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Abstract

The current study examined the effects of cartel violence and terrorism threat on people’s judgments, emotions and behaviors in response to the threat. It was hypothesized that prior threat experience, perception of threat severity, negative emotions, and attitudes toward authorities would influence trust in federal and local authorities for protection against the threat of cartel violence and terrorism. It was also expected that trust in authorities would increase compliance to authority recommendations to prepare for the threat. The sample consisted of 592 University of Texas at El Paso Introduction to Psychology students and El Paso community members. Participants completed an online survey and were assigned to read a cartel violence threat article or a terrorism threat article. Participants reported their judgments, emotions, and compliance behaviors in response to the threat posed. Results revealed that attitudes toward local authorities and trust in local authorities for protection against threats were lower than for federal authorities. A measured variable path analysis revealed that threat experience and perception of threat severity increased anger and fear in response to the future threat. Attitudes toward authorities was the only significant predictor of trust in authorities. In addition, perception of threat severity, attitudes, trust, and fear predicted compliance to authority recommendations. Cartel violence and terrorism threat had several different effects on judgments and emotions and more importantly, several factors were found to be related to compliance behaviors. The ultimate goal for authorities is to ensure the public’s safety when there is a possibility of a crisis; thus future research should continue to explore the effects of external threats in an effort to decrease the negative consequences these threats can have.
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Chapter 1: General Introduction

An essential responsibility of government is to protect the public from external threats. An external threat is a natural or human made occurrence that can cause potential harm to people’s lives (DHS Risk Lexicon, 2010). Three important types of external threats are criminal violence, terrorism, and natural disasters (Heilbrun, Wolbranksky, Shah, & Kelly, 2010). Both federal and local governments are important in dealing with external threats because they have different responsibilities (FEMA, 2010). For instance, the federal government monitors nationwide terrorism threat while local governments are responsible for dealing with crime. In order to respond to a threat, governments frequently require the cooperation and assistance of citizens such as reporting suspicious criminal activity or complying with the Transportation Security Regulations when flying. Citizen cooperation when facing an external threat also requires that citizens trust the government (Homeland Security, 2011). Thus, trust in government authorities for protection against external threats can be critical to mitigate negative consequences if the threat were to occur. Hence, the goal of the current research is to examine the antecedents and consequences of people’s trust in federal and local authorities for protection against two types of external threats, cartel violence and terrorism. Specifically, we were interested in how threat experience, perception of threat severity, negative emotions, and attitudes influence trust in authorities for protection against the external threat. Furthermore, we wanted to determine how trust in authorities for protection against an external threat influences compliance to authority recommendations to prepare for the threat.

1.1 Political Trust

Political trust is broadly defined as a basic evaluation toward the government based on how well the government meets and produces