




Development Of A Measure Of Attitudes Toward Terrorism: A Factor Analysis Study

Dr. Hesham Yahya Ali Aljubaily
Department of Psychology
Faculty of Social Sciences
Imam Mohammad Ibn Saud Islamic University





Development Of A Measure Of Attitudes Toward Terrorism: A Factor Analysis Study

Dr. Hesham Yahya Ali Aljubaily

Department of Psychology.- Faculty of Social Sciences
Imam Mohammad Ibn Saud Islamic University

تاريخ تقديم البحث: ٢٨ / ٥ / ١٤٤٢ هـ تاريخ قبول البحث: ١٥ / ٨ / ١٤٤٠ هـ

Abstract:

The current study investigated people's attitudes toward terrorism and developed a scale to measure Attitudes Toward Terrorism (ATT). The scale is based on different factors that framed in eight factors. Data of the study were collected from ١٥٨ participants from different nationalities. Factor analysis was used to determine the number of factors. Four factors were found by using exploratory factor analysis: "fear of terrorism," "personal causations to terrorism," "societal influences of terrorism," and "Perspectives of Terrorism." The scale and each subscale showed sufficient score of reliability and high validity. There was no significant difference between the U.S. and the international groups in the attitudes toward terrorism. The study suggests that terrorism is the consequence of many complicated sources.

Key words: Factor Analysis, Terrorism, Attitudes

بناء مقياس الإتجاهات نحو الإرهاب: دراسة باستخدام التحليل العاملي

د. هشام بن يحيى بن علي الجبيلي
قسم علم النفس – كلية العلوم الإجتماعية
جامعة الإمام محمد بن سعود الإسلامية

تاريخ تقديم البحث: ٢٨ / ٥ / ١٤٤٢ هـ تاريخ قبول البحث: ١٥ / ٨ / ١٤٤٠ هـ

الملخص:

هدفت الدراسة الحالية لمعرفة إتجاهات الأشخاص نحو ظاهرة الإرهاب وبناء مقياس لقياس الإتجاهات نحو الإرهاب (ATT). وتم تصميم المقياس بناء على ثمانية عوامل مختلفة متعلقة بالإرهاب. وتكون عدد العينة لهذه الدراسة من ١٥٨ مشاركا من جنسيات مختلفة. تم استخدام التحليل العاملي للمقياس لاكتشاف عدد العوامل المكونة للإتجاهات نحو الإرهاب. ونتجت الدراسة بوجود أربعة عوامل هي: "الشعور بالخوف من الإرهاب" و "العوامل الذاتية المسببة للإرهاب" و "العوامل الإجتماعية المسببة للإرهاب" و "وجهات النظر لمفهوم الإرهاب". وأظهرت النتائج ثبات مرتفع للمقياس ولجميع المقاييس الأربعة الفرعية. وتم التحقق من صدق المقياس باستخدام طرق مختلفة كالصدق العاملي والبنائي والصدق التلازمي وصدق المحتوى وأظهرت النتائج بأن المقياس الكلي ومقاييسه الفرعية تتسم بمصدقية عالية. وأظهرت نتائج الدراسة بأنه لا يوجد فرق دال بين متوسطي العينة الأمريكية والعينة من جنسيات مختلفة في الإتجاهات نحو الإرهاب. وتوصي الدراسة الحالية بأن الإرهاب هو نتيجة العديد من العوامل المتداخلة والمعقدة.


الكلمات المفتاحية: التحليل العاملي، الإرهاب، الإتجاهات.

INTRODUCTION

Terrorism is an international disaster phenomenon that threatens many countries around the world. Many countries have suffered from terrorism and its different forms. Terrorism has different types and different goals, therefore, it can be called by different names by different people such as freedom fighters or terrorists (Takooshian, &Verdi, ١٩٩٥). Terrorism is usually correlated with violence. Terrorism has types of violence actions such as revolutionary, state oppression, war criminal, and brutal counter-revolution. They depend on different condition such as initiator (such as military force), target (such as current ruling class, military force, or citizen), goal (such as political, national, or religious goals), and means (such as violent, incite fright, or no violence) (Novotny, ٢٠٠٧).

Terrorism has been the most famous word in the media and in our lives. Yet, it is the most controversial term. The difficulty of defining this concept comes from different factors that lead to terrorism. Therefore, people have different attitudes towards terrorism so they define it differently. Fog (٢٠٠٢) declares that terrorism has arbitrary definitions and we need to define it before we analyze it. People define terrorism to blame or to censure enemies rather than use scientific definition. Fog asserts that we need scientific methods and analysis to identify terrorism rather than what people consider. According to Fog (٢٠٠٢) the most widespread definition is that "The intentional use of, or threat to use violence against civilians or against civilian targets, in order to attain political aims" (p.١). Fog criticizes that definition because it did not include non-human targets (٢٠٠٢). This definition relies terrorism on political motives and doesn't pay attention to the other factors. Michael Stevens (٢٠٠٥) says "Viewing terrorism as political violence creates several dilemmas" (p.٥١٣). Stevens mentioned other kinds of violence such as economic and religious violence.

Terrorism has hundreds of definitions as Fog (٢٠٠٢) says, but this study affirms the importance of defining terrorism in an empirical method rather than unempirical definitions. For that



reason, this study defines terrorism as: "a criminal action including killing, threatening, and horrifying innocent civilians, and destroying public facilities whenever the perpetrators' intentions are committed by an organized or named groups that has intentions, goals, ideologies, and tactics by using violence or harmful acts, physically or psychologically, to have an effect on other people, to send a message, or to change a current situation." We must have obvious definition to take action or counter terrorism (Ruby, ۲۰۰۲; Huff, & Kertzer, ۲۰۱۸; Johnson, ۲۰۲۰). Therefore, this study builds its scale regarding to this definition.

Statement of the Problem

People in many countries have experienced some terrorist attacks, therefore, they have opinions and attitudes toward the phenomenon of terrorism and in its types, its roots, and its influences on them. Yet little is known about how people view terrorism. Speculations and empirical research on terrorists abounds (e.g., Balestrini, ۲۰۲۰) as does research on the direct victims of terrorist attacks (e.g., Aber, Gershoff, Ware, & Kotler, ۲۰۰۴). There are few, if any, empirical extended studies considering what people think about terrorism's reasons and how it impacts their lives. The few studies have focused in terrorism in specific communities, e.g., Armenia (Takooshian, & Verdi, ۱۹۹۳) and Northern Ireland (Ferguson, & McAuley, ۲۰۲۰). More general scales on broad aspects of terrorism have been called for (Takooshian & Verdi, ۱۹۹۳, ۱۹۹۵).

Many aspects or causes motivate terrorists to resort to terrorist actions. In order to be aware of terrorism, we must know its roots, reasons, motives, causes, and its effects. David Rodin (۲۰۰۴) says, "If we are to be engaged in a war on terrorism, then we had better get clear about what terrorism is" (p.۷۵۲). Also, we must recognize these factors to provide appropriate counterterrorism programs. Concentration on the roots of terrorism is more important than its effects. That does not mean we ignore the influences of terrorism, but studying its reasons will help us to know how to prevent it rather than make it happens and then study its consequences. Yet, most

empirical studies focused more on the result or the effect of terrorism than its reasons.

Unfortunately, researchers did not provide sufficient empirical researches and scales to study attitudes towards terrorism or terrorism's causes and effects. Furthermore, there are lack of empirical extensive studies considering what people think about terrorism's reasons and how it impacts their lives. Therefore, this study aims to develop a scale for measuring people's perceptions about the roots of terrorist actions. Harold Takooshian and William Verdi emphasize that researchers use their public opinions to describe terrorism. They resort to this way because they have difficulty in applying psychological measurement to measure attitudes towards violence and terrorism in a quantitative way (Takooshian, & Verdi, 1995). With respect to their perspective, Psychological measurements allow us to provide appropriate scales to measure different aspect of attitudes.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this factorial study is to develop a valid and reliable scale to measure attitudes toward terrorism in an empirical quantitative method. So, ideally our judgments and attitudes toward terrorism will be based on empirical information rather than biased or unempirical resources. The attitudes toward terrorism were collected from the United States and diverse international participants to obtain opinions from different cultural backgrounds and brace the generalizability of the scale.

Significance of the Study

The importance of the present study can be identified as follows:

a- Theoretical Significance:

This study used exploratory factor analysis to analyze pool of items that were built based on a table of specification of \wedge diminutions that are related to terrorism (media, familial, psychological, social, political,

ideological, economical, and educational) factors to explore how many factors from these items and what are these factors. Therefore, the current study will allow a better understanding to the causes of terrorism based on people's perceptions.

b- Practical Significance:

Providing a comprehensive, reliable, and valid scale to measure attitudes toward terrorism is the unique significance of this study in the psychological measurements field.

