other research that examines crime rates has argued that neighborhoods that are more disorganized are less able to obtain resources from the government and are less able to exercise social control. Thus these areas usually have higher crime rates. These social disorganization frameworks have used similar measures of trust to capture the concepts of social capital or social organization. Another key conceptual construct relevant to social disorganization theory is collective efficacy, defined as social cohesion among neighbors combined with their willingness to intervene on behalf of the common good (Sampson et al 1997). Scholars have consistently found that greater levels of collective efficacy are associated with reduced violence. Intriguingly, our study has similarly found that counties in which people feel more trusting are less likely to be home to a VFRP. It makes sense to wonder if in counties where more individuals are more trusting, there are also more persons willing to intervene for the common goal. In our future research we will therefore explore the effects of collective efficacy and other related measures on the odds of a VFRP residing in a county.

[8] We use a dichotomous measure of Muslims because, compared to the other religious groups, few counties have any Muslims and a dichotomous measure seemed more intuitive. Additionally, in a separate analysis when we used proportion Muslim, in contrast to the dichotomous measure, the proportion Muslim measure appeared unstable in the multivariate context. Specifically, when proportion Muslim was included with population the direction of the Muslim coefficient's sign changed and then changed again when the remaining control variables were included. We found that the relationship between Muslim and VFRP was consistent across the bivariate and the multivariate analyses when we used the dichotomous measure.

Further, we found that counties where a higher percentage of the population has moved in the past five years are also more likely to have VFRPs residing in them. This measure of population mobility has long played a key role in social disorganization theory in criminology. Importantly though, it has long also played a role in understanding far-right mobilization (and to a lesser extent far-right violence). Lipset and Raab's (1977) classic historical overview of far-right mobilization in the US empirically found that migration measures similar to the one used here were consistently associated with more right-wing mobilization.

Our findings thus provide preliminary support for the idea that social disorganization framework and related systemic and control models may be useful in the study of terrorism. Conceptually, they raise the possibility that criminological theory has an important role to play in shedding light on this phenomenon. Policy-wise, they suggest that programs designed to increase cohesiveness and levels of trust might impact ideological violence as well as "regular" crime. This is important since such "two for one" possible dividends could be especially attractive in the current period of austerity and reduced resources.

Works Cited

Berrebi, C. 2009. The Economics of Terrorism and Counterterrorism: What Matters and Is Rational-Choice Theory Helpful? RAND MG-849-OSD, In *Social Science for Counterterrorism*, Paul K. Davis and Kim R. Cragin, eds.

Chermak, Steven, Joshua Freilich, and Joseph Simone. 2010. "Surveying American state police agencies about lone wolves, far-right criminality, and far-right and Islamic jihadist criminal collaboration." *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 33: 1-23.

Eidelson, R.J. & McCauley, C. (2010). US Polls: Public Opinion and Right-Wing Extremism: Final Report. Submitted to the National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism (START).

Freilich, Joshua D., Steven M. Chermak and Joseph Simone Jr., 2009. "Surveying American State Police Agencies about Terrorism Threats, Terrorism Sources, and Terrorism Definitions," *Terrorism and Political Violence* 21 (3); 450-475.

Hewitt, Christopher. 2003. *Understanding terrorism in America: From the Klan to Al Qaeda*. New York: Routledge

LaFree, Gary and Bianca E. Bersani. 2012. *The Geographic Concentration of Terrorism in the United States, 1970 to 2008* Final Report to Human Factors/Behavioral Sciences Division, Science and Technology Directorate, U.S. Department of Homeland Security. College Park MD: START.

Lipset, Seymour & Earl Raab. 1977. *The Politics of Unreason: Right Wing Extremism in America, 1790-1977*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sampson, Robert J., Stephen W. Raudenbush & Felton Earls. 1997. Neighborhoods and Violent Crime: A Multilevel Study of Collective Efficacy. *Science* 15 (Vol. 277 no. 5328): 918-924

Smith, Brent L. 1994. *Terrorism in America: Pipe bombs and pipe dreams*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Webb, J. and S. L. Cutter, 2009. The geography of US terrorist incidents, 1970-2004.*Terrorism and Political Violence*, 21: 428-449.