Questions of the Study

The current study seeks to answer the following questions:

١. How many factors will be resulted in the developed scale by exploratory factor analysis?

٢. Do the resulted factors correspond with the scale's blueprint (table of specification)?

٣. Is there significant difference between the United States and the International Samples in the scale of attitudes towards terrorism?

Delimitations of the Study

Subject Delimitations: the study is particularly intended to develop a valid and reliable scale to measure individuals' attitudes towards terrorism from different nations.

Locality Delimitations: The current study was conducted in Saudi Arabia. However, the scale was sent through e-mail to participants that live in The United States and Pakistan.

Time Delimitations: This study was applied in the first semester of the academic year ١٤٤١/١٤٤٢ A.H.

Definitions

Terrorism:

Global Terrorism Database codebook (٢٠١٥) defines terrorism as: “the threatened or actual use of illegal force and violence by a non-state actor to attain a political, economic, religious, or social goal through fear, coercion, or intimidation” (p.٨).

Attitudes:

Arendt, Northup, and Camaj (٢٠١٩) defined Attitudes as: “conceptualized as a tendency to respond positively or negatively toward a certain target object; or, stated differently, as likes and dislikes.” (p. ٤).

Factor Analysis:

Connelly (٢٠١٩) stated that:”Exploratory factor analysis is used to discover the structure of a set of items by analyzing intercorrelations among them (thus the exploratory nature of this type of analysis). This type of factor analysis does not require an initial hypothesis or measurement model. The underlying dimensions are called factors, the latent trait the authors hope to measure.” (p. ١).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Literature reviews will be presented next in two sections. First, literature reviews that include the dimensions of the blueprint or table of specifications of the developed scale were presented. Second, the current study provides previous researches on attitude towards terrorism.

Dimensions of the Attitudes Towards Terrorism Scale

An extensive literature review was done to build a reliable, valid, and comprehensive scale and to strengthen the content validity of ATT. The first step in developing the ATT was to construct a blueprint, or table of specification. The blueprint was based upon an empirical review of the literature on terrorism. Broadly speaking, two themes emerge, emotional responses to terrorism and beliefs about the cause of it. Terrorism appears to increase negative psychological states, e.g. fear, anxiety, depression, dissociation (Aber et al., ۲۰۰۴; Gould, Munfakh, Kleinman, Lubell, & Provenzano, ۲۰۰۴). Fear and anxiety may not only be about personal harm, but also about its negative influences on economic development (Balestrini, ۲۰۲۰; Blomberg, Hess, & Weerpana, ۲۰۰۳). A number of possible beliefs about the cause of terrorism can be gleaned from the literature, whether or not empirical foundations may exist for the beliefs (Hippel, ۲۰۰۲). Such beliefs may be: (a) terrorist can be the results of some psychological disorders such as Frustration-Aggression, Negative identity, Narcissistic Rage, and hostility (Borum, ۲۰۰۴; Gill & Corner, ۲۰۱۷); (b) terrorism may be caused by social reasons such as violence, anti-social behaviors, identity, social conflicts, and group dynamics (Decety, Pape, & Workman, ۲۰۱۸; Borum, ۲۰۰۴; Hudson, ۱۹۹۹); (c) terrorism is a result of ideological grounds to make political changes (Bjorgo, ۲۰۰۲; Borum, ۲۰۰۴; Hudson, ۱۹۹۹; Brouard, Vasilopoulos, & Foucault, ۲۰۱۸); (d) political oppression is a cause of terrorism (Lloyd, & Kleintot, ۲۰۱۷; Abadie, ۲۰۰۶; Bjorgo, ۲۰۰۳; Hudson, ۱۹۹۹); (e) media may play an important role in provoking terrorism and hostility by providing biasness and stereotype against other cultures or countries, and also causing psychological stress (Abdolian & Takooshian, ۲۰۰۳; Holbrook, ۲۰۱۷; Cho, Boyle, Keum, Shevy, McLeod, Shah, & Pan, ۲۰۰۳; Derian, ۲۰۰۰; Donohue, ۲۰۰۰; Strickland, ۲۰۰۰; Turk, ۲۰۰۴); (f) low economic status can make some people resort to terrorism (Balestrini, ۲۰۲۰; Abadie & Gardeazabal, ۲۰۰۰; Bjorgo, ۲۰۰۳; Blomberg et al., ۲۰۰۳; Hudson, ۱۹۹۹); (g) a lack of education and teaching terrorist thoughts may lead to the engagement to terrorist groups and terrorist acts (Dhumad, Candilis, Cleary, Dyer, & Khalifa, ۲۰۲۰; Aly, Taylor, & Karnovsky, ۲۰۱۴; Hippel, ۲۰۰۲; McMahon &

Bergen, ٢٠٠٥); and (h) parental style, parental problems, neglecting, and improper home environment can make some people engage to terrorists group (Schwartz, Dunkel, & Waterman, ٢٠٠٩; Wadsworth, ٢٠١٠).

Based upon these themes, a table of specification (blueprint) was constructed and developed from the previous beliefs into eight dimensions which included: media, nurture, psychological, social, political, ideological, economical, and educational factors. First dimension is the media (Holbrook, ٢٠١٧; Abdolian & Takooshian, ٢٠٠٣; Derian, ٢٠٠٥; Turk, ٢٠٠٤). The items of this dimension indicated media factors could lead to terrorism and terrorism could be the result of what is shown in media by conveying biased content and stirring emotions (Cho et al., ٢٠٠٣; Donohue, ٢٠٠٥). Second dimension is the nurture factors. This dimension demonstrated that family problems and home environment could make some people enroll in terrorist groups (Schwartz, Dunkel, & Waterman, ٢٠٠٩; Wadsworth, ٢٠١٠). Third dimension is the psychological factors. This dimension stressed on the psychological reasons of terrorism and terrorism's influences on people's psychological health (Hudson, ١٩٩٩). Fourth dimension is the social factors. Social factors such as friendship or communities effects could contribute to terrorism, and terrorism itself could affect the social life or relationships (Borum, ٢٠٠٤; Hudson, ١٩٩٩). Fifth dimension is the political factors. This dimension tries to show if the political factors lead to terrorism and terrorism is the result of political situations (Bjorgo, ٢٠٠٣; Hudson, ١٩٩٩; Brouard, Vasilopoulos, & Foucault, ٢٠١٨). Sixth dimension is the ideological factors. This factor tells that some people promote wrong ideologies that lead to terrorism and how these ideologies turn to terrorist actions as the result of those wrong concepts (Knott, & Lee, ٢٠٢٠; Abadie, ٢٠٠٦; Bjorgo, ٢٠٠٣). Seventh dimension is the economical factors. This factor tries to tell how economical situations like poverty might guide some people to terrorist groups and tells how terrorism affects the domestic or national economic (Balestrini, ٢٠٢٠; Blomberg et al., ٢٠٠٣). Finally, the eighth dimension is the educational factors. This dimension illustrates that if the educational environment or educational level can lead to terrorism and how terrorism influence students' achievement (Dhumad, Candilis,

Cleary, Dyer, & Khalifa, ۲۰۲۰; Hippel, ۲۰۰۲; McMahon, & Bergen, ۲۰۰۵). In general, the constructed scale of the study tries to illustrate comprehensive thoughts about terrorism' reasons and effects according to people's viewpoints and perceptions.

Review of Literature on Attitudes Towards Terrorism

Takooshian and Verdi (۱۹۹۳) developed a scale to measure attitudes toward terrorism (AT); their scale examined mostly political violence. Takooshian's and Verdi's study was conducted in New York City and involved ۹۰ students, ۳۰ uniformed NY Police Department, ۲۴ governors of hostage negotiation, ۲ groups of Armenians included ۳۶ from the Doshang group and ۲۰ from the Non-Doshang group, and ۴ Iranians. Doshang Armenians had higher endorsement of terrorism than Non-Dishang Armenians, NYPD, students, and governors for hostage negotiation. Scores ranged from ۰ to ۲۰ from hatred attitudes to endorsement. Takooshian and Verdi (۱۹۹۳) declared that Doshang Armenians group showed more endorsement of terrorism because they had been involved in political violence in the past. Takooshian and Verdi (۱۹۹۳) asserted the need to develop more symmetrical scales and conduct more researches on attitudes toward terrorism.

Abdolian and Takooshian (۲۰۰۳) conducted a study utilizing a multi-items survey to measure the publics' opinions toward terrorism. Their scale involved a Likert rating, open-ended questions, and dichotomous and multiple choice questions. The scale involved specific questions about ۹/۱۱ terrorist attacks revolving around four aspects: authoritarianism, acceptance of terrorism, acceptance of Al-Qaeda, and preference of liberties rather than security. They conducted their study in New York City and surveyed ۳۰۹ participants from different backgrounds, ages, and jobs to have more variability. The results showed a variety of attitudes from support to resistant; specifically participants' attitudes toward terrorism as a political strategy. However, ۹۰٪ of the participants considered terrorism to be killing innocent people and morally unacceptable (Abdolian, & Takooshian, ۲۰۰۳). Participants had a

non-acceptance attitude toward Al-Qaeda, but 53% agreed that terrorists have excuses to be angry at the U.S. and its civilians (Abdolian, & Takooshian, 2003). In addition, participants' views were in the middle between preferring security and liberties and more than 50% preferred inspections at airports, use of wiretaps, and inquiring into civilian privacy. Participants who supported liberty scored significantly less in authoritarianism and were more accepting of terrorism; while participants who support security significantly scored more in authoritarianism and supported to terrorism less (Abdolian & Takooshian, 2003).

A study concerned views about terrorism and punishment of terrorism of White and African-American students. The study conducted on 302 students involved 229 White and 73 African-American undergraduate students in Midwestern universities. The study found that White students significantly view terrorism as a very serious problem, more supportive for military courts, support government court not including court orders, and death penalty for terrorists. Non-whites significantly support protection of civil rights and life prisons instead of the death penalty. Authors expected differences in attitudes between the two groups because they have been treated differently through history by the justice system. Yet, they have similar opinions in general. For instance, from both groups, most of them were uncertain or disagreed to define terrorism as a crime, less than one-third found terrorists should have the same legal rights like others, less than 20% agree that who is against government in its war against terrorists are considered as a terrorist too, one-third show low level of fear of prospect terrorist attacks, 50% agree terrorist would do more attacks if they were not get proper punishments, and less than one third agree that other countries should let the U.S. government eliminate or track terrorists in their countries (Lambart, Ventura, Hall, Clarke, Elechi, Baker, & Jenkins, 2003).

Saudi youth attitudes' towards terrorism was investigated in a study conducted by Alsharari (2007). His study intended to discover the potential causes of engagement in the terrorist groups, and to find

out youths' perceptions of terrorism in relation to some factors such as field of study, residency, academic year, age, monthly income, and the employment status. The study was conducted on ٨٦٠ students at King Abdul Aziz University in Jeddah. A scale measuring attitude towards terrorism was developed by the researcher, and face validity and test-retest analysis were used to analyze the validity and reliability of the scale. The study found that the major factors that cause terrorism were: declined economic situation, unemployment, strict religionists, social and family crisis, and political conflict such as wars and occupations. Additionally, the study resulted that there were no significant differences between the attitudes of Saudi youth towards terrorism regarding to the place of residence and monthly income. While there were significant differences attributed to employment status which is resulted in favor of employed students, academic year level which is resulted in favor of higher academic levels, and age which is resulted in favor of elder students.

Azizo, S. S. (٢٠١٢) aimed to study the attitudes of young Algerians towards terrorism in relation to religiosity and the feeling of belonging to society. She developed a scale to measure attitudes towards terrorism. The scale was conducted on a pilot sample of ١٣٠ participants. Her study did not provide sufficient psychometric information and details about the scale, and its construction and contents. Only the obtained reliability was presented which was .٦٨. However, Azizo's study founded that there were a significant positive relationship between attitudes towards terrorism and religious level. Also, there were a significant inverse relationship between attitudes towards terrorism and feeling of belonging to society. In addition, there were no significant differences attributed to gender, employment status, and educational level.

Alkafaween (٢٠١٧) interviewed ٣٢ students at University of Jordan to explore their perceptions of terrorism and its causes. His study results showed that most of the students have the same opinion on defining terrorism. According to them, the definition of terrorism should include any act of terrorism regardless who committed this

act either an individual, a society, an organization, or a country, and it comes in many forms such as terrorizing and killing innocent people, civilians, and children, also attacking and occupying another countries. The sample of the study also stated that it is difficult to explain the causes of terrorism attacks and to be referred them into one reason. Also, participants illustrated that each attack could be motivated differently. They provided different causes such as political and religious ideologies, taking over the rule of the state, revenge, oppression, injustice, and colonial occupation.

Kiendrebeogo and Ianchovichina (٢٠١٩) analyzed justification of terrorist attacks on civilians and attitudes toward terrorism by applying nationally representative Gallup World Poll surveys. The sample of the study consisted of ٣٠,٧٨٧ individuals from ٢٧ different developing countries. The results showed that young, unemployed, struggling economically, uneducated, and strong believers individuals are more likely to support terrorist attacks on civilians. In addition, gender and marital status variables do not correlate with justification of terrorist attacks.

From previous literature review, studies have not provided sufficient comprehensive empirical studies that can concentrate on effective factors and reasons of terrorism from people's perspective. In addition, studies did not provide satisfactory scales to measure the phenomenon of terrorism. The previous studies investigated attitudes and perceptions towards terrorism as well as this study. Similarly, they examined terrorism in relation to different variables such as employment status, educational level, religious and political ideologies causes, psychological and social influences, economical effects, and media influences. Yet, they were different in many ways in studying the phenomenon of terrorism. For instance, the construction of a valid and reliable scale was not the main goal in the previous studies, and they were focused on certain variables and ethnicities. On the contrary, this study provided an empirical scale and an empirical broad study about attitudes towards terrorism. The current study presented comprehensive factors that are related to terrorism and were the components of the scale's table of specifications to identify the aspects

of terrorism clearly. Furthermore, the study relied on appropriate and rigid psychometric analyses that strengthen its construction, reliability, and validity.

METHODOLOGY

Sample of the Study

One hundred fifty eight persons participated in the current study. Data were collected from the sample through e-mail and directly by using a snowball sampling method. The sample was selected from the United States and other countries. The total participants of this study were 158 participants including 93 (58.86%) female and 65 (41.14%) male. The data involves two groups: the U.S. group ($n = 85, 53.8\%$) and the international group ($n = 73, 46.2\%$). The U.S. participants were 41.8% White, 1.3% African-American, 7% Hispanic, and 3.2% Other. Most of the U.S. participants' age ranged from 17 to 51 years of age with a mean age of 22.12 and a standard deviation of 5.35. The educational level of the U.S. participants involved: 17.9% were high school students, 73.1% were undergraduate students, 10.0% were graduate students, and 3.6% have other educational level with a mean score of 2.00 and a standard deviation of .793. The majority of the U.S. participants were Christians (70%), 10.7% were Muslims, 2.4% were Jewish, and 11.9% had other religions with a mean score of 2.10 and standard deviation of .768.

The international participants were from different countries that were surveyed directly or through e-mail. Data were collected directly from participants who lived in The United States and Pakistan and they were from different nationalities (29 from Pakistan (39.73%), 26 from Saudi (35.71%), 0 from Lebanon (0%), 2 from France (2.71%), 1 from Philippine (1.33%), 1 from Turkey (1.33%), 1 from Bulgaria (1.33%), 1 from Greek (1.33%), and 1 from Taiwan (1.33%), 1 from Bangladesh (1.33%), 1 from Morocco (1.33%), 1 from Egyptian (1.33%), 1 from Iraq (1.33%), 1 from Italy (1.33%), 1 from Spain (1.33%), and 1 from Portugal (1.33%). The sample of the international included 28 females (37.84%) and 45 males (62.16%). The international participants' age

ranged from 19 to 50 years of age with a mean score of 26.81 and a standard deviation of 8.027. The educational level of the international involved: 9.0% were high school students, 74.3% were undergraduate students, and 16.2% were graduate students with a mean score of 2.39 and a standard deviation of 0.93. The majority of the international participants were Muslims (90.04%), 8.11% were Christians, and 1.35% had other religions with a mean score of 1.07 and a standard deviation of 0.382. The sample's demographic information is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: The Demographic Information of the Sample

Variables	Categories	The U.S. Group	The International Group	Total
Gender	Female	40 (47.6%)	53 (71.6%)	93 (58.86%)
	Male	44 (52.4%)	21 (28.4%)	65 (41.14%)
Educational Level	High school	10 (17.9%)	7 (9.0%)	17 (13.92%)
	Undergraduate	53 (63.1%)	50 (74.3%)	103 (68.35%)
	Graduate	13 (15.0%)	12 (16.2%)	25 (15.82%)
	Other	3 (3.6%)	0 (0%)	3 (1.9%)
Religion	Christians	63 (75.0%)	6 (8.11%)	69 (43.67%)
	Muslims	9 (10.7%)	67 (90.04%)	76 (48.77%)
	Jewish	2 (2.4%)	0 (0%)	2 (1.27%)
	Other	10 (11.9%)	1 (1.35%)	11 (6.96%)
Total		84 (53.2%)	74 (46.8%)	158

Procedures

The U.S. participants were surveyed through e-mail. The survey was sent via e-mail to volunteers to assist the researcher to collect the data. Data was collected from participants who lived in Colorado, New York, and Kentucky. Their consents were obtained and they were contacted through e-mail. Then, their responses were received through e-mails.