Appendix: GSS Variable Names, Full Question and Categories

	Marginalization/integration
Attend	How often do you attend religious services?
Helpful	Would you say that most of the time people try to be helpful, or that they are mostly just looking out for themselves?
Socommun	Would you use this card and tell me which answer comes closest to how often you do the following things...Spend a social evening with someone who lives in your neighborhood?
Visitors	Number of visitors in household
	Economic factors
Class	If you were asked to use one of four names for your social class, which would you say you belong in: the lower class, the working class, the middle class, or the upper class?
Finrela	Compared with American families in general, would you say your family income is far below average, below average, average, above average, or far above average?
	Social capital/Trust
Confed	I am going to name some institutions in this country. As far as the people running these institutions are concerned, would you say you have a great deal of confidence, only some confidence, or hardly any confidence at all in them? Executive branch of the federal government.
Conjudge	I am going to name some institutions in this country. As far as the people running these institutions are concerned, would you say you have a great deal of confidence, only some confidence, or hardly any confidence at all in them? US Supreme Court.
Conlegis	I am going to name some institutions in this country. As far as the people running these institutions are concerned, would you say you have a great deal of confidence, only some confidence, or hardly any confidence at all in them? Congress.
Fair	Do you think most people would try to take advantage of you if they got a chance, or would they try to be fair?
Fear	Is there any area right around here--that is, within a mile--where you would be afraid to walk alone at night?
Trust	Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?
	Social support services
Helpnot	Some people think that the government in Washington

	is trying to do too many things that should be left to individuals and private businesses. Others disagree and think that the government should do even more to solve our country's problems. Still others have opinions somewhere in between. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you made up your mind on this?
Helppoor	Some people think that the government in Washington should do everything possible to improve the standard of living of all poor Americans; they are at Point 1 on this card. Other people think it is not the government's responsibility, and that each person should take care of himself; they are at Point 5. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you have up your mind on this?
Helpsick	In general, some people think that it is the responsibility of the government in Washington to see to it that people have help in paying for doctors and hospital bills. Others think that these matters are not the responsibility of the federal government and that people should take care of these things themselves. Where would you place yourself on this scale, or haven't you made up your mind on this?

Civil liberties/Under siege

Colath	There are always some people whose ideas are considered bad or dangerous by other people. For instance, somebody who is against all churches and religion . . . Should such a person be allowed to teach in a college or university, or not?
Colhomo	And what about a man who admits that he is a homosexual? Should such a person be allowed to teach in a college or university, or not?
Colrac	Or consider a person who believes that Blacks are genetically inferior. Should such a person be allowed to teach in a college or university, or not?
Librac	If some people in your community suggested that a book he wrote which said Blacks are inferior should be taken out of your public library, would you favor removing this book, or not?
Spkath	There are always some people whose ideas are considered bad or dangerous by other people. For instance, somebody who is against all churches and religion . . .If such a person wanted to make a speech in your (city/town/community) against churches and religion, should he be allowed to speak, or not?
Spkcom	Suppose this admitted Communist wanted to make a speech in your community. Should he be allowed to speak, or not?
Spkhomo	Suppose (an) admitted homosexual wanted to make a speech in your community. Should he be allowed to

	speak, or not?
Spkmil	Consider a person who advocates doing away with elections and letting the military run the country. If such a person wanted to make a speech in your community, should he be allowed to speak, or not?
Spkrac	Consider a person who believes that Blacks are genetically inferior. If such a person wanted to make a speech in your community claiming that Blacks are inferior, should he be allowed to speak, or not?

Religion

Prayer	The United States Supreme Court has ruled that no state or local government may require the reading of the Lord's Prayer or Bible verses in public schools. What are your views on this--do you approve or disapprove of the court ruling?
Reliten	Would you call yourself a strong (PREFERENCE NAMED IN RELIG) or a not very strong (PREFERENCE NAMED IN RELIG)?
Fund	Fundamentalism/Liberalism of Respondent's Religion
Bible	Which of these statements comes closest to describing your feelings about the Bible? (a) The Bible is the actual word of God and is to be taken literally, word for word (b) The Bible is the inspired word of God but not everything in it should be taken literally, word for word (c) The Bible is an ancient book of fables, legends, history, and moral precepts recorded by men
Postlife	Do you believe there is a life after death?
Pray	About how often do you pray?

Attitudes

Grass	Do you think the use of marijuana should be made legal or not?
Homosex	What about sexual relations between two adults of the same sex--do you think it is always wrong, almost always wrong, wrong only sometimes, or not wrong at all?
Premarsx	There's been a lot of discussion about the way morals and attitudes about sex are changing in this country. If a man and woman have sex relations before marriage, do you think it is always wrong, almost always wrong, wrong only sometimes, or not wrong at all?
Abany	Please tell me whether or not you think it should be possible for a pregnant woman to obtain a legal abortion if. . The woman wants it for any reason?
Fefam	Now I'm going to read several more statements. As I disagree, or strongly disagree with it. It is much better for everyone involved if the man is the achiever outside the home and the woman takes care of the home and family.