Similarly, data was collected from the international sample that lived in The United States by volunteers who participated to assist the

researcher. Also, data was collected via e-mail from international students who lived in The United States. In addition, data was gathered via e-mail from undergraduate and graduate students from Institute of Information Technology in Islam Abad, Pakistan, with the cooperation of an assistant teacher at that institute.

Instrumentation

Based upon the table of specifications 147 items were constructed or adapted from other surveys. From the 147 items, 40 items were chosen to create ATT. Items were reviewed by panel of expert in the Psychological field. Items were selected carefully to fit with the eight factors. The items were written in a Likert scale format that included six categories (Strongly Agree = 5, Agree = 4, Slightly Agree = 3, Slightly Disagree = 2, Disagree = 1, and Strongly Disagree = 0). Some items were adopted and modified from other studies (Abdolian, & Takooshian, 2003; Murphy, Wismar, & Freeman, 2003; Riemann, Braun, Greer, & Ullman, 2004) to investigate the concurrent validity of the scale; those items were 1, 13, 17, 23, 25, 26, 34, 36, and 42. The psychometric characteristics (reliability and validity) of the scale are presented and discussed later in the results of the study.

Data Analyses

Factorial analysis was used to analyze ATT. Exploratory factor analysis was used to indicate and discover number of factors that are underlying in this instrument then the number of ATT's subscales (DeVellis, 2003). Factors were determined by using parallel analysis. The KMO assesses the sampling adequacy which should be greater than 0.5 for a satisfactory factor analysis. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett test of sphericity was used to verify the sufficiency of matrix correlation between each variable with other variables. Principle axis and oblique rotation (promax rotation) of Kappa equal 1 was used to maximize the hyperplane count and to find better congruence between items (Field, 2005). In order to confirm the number of factors, scree plot was used and which confirmed the founded results. Every subscale was calculated

by Cronbach's coefficient alpha to assess the internal consistency reliability. Cronbach's alpha for the two groups was examined to see if there is a difference in the internal consistency between the U.S. group and the international group.

RESULTS

The collected data was analyzed and factor analysis and other appropriate statistical analyses were conducted to answer the results of the research questions and present the research's results.

Number of the Factors of ATT Scale

The first research question was: "How many factors will be resulted in the developed scale by exploratory factor analysis?"

Exploratory factor analysis was used to investigate the number of factors that underlay the ATT. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett test of sphericity was used to investigate the sufficiency of the matrix correlation for a factor analysis. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) was .78 which indicated that the correlation matrix of ATT was appropriate for factor analysis. The Bartlett's test of sphericity also supported the satisfactory of the matrix, with the matrix being significantly different from a singular matrix, $p < .0001$. A principle axis factor analysis was conducted, with the number of factors determined by using parallel analysis with random resampling of the raw data (O'Connor, 2000). In parallel analysis, the obtained eigenvalues are compared to those obtained from a comparable set of random data. The first five eigenvalues from the data were 9.17, 4.98, 3.50, 1.91 and 1.75. The corresponding eigenvalues for the random data were 2.21, 2.07, 1.97, 1.88, and 1.80.

The graph of the scree plot illustrates that four factors were obtained, and the scree plot figure confirms the number of factors. The resulted four factors were subjected to a promax rotation with the degree of obliqueness determined by the maximum hyperplane count and interpretability of the results. The hyperplane count is an objective

method for determining the degree of obliqueness in a rotation determined from the hyperplane count. The hyperplane count consists of the number of essentially zero loadings on a set of factors. The hyperplane count was always determined by the factor pattern. To allow for some randomness of loadings around zero, the hyperplane count usually includes the number of variables with loadings on the factor between $+.10$ and $-.10$ (Gorsuch, 1983). The percent of elements in the hyperplane is calculated by dividing the count by the number of variables. As a first step an orthogonal rotation is conducted. Then a series of rotations were conducted with each rotation allowing for an increasingly oblique rotation. The rotation with the highest hyperplane count was selected. An orthogonal solution ($\kappa = 1$) produced the most acceptable results. Based on sample size criteria delineated by Gorsuch (1983) and (Field, 2000) and the sample sizes of the current study, factor loading of $.50$ or more was used to identify meaningful factor loadings. After rotation, the factors accounted for the following percentages of variance: Factor 1 = 19%; Factor 2 = 10%; Factor 3 = 7%; and Factor 4 = 3%. Ten items (1, 6, 17, 21, 28, 32, 40, 41, 43, and 44) out of 40 items had a low factor loading less than $.50$ and did not fit well on any factor.

The interpretation of the items loadings in each factor was conducted. The items loaded high in Factor 1 and were from the psychological categories of the blueprint. Factor 2 contained items regarding beliefs about personal characteristics, or personal causations of terrorist from the psychological categories, all the nurture items, two of the three economic questions, and one media. Factor 3, contained items related to external causation, contained items from the ideological, political, and perspective categories. Factor 4 contained items from general perspectives or attitudes and ideological dimensions.

Correspondence With Blue Print

The second research question was: “Do the resulted factors correspond with the scale’s blueprint (table of specification)?”

The developed scale's items were linked to their corresponding categories. A correspondence between the factor analysis and the blueprint was observed. As showed earlier in the previous interpretation of the items loadings, clustered items were meaningful and reasonable in the four factors. Accordingly, correspondence between the factor analysis and the blueprint was mostly attained.

However, since the elements of the table of specification were twice as the resulted factors, it is expected to find some items that do not fit with other items. The exception suggests that the original blueprint may have separated some areas, e.g., politics, perspectives, therefore, items in these elements loaded in the same factor. In addition, the factor analysis loadings failed to isolate psychological emotions from psychological attributions.

The Scale's Concurrent Validity

From previous presented outcomes, the results suggested that the ATT had evidence of concurrent validity. All of the items from previous studies, except two (items ١ and ١٧), had factor loadings greater than .٤٠. Four of six items from Abdolian and Takooshian (٢٠٠٣) study of attitudes toward terrorisms loaded in the fourth factor. Abdolian and Takooshian (٢٠٠٣) study concerned public opinions which consisted of the fourth factor which also measured general opinions about terrorism. Another item from Abdolian and Takooshian (٢٠٠٣), "Terrorists are mentally disturbed," loaded on Factor ١ along with other psychologically based items. One more item from Abdolian, and Takooshian (٢٠٠٣), "Terrorist is misguided by terrorist leaders," loaded on Factor ٣ along with other items related to external causation.

Other two adopted items from Murphy et al. (٢٠٠٣) that concerned psychological factors were found in the first factor which also included psychological feelings. The one item from Riemann et al., (٢٠٠٤), "My school performance has decreased after terrorist attacks," was also on the psychological factor, but it had a weak factor loading. The other adopted items had high factor loading and had significant correlation with other items. That suggests ATT has a strong concurrent criterion

related validity. Factorial validity, structural validity, content validity, and concurrent validity showed high validity for ATT and each subscale.

Optimization and Scale Construction

The items differed greatly in their factor loadings and some had very low factor loading. Since the goal of the analysis of study was to develop subscales to examine the dimensions of attitude toward terrorism, the four factors were optimized by using item analysis method. The aim of the optimization was to select items which lead to the greatest internal consistency of the subscales. The items on each factor were analyzed separately. If the inclusion of an item leads to lower reliability for the scale, then that item was dropped.

As mentioned earlier, items less than .4 were dropped already, so item analysis was done for items higher than .4 of factor loading. In addition, each of the two groups (U.S. and International sample) were examined separately, any remaining items that did not correlate with the total score in one group was dropped from both group. Five items from Subscale 1, two items from Subscale 2, three items from Subscale 3, and only one item in Subscale 4 were dropped based upon these criterions.

Subscale 1 (Factor 1) contained 4 items. This factor involves items represent feelings traits particularly fears. Therefore, this subscale can be called "fear of terrorism." Items in this factor were items 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, 28, and 27 in order. The overall internal consistency for this scale was .91.

Subscale 2 (Factor 2) also contained 4 items. Factor 2 represented personal reasons of terrorists. These reasons were related to terrorists and their situations. This factor was called "personal causations of terrorism." Items in this factor were items 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35 in order. The overall internal consistency for this scale was .88.

Subscale 3 is comprised of 4 items. It assesses beliefs that some factors in societal influences of terrorism. This factor can be called

“societal influences of terrorism.” Items in this factor were items ١٥, ٢٠, ٣٨, ٢٩, ٢٤, ٣٧, ٣, and ٣٦ in order. The overall internal consistency for this scale was .٧٣.

Finally, Subscale ٤ demonstrated participants' opinion or thoughts about terrorism. This factor tells how they define terrorism and what their perspectives are. It also demonstrated the level of their endorsements of terrorism. This factor assesses "perspectives of terrorism." The items in this factor were items ١٠, ٣٤, ٦, ١٣, and ٢٦ in order. The overall internal consistency for this scale was .٧٨. The items in each subscale and their corrected item total correlations are shown in Table ٢.

Table ٢: The Final Version of the Scale: Highest Reliability of Each Factor After Item Analysis

Items	Factor Loading			
	١	٢	٣	٤
Factor ١: Fear of Terrorism				
٣٩. I'm afraid that I will be killed in a terrorist attack.	.٨٤			
٤٥. I'm afraid that I will be injured in a terrorist attack.	.٨٤			
٣٣. I feel insecure because of terrorism.				
٣٠. I'm afraid that somebody I know will be killed in a terrorist attack.	.٧٦			
٢٢. I'm afraid that somebody I know will be hurt in a terrorist attack.	.٧٣			
١٨. The terrorist attacks make me feel afraid.	.٧٢			

	Factor Loading			
٢٧. The terrorist attacks make me avoid public places.	.٦٨			
	.٦٢			
Factor ٧: Personal Causations to Terrorism				
٣٥. Depressed people are likely to engage in terrorism.		.٨٠		
٢. Stressed people tend to commit terrorism.		.٧٨		
١٤. Frustrated people become terrorists.		.٧١		
٤. Unemployment status leads to terrorism.		.٧٠		
١١. Family problems make people tend to be terrorists.		.٦٨		
١٦. Poverty contributes to terrorism.		.٦٥		
٣١. Parents' negligence leads their children to terrorism.		.٦١		

Factor ٣: Societal Influences of Terrorism	Factor Loading			
١٥. Misunderstanding some religious concepts contributes to terrorism.			.٥١	
٢٠. Terrorism has hurt some religions.			.٥٠	
٣٨. Enemies' civilians are innocents.			.٥٠	
٢٩. Terrorism attacks are reactions of political situations.			.٤٧	
٢٤. Terrorists believe that they represent their religions.			.٤٥	
٣٧. Terrorism decreases the economic development.			.٤٣	
٢. Some radical religious scholars justify terrorist attacks.			.٤٣	
٣٦. Terrorists are misguided by terrorist leaders.			.٤٣	
			.٤٠	
Factor ٤: Perspectives of Terrorism				
١٠. I think it is fair when some terrorist attacks happen.			.٨٠	
٣٤. Some terrorist attacks are justified.			.٧٦	

	Factor Loading			
٦. I feel cheerful when some terrorist attacks happen.				.٥٧
١٣. Terrorist attacks are inexcusable.				.٥٤
٢٦. Terrorism is killing innocent people.				.٤٠
Reliability	.٩٠٨	.٨٨١	.٧٣٠	.٧٨٠
Number of Items	٧	٧	٨	٥

The resulting four scales were strongly related to the factors they represented. The correlations between scales and the corresponding factor scores were high: Scale ١, $r = .٩٧$; Scale ٢, $r = .٩٧$; Scale ٣, $r = .٨٦$; scale ٤, $r = .٨٥$. The factor scores were computed from the Anderson-Rubin procedure. A factor analysis of the items in the four scales further confirmed the structure of the derived scales.

ATT scale and each subscale's internal consistency reliability were assessed also by Cronbach's alpha. The first subscale, "fear of terrorism," has .٩١ of reliability. Factor ١ had a mean of ٣,٠٠ and a standard deviation of .٨٧. The reliability of second factor "personal causation of terrorism," is .٨٨. Factor ٢ had a mean of ٢,٥٥ and a standard deviation of .٨٠. The third factor, "societal influences of terrorism," had a reliability of .٧٣. Third factor had a mean of ٣,٨١ and a standard deviation of .٦١. Finally, the fourth factor "perspectives of terrorism," also had a reliability of .٧٨. Fourth factor had a mean of ١,٠٨ and a standard deviation of .٦٦. Table ٢ presents each factor with its reliability and number of items.

The third research question was: "Is there significant difference between the United States and the International Samples in the scale of attitudes towards terrorism?"

The difference in internal consistency of the resulted factors between the United States and the International samples were examined. The four subscales were very similar. The difference between Cronbach's alpha between the two groups was examined and no significant differences in internal consistency between the United States and the International samples were found. The results showed that there are no significant differences between the international sample and the American sample in the four factors. The reliability for the two groups is presented in Table ٣ along with the test of significance in the coefficient alphas.

Table ٣: Comparison of Reliabilities of the U.S. and the International Groups

Factor	Alpha U.S. Group	Alpha International Group	Chi-Square Value	Probability
١	.٨٦٩	.٨٧٢	.٠٠٨	.٥٥١
٢	.٧٩٥	.٨٠٢	.٠١٨	.٦١٢
٣	.٧٥٨	.٧٢٦	.٢٣٤	.٦٢٤
٤	.٧٧٣	.٧١٤	.٦٨٨	.٤١٢

Based on the descriptive statistical results, the international sample showed slightly more fear than the American sample. The international sample demonstrated slightly higher endorsement of personal causations than the American sample. Again, the international sample illustrated slightly higher endorsement of external or societal influences than the American sample. Finally, the international sample showed very slightly lower endorsement of justification of terrorism. However, comparison of the sample means as shown in Table ٤ verified that there are no significant differences in the four factors between the two samples, and both samples confirmed similar attitudes toward terrorism.

Table ٤: Comparison of Sample Means of the U.S. and the International Groups

Factors	U.S. Mean (sd)	International Sample Mean (sd)	T-Value (df = ١٠٦)	p-value	Dunn-Sidak adj p-value
Factor ١	٢,٤٤ (١,٢١)	٢,٨٦ (١,٢٣)	-٢,١٤	.٠٣	.١٨
Factor ٢	٢,٢٣ (١,٠٤)	٢,٣٧ (١,١٩)	-.٧٩	.٤٢	.٨٩
Factor ٣	٣,٨٤ (٠,٦١)	٣,٨٦ (٠,٦٢)	-.٢٤	.٨٠	.٩٩
Factor ٤	٠,٦٣ (٠,٨٠)	٠,٥٣ (٠,٥٦)	.٨٧	.٣٨	.٨٦

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The results of this study suggested the preliminary version of the ATT had acceptable psychometric properties. The scale and subscales developed from the factors were found to have acceptable reliabilities. Evidence for structural validity and content validity were found with factors that were conceptual internally consistent (Field, ٢٠٠٥) and overlapped with the a priori blueprint. Evidence for criterion validity was also apparent in the factor loadings of items from previous studies.

People had different views and opinions and range of endorsement from supporting to refusing terrorism (Takooshian & Verdi, ١٩٩٣). This study investigated people's attitude toward terrorism by developing a scale to assess Attitudes Toward Terrorism (ATT). This instrument tried to investigate people's attitude towards these factors and their perspectives about terrorism. It studies about how people think about and perceive terrorism and what do they assume about terrorism's roots and influences.

Factor analysis was used to discover the number of factors in ATT scale. Four factors were found. The four factors are: "feelings toward terrorism," "attitudes toward root of terrorism," "attitudes towards

influences of terrorism," and "perspectives of terrorism." These four factors included different factors that were based on eight general factors (media, familial, psychological, social, political, ideological, economical, and educational) and perceptions or viewpoints of terrorism. This study provided comprehensive approach to study people attitudes about these factors' reasons and effects.

The resulted four factors included the basic three assumptions of terrorism researches. These assumptions investigate how people defined or described terrorism; how they attributed the root of terrorism, and how terrorism affected humans. These three assumptions (perspectives, causes, and effects) were expressed within the eight factors. From the result section, we can see that the eight factors overlapped in the last three loaded factors except the first factor which was psychological which just contains feelings or emotions. These different factors resulted from different opinions.

Factor ١, "feelings toward terrorism," demonstrated psychological characteristic of participants. Participants showed their feelings toward terrorism. Their feelings were related to themselves, others, and even terrorists. They were afraid to be killed or injured as well as their family members and friends. Terrorism made them feel afraid, unsecured, stressed, avoid public place, and upset. Also, they felt angry toward terrorists and they consider them mentally disturbed.

Psychological factors, especially feelings and emotions, had big attention more than any factors after September ٩/١١. Previous studies showed the incensement of different psychological symptoms such as anxiety, insecurity, fear, depression, and so on. For instance, a study was done after seven weeks of the ١٩٩٥ Oklahoma City bombing on middle and high school students in the same city. It conducted a clinical scale on ٢,٧٢٠ students to predict post-traumatic stress symptoms, functional behaviors, and treatment services. Students were asked about media exposure, current stress symptoms, safety, functional behavior, and contact with counselors. The study demonstrated that stress symptoms were highly correlated with the terrorist attack and with media exposures. Girls showed significant

higher stress and worry about safety than boys. Also, it found difficulty in functional behaviors related with stress symptoms and just 14% (14%) of the sample has treatment or counseling service. Finally, the study showed no relationship between contact treatment such as counseling or psychologist and students who had high level of stress symptoms. The study emphasized the importance of counseling services after crises especially in public schools (Pfefferbaum, Sconzo, Flynn, Kearns, Doughty, Gurwitch, Nixon, & Nawaz, 2003).

Having the highest factor loading on the psychological factor of terrorism was not surprising because the psychological factor included different aspects of psychological characteristics such as fear, anxiety, depression, and so on (Gould et al., 2004) that influenced our feelings and emotions when terrorist attacks happen. Terrorism literally had a psychological meaning which was horrifying. Terrorism included psychological causes and influences on terrorists, victims of terrorism, and other people. Most psychological empirical studies of terrorism focused more on the effect of the terrorism rather than reasons of terrorism (e.g., Holbrook, 2007; Derian, 2000; Donohue, 2000; Strickland, 2000). Psychologist and psychotherapists endeavored to know why some people affiliate with terrorists' groups and how to help victims of terrorism. In addition, we do not have incorporated theory that can address terrorism (Stout & Felthous, 2000; Coccia, 2008). Many studies show that terrorism had a strong psychological influences and leads to psychological consequences and post-traumatic stress symptoms such as hopeless, impairment, anxiety symptoms, depression, control problems, conduct problems, and violence (Aber et al., 2004; Gould et al., 2004).


Factor 2, "attitudes toward root of terrorism," revealed the reasons that made terrorists resort to terrorism. These reasons were related to terrorists as internal and external causes. Participants saw that frustration, depression, anger, and stress led terrorists to be involved in terrorist groups. They also declare that some situations provoked terrorism such as unemployment status, family problems,

parents' negligence, peers' pressure to engage in terrorist groups, lack of media freedom or expression, poverty, and some TV channels which encouraged hostility.

Terrorism was the result of many factors. These factors could be media, familial, psychological, social, political, ideological, economical, and educational factors. Hudson (١٩٩٩) called them multiple causal factors. Factors included ethnic conflicts, religious and ideological conflicts, poverty, stresses, political situations, lack of peaceful communications channels, tradition of violence, revolutionary groups, and government and regime strife. These factors could be the roots of terrorism. They could be internal (psychological or ideological) or external (media, familial, social, political, economical, or educational) factors. One factor or more may interact to provoke terrorism.

"Attitudes towards influences of terrorism" is the third subscale or factor. This factor demonstrated that terrorism influenced on and influenced by societies and people who live in those societies. Participants believe that terrorism was the outcome of misunderstanding religious concepts which lead to misrepresentation of religions, fanatic scholars' justifications and teaching wrong religious concepts, terrorists' leader misguiding, and political situations. Obviously, ideologies of terrorism that taught by terrorist leaders and extreme scholars have huge influences on terrorists. In addition, participants show the dreadful effect of terrorism on them. They believed that terrorism had hurt religions particularly Islam because terrorist act by the name of religions, and terrorism declines economic. Many civilians were harmed in many terrorist attacks, therefore, participants also saw that enemies' civilians were innocent and were not enemies and should not be attacked by terrorists.

Some studies have been done to study the impact of terrorism on societies. The effect of family, media, and direct exposures of ٩/١١ had no impact on social attitudes, but they had a significant impact on social mistrust. It had more effect on the other forms of violence exposure (Riemann et al., ٢٠٠٤; Gould et al., ٢٠٠٤). Participants' responses of



social attitudes section were divided two ways: exposure to community violence as witness and exposure to community violence as victim. The result showed significant correlation of the two exposures with hostile attribution bias and significant correlation between social mistrust and exposure to community violence as witness (Aber et al., ۲۰۰۴). Discussed earlier how religious schools or groups could teach violence and hostility. Another example, Aum Shinrikyo is a Buddhist group in Japan who its leader teaches his group members that there will be a big war between West world and Buddhist, so they should be prepared for this war and fight Western world (Knott & Lee, ۲۰۲۰).

Factors ۲ and ۳ illustrated personal causations and societal causations of terrorism. As mentioned earlier, terrorism was motivated by different elements or roots, and could be motivated by one or more than two personal or societal causations, or personal or societal causations work together to elicit terrorism (Alkafaween, ۲۰۱۷). Therefore, we cannot clarify exactly what can cause terrorism or refer to specific reasons of terrorist acts. According to panel of experts on terrorism met in Oslo to discuss root and causes of terrorism in ۲۰۰۳, “There [causes] exists no single root cause of terrorism, or even a common set of causes...Terrorism is better understood as emerging from a process of interaction between different parties, than as a mechanical cause-and-effect relationship” (Bjorgo, ۲۰۰۳, p. ۲). Also, the panel of experts in terrorism affairs around the world differentiated between two kinds of causations of terrorism: a number of preconditions and precipitants that are behind any form of terrorism. First, preconditions set the stage for terrorism in the long run. They are of a relatively general and structural nature, producing a wide range of social outcomes of which terrorism is only one. Preconditions alone are not sufficient to cause the outbreak of terrorism. Second, precipitants are much more directly affecting the emergence of terrorism. These are the specific events or situations that immediately precede, motivate or trigger the outbreak of terrorism. Preconditions causations such as lack of democracy, civil liberties and the rule of law, extremist ideologies of a secular or religious nature, antecedents of political violence, civil wars, revolutions, dictator-ships or occupation, inequality of power,

repression by foreign occupation or by colonial powers, illegitimate or corrupt governments, and social injustice. Precipitants' reasons such as the presence of charismatic ideological leaders and triggering events such as outrageous act committed by the enemy, lost wars, massacres, contested elections, police brutality, or other provocative events that call for revenge or action (Bjorgo, ٢٠٠٣). Hudson (١٩٩٩) says, "Because terrorism is a multicausal phenomenon, it would be simplistic and erroneous to explain an act of terrorism by a single cause, such as psychological need of the terrorist to perpetrate an act of violence" (p.١٥).

Finally, the last factor provided the last subscale which is "perspectives of terrorism." The last factor displays participants' endorsements of terrorism. It notified us how participants defined terrorism. Participants believed that terrorism was not fair, not justified, inexcusable, and not understandable under any conditions. They also considered terrorism as a crime and killing innocent people. They also showed unhappy feelings for any terrorist attacks. In addition, they believed that terrorism was provoked by political reasons. Participants' perspectives were consistent with the current study definition of terrorism which was "Terrorism is an illicit criminal action including killing, threatening, and horrifying innocent civilians, and destroying public facilities whatever there intention is." Participants from different nationalities and ethnic groups in the current study showed high percentage of rejecting terrorism. The results of the fourth factor is supported by a study had aimed to analyze definition of terrorism from different journals. It demonstrated many aspects of terrorism's definitions. The aspects were: violence, political, fear, threat, victim, tactic, civilians, and movement. The aspects had various percentages among the three journals. Violence had the highest percentage in the three journals. That study also showed various percentages through years from ١٩٧٧ to ٢٠٠١. Violence also had the highest percentage through years. The result showed the frequencies of these aspects in three journals: Terrorism, Studies in Conflict and Terrorism, and Terrorism and Political Violence. The differences of these aspects among the three journals were investigated by one way ANOVA. It found significant differences with relation to threat and tactic (Weinberg,


Pedahzur, & Hirsch-Hoefler, ٢٠٠٤). The definition of terrorism in the current study involved most of previous eight aspects. Some elements in the current study's definition were not literally consistent, but they had almost the same meanings. These elements were violence, fear, threat, victim, civilians, and tactic. Threat and civilians were literally consistent with two elements. Killing and destroying were considered as aspects of violence. Horrifying was considered as an aspect of fear. Terrorist actions were considered as tactics. Finally, innocent civilians were the victims of terrorists' attacks. Political elements assumed to be the motive of terrorism, but political reasons were not the only motives of terrorism. Current study assumed that terrorism could be the consequence of any factors that mentioned in this study.

Philip Zimbardo (٢٠٠٤) called terrorism and any kind of violence as an evil. He defined evil as "Evil is intentionally, or causing others to act, in ways that demean, dehumanize, harm, destroy, or kill innocent people" (p.٢٣). Their actions were motivated by different factors such as poverty, destruction of environment, or prejudice. Therefore, these actions had negative consequences (Zimbardo, ٢٠٠٤). The aspect of killing innocent people in Zimbardo's definition was agreed with by participants in this study. In similar to Takooshian and Verdi (١٩٩٣) study, where participants showed range of endorsement between supporters and not supporters attitudes toward terrorism, participants show strongly no endorsement of terrorism from both the U.S. and international groups in the fourth factor. However, endorsement may be influenced by the experience of participants and the time of terrorist incidents. For example, in the study of Takooshian and Verdi (١٩٩٣), Doshang Armenians group showed more endorsement of terrorism than other groups because they had involved in political violence in the past, and their study was conducted before ٩/١١. Also, in Lambart et al. (٢٠٠٣) study, White and African-American students had different perspectives on terrorism and punishment of terrorists because they had different history of justice system thus they were treated differently.

In general, attitude towards terrorism of the U.S. sample and international sample made four factors which they based on eight different dimensions. In general, the findings suggested that respondents were strongly disapproved terrorism. In addition, there was no significant difference in the means across the two groups. The tendency of responses to Factors ١ and ٢ were Slightly Disagree, for Factor ٣ Slightly Agree, and for Factor ٤ Strongly Disagree.

In summary, the current study was distinctive from other terrorism study because it uses a tactical approach to identify the number of factors in ATT. Factors were determined by factorial analysis. Factors were identified by statistical analysis factors to avoid biasness. Agner Fog (٢٠٠٢) recognizes that it is difficult to apply studies of terrorism don't have general standards scientific approaches to study terrorism which leads to unbiased results. He also says, "It has been found that most studies of terrorism are based on biased information sources such as news media and government sources" (Fog, ٢٠٠٢, p. ١). Therefore, terrorism's studies must be based on empirical researches and based its search on empirical studies. The lack of scales that measure terrorism inspired the author to create valid and reliable scale over the time. This study provided a new scale in the psychometric field. In addition, it provides four subscales that measure different aspects of terrorism. These subscales are "feelings toward terrorism," "attitudes toward root of terrorism," "attitudes towards influences of terrorism," and "perspectives of terrorism." The results showed high validity and reliability of ATT scale and high validity and reliability of the four subscales. In addition, this study sought to discover the reasons and impacts of terrorism in a quantitative and an empirical way. The study predicted that these factors could be roots of terrorism and have an impact on terrorism according to people's attitudes. Each factor can be a root or an influence of terrorism. Therefore, statistical factor analysis was used to find which factors underlay the attitude toward causes, results, and perception of terrorism.

Therefore, the current study has a lot of advantages. First, it tells us how people perceive the terrorism and think about it and what their opinions about terrorism are. Secondly, it develops a valid and reliable



scale that can measure attitudes towards terrorism across places and times. Thirdly, this study represents people's thoughts in a quantitative data instead of biased or unempirical perspectives. Finally, this study based its data on different cultures and backgrounds so it provides different opinions about the terrorism from different cultures, backgrounds, religions, genders, ages, ethnicities, educational levels as well as different perspectives about the eight factors.

Limitation and Recommendations

Participants usually avoid choosing Slightly Disagree and Slightly Agree especially in a topic such as terrorism where people are either have endorsement or not, and also to avoid binomial distributions, so the number of Likert choices should be shortened to 4 for future studies. According to Takooshian and Verdi (1993), participants may hesitate in answering questions about a sensitive topic such as terrorism especially when they are international participants who live in the United States.

In the field of studying terrorism, it is very hard to induct a direct study about terrorists. In addition, it is not easy to collect a quantitative data to describe terrorists' traits. The difficulty existed for two main reasons. First, in order to have any information about terrorists, the researcher must have access to police files or access to conduct direct testing or interview. No researcher can have access to terrorist directly for political or security reasons. Second, studying terrorists' profiles or their biographical information takes a long time (Hudson, 1999). In addition, participants sometimes are not comfortable answering surveys that talk about terrorism (Takooshian & Verdi, 1993).

This study suggested that the constructed scale be conducted on samples from cities that have experienced terrorist attacks such as New York, London, Madrid, Riyadh, and so on, and be compared with other cities that did not experienced terrorist attacks to explore the differences in attitudes toward terrorism. In addition, the current study collected the data from participants from different cultures but

they all live in the United States, thus this study proposed to collect data from samples that live in two or more different cultures.

From the results, we can see that the eight factors are overlapped in the loaded resulted factors, and terrorism could be caused by different factors. Therefore, the current study suggests that it is difficult to indicate a single or specific cause of terrorism. Also, the study recommends that studies aim to construct scales should rely on a clear and comprehensive table of specification to explore potential influencing factors. This procedure would clarify clustered items and give meaningful and reasonable explanations of the factors.

Finally, the current study suggests that terrorism is internationally unacceptable and intolerable. The indifferences among the international participants indicate that people from different cultures and backgrounds don't support terrorist actions and they generally agree on the causes of terrorism.

REFERENCES

- Abadie, A. (٢٠٠٦). Poverty, political freedom, and the roots of terrorism. *American Economic Review*, ٩٦(٢), ٥٠-٥٦.
- Abadie, A., & Gardeazabal, J. (٢٠٠٥). Terrorism and the world economy. DFAEII Working Papers ٢٠٠٥١٩, University of the Basque Country - Department of Foundations of Economic Analysis II.
- Abdolian, L., & Takooshian, H. (٢٠٠٣). The USA Patriot Act: Civil liberties, The media, and public opinion. *Fordham Urban Law Journal*. ٣٠(٤), ١٤٢٩-١٤٥٣.
- Aber, L., Gershoff, E., Ware, A., & Kotler, J. (٢٠٠٤). Estimating the effects of September ١١th and other forms of violence on the mental health and social development of New York City's youth: A matter of context. *Applied Developmental Science*. ٨(٣), ١١١-١٢٩.
- Alkafaween, M. M. (٢٠١٧). Jordanian University Students' Perceptions about Terrorism: Concept, Causes, and Combating Strategies. *Humanities and Social Sciences Studies*, ٤٤(٤), ١٨٣-٢٠٢.
- Alsharari, M. S. (٢٠٠٧) Attitudes Of Saudi Youth Towards Terrorism: A Study On A Sample Of Students Of King Abdul Aziz University In Jeddah. Doctoral Dissertation. Jordan University, Amman, Jordan. Retrieved from: <http://search.mandumah.com.sdl.idm.oclc.-org/Record/٥٤٦٧٩٣>
- Aly, A., Taylor, E., & Karnovsky, S. (٢٠١٤). Moral Disengagement and Building Resilience to Violent Extremism: An Education Intervention. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, ٣٧(٤), ٣٦٩-٣٨٥.
- Arendt, F., Northup, T., & Camaj, L. (٢٠١٩). Selective Exposure and News Media Brands: Implicit and Explicit Attitudes as Predictors of News Choice. *Media Psychology*, ٢٢(٣), ٥٢٦-٥٤٣.
- Azizo, S. S. (٢٠١٢). Attitudes Towards Terrorism And The Relationship With Religious Level And The feeling of Belonging To Society Of Algerians Graduated College. *Majallat Al-'Ulūm Al-Insāniyah Wa-Al-Ijtimā'iyah*, ٧, ٣٠٤.

- Balestrini, P. P. (٢٠٢٠). Public opinion and terrorism: does the national economic, societal and political context Really Matter? *European Security*, ٢٩(٢), ١٨٩-٢١١.
- Bjorgo, T. (٢٠٠٣, June ٩-١١). Root causes of terrorism. Findings from an international expert meeting in Oslo.
- Blomberg, S., Hess, G., & Weerpana, A. (٢٠٠٣). Economic condition and terrorism. *European Journal of Political Economy*, ٢٠, ٤٦٣-٤٧٨.
- Borum, R. (٢٠٠٤). *Psychology of terrorism*. Tampa, FL: University of South Florida.
- Brouard, S., Vasilopoulos, P., & Foucault, M. (٢٠١٨). How terrorism affects political attitudes: France in the aftermath of the ٢٠١٥-٢٠١٦ attacks. *West European Politics*, ٤١(٥), ١٠٧٣-١٠٩٩.
- Cho, J., Boyle, M., Keum, H., Shevy, M., McLeod, D., Shah, D., & Pan, Z. (٢٠٠٣). Media, terrorism, and emotionality: Emotional differences in media content and public reactions to the September ١١th terrorist attacks. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, ٤٩(٣), ٣٠٩-٣٢٧.
- Coccia, M. (٢٠١٨). A THEORY OF GENERAL CAUSES OF TERRORISM. *Archives Of Psychology*, ٢(٤). Retrieved from: <https://archivesofpsychology.org/index.php/aop/article-view/٣٢>.
- Connelly, L. M. (٢٠١٩). What Is Factor Analysis? *MEDSURG Nursing*, ٢٨(٥), ٣٢٢-٣٣٠.
- Decety, J., Pape, R., & Workman, C. I. (٢٠١٨). A multilevel social neuroscience perspective on radicalization and terrorism. *Social Neuroscience*, ١٣(٥), ٥١١-٥٢٩.
- Derian, J. D. (٢٠٠٥). Imaging terror: Logos, pathos and ethos. *Third World Quarterly*, ٢٦(١), ٢٣-٣٧.
- DeVellis, R. F. (٢٠٠٣). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (٢nd ed.) (Applied Social Research Methods Series, Vol. ٢٦). London: SAGE Publications.
- Dhumad, S., Candilis, P. J., Cleary, S. D., Dyer, A. R., & Khalifa, N. (٢٠٢٠). Risk factors for terrorism: a comparison of family, childhood, and personality risk factors among Iraqi terrorists, murderers, and controls. *Behavioral Sciences of Terrorism and Political Aggression*, ١٢(١), ٧٢-٨٨.

- Donohue, L. (۲۰۰۵). Security and freedom on the Fulcrum. *Terrorist and Political Violence*, ۱۷, ۹۶-۸۷.
- Ferguson, N., & McAuley, J. W. (۲۰۲۰). Radicalization or Reaction: Understanding Engagement in Violent Extremism in Northern Ireland. *Political Psychology*, ۴۱(۲), ۲۱۵-۲۳۰.
- Field, A. (۲۰۰۵). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (۲nd ed.) (Applied Social Research Methods Series). London: AGE Publications Ltd.
- Fog, A. (۲۰۰۲). Why terrorism doesn't work (Draft Article). Retrieved from <https://www.agner.org/cultsel/terror.pdf>
- Gill, P., & Corner, E. (۲۰۱۷). There and back again: The study of mental disorder and terrorist involvement. *American Psychologist*, 72(۳), ۲۳۱-۲۴۱.
- Global Terrorism Database codebook (۲۰۱۵). Codebook: inclusion criteria and variables. National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism (START). Global Terrorism Database. Retrieved from: <http://www.start.umd.edu/gtd,-College Park, MD>.
- Gorsuch, R. (۱۹۸۳). *Factor analysis* (۲nd ed.). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Gould, M., Munfakh, J., Kleinman, M., Lubell, K., & Provenzano, D. (۲۰۰۴). Impact of the September ۱۱th Terrorist Attacks on Teenager's Mental Health. *Applied Developmental Science*, ۸(۳), ۱۵۸-۱۶۹.
- Hippel, K. V. (۲۰۰۲). The root of terrorism: Probing the myths. *Political Quarterly*, ۷۳, ۲۵-۳۹.
- Holbrook, D. (۲۰۱۷). What Types of Media do Terrorists Collect? An Analysis of Religious, Political, and Ideological Publications Found in Terrorism Investigations in the UK. ICCT Research Papers, ۱۱, ۱-۳۱.
- Hudson, R. A. (۱۹۹۹). *The sociology and psychology of terrorism: Who become a terrorist and why*. (Washington, DC: Library of Congress, Federal Research Division.
- Huff, C. & Kertzer, J. D. (۲۰۱۸). How the Public Defines Terrorism. *American Journal of Political Science*, ۶۲(۱), ۵۵-۷۱.
- Johnson, T. (۲۰۲۰). An exploration of disengagement leading to student violence in the fayetteville arkansas K۱۲ school districts (Order No. ۲۷۹۶۴۲۱۹). Available from ProQuest

- Dissertations & Theses Global. (٢٤١٥٤١٢١٩٥). Retrieved from <https://search-proquest-com.sdl.idm.oclc.org/dissertations-theses/exploration-disengagement-leading-student-docview-٢٤١٥٤١٢١٩٥/se-٢?accountid=١٤٢٩٠٨>.
- Kiendrebeogo, Y., & Ianchovichina, E. (٢٠١٩). Who justifies attacks on civilians? Analysis of attitudes toward terrorism based on value surveys. *Review of Development Economics*, ٢٣(٤), ١٥٨٠-١٦٠٣.
- Knott, K., & Lee, B.J. (٢٠٢٠) Ideological Transmission in Extremist Contexts: Towards a Framework of How Ideas Are Shared, *Politics, Religion & Ideology*, ٢١:١, ١-٢٣.
- Lambart, E. G., Ventura, L. A., Hall, D. E., Clarke, A., Elechi, O. O., Baker, D. N., & Jenkins, M. (٢٠٠٣). United we stand? Differences between white and nonwhite college students in their views on terrorism and punishment of terrorists. *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice*, ١(٣/٤), ٩١-١٠٨.
- Lloyd, M., & Kleinot, P. (٢٠١٧). Pathways into terrorism: the Good, the Bad and the Ugly. *Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy*, ٣١(٤), ٣٦٧-٣٧٧.
- McMahon, J., & Bergen, P. (٢٠٠٥). The Madrassa Myth. *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, ٢٤(٦), ١٤-١٥.
- Murphy, R. T., Wismar, K., & Freeman, K. (٢٠٠٣). Stress symptoms among African American college students after the September ١١, ٢٠٠١, terrorist attacks. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, ١٩١(٢), ١٠٨-١١٤.
- Novotny, D. (٢٠٠٧). What is Terrorism? in: Linden. Edward V. ed. *Focus on Terrorism* ^. ch. ٢. pp. ٢٣-٣٢.
- Pfefferbaum, B., Sconzo, G., Flynn, B., Kearns, L., Doughty, D., Gurwitch, R., Nixon, S., & Nawaz, S. (٢٠٠٣). Case finding and mental health services for children in the aftermath of the Oklahoma City bombing. *Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research*, ٣٠(٢), ٢١٥-٢٢٧.
- Riemann, B., Braun, M., Greer, A., & Ullman, J. (٢٠٠٤). Effects of September ١١ on patients with obsessive compulsive disorder. *Cognitive Behaviour Therapy*, ٣٣(٢), ٦٠-٦٧.
- Rodin, D. (٢٠٠٤). Terrorism without Intention. *Ethics*, ١١٤(٤), ٧٥٢-٧٧١.

- Ruby, C. L. (٢٠٠٢). The definition of terrorism. Analyses of social issues and public policy, ٢(١), ٩-١٤.
- Schwartz, S., Dunkel, C., & Waterman, A. (٢٠٠٩). Terrorism: An Identity Theory Perspective. Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, ٣٢(٦), ٥٣٧-٥٥٩.
- Stevens, J. M. (٢٠٠٥). What is terrorism and can psychology do anything to prevent it. Behavioral Science and Law, ٢٣(٤), ٥٠٧-٥٢٦.
- Stout, C., & Felthous, A. (٢٠٠٥). Introduction to this issue: Terrorism. Behavioral Sciences & the Law, ٢٣(٤), ٤٤٩-٤٥٠.
- Strickland, M. A. (٢٠٠٥). Reinventing the counterinsurgency wheel. The joint interagency coordination group: The operationalization Of DIME. Small Wars Journal, ٢, ١٣-١٧.
- Takooshian, H., & Verdi, W. (١٩٩٣). U.S. attitudes toward the terrorism problem. Journal of Psychology and the Behavioral Sciences, ٧, ٨٣-٨٧.
- Takooshian, H., & Verdi, W. (١٩٩٥). Assessment of attitudes toward terrorism. In L. L. Adler & F. L. Denmark (Eds.), Violence and the prevention of violence, ٣٣-٤٣. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Turk, A. T. (٢٠٠٤). Sociology of terrorism. Annual Review Social, ٣٠, ٢٧١-٢٨٦.
- Wadsworth, S. M. M. (٢٠١٠). Family Risk and Resilience in the Context of War and Terrorism. Journal of Marriage and Family, ٧٢(٣), ٥٣٧-٥٥٦.
- Weinberg, L., Pedahzur, A., & Hirsch-Hoefler, S. (٢٠٠٤). The challenge of conceptualizing terrorism. Terrorism and Political Violence, ١٦(٤), ٧٧٧-٧٩٤.
- Zimbardo, P., G. (٢٠٠٤). A situationist perspective on the psychology of evil: Understanding how good people are transformed into perpetrators. In A. Miller (Ed.), The Social Psychology of Good and Evil: Understanding Our Capacity for Kindness and Cruelty, (pp.٢١-٥٠). New York: Guilford.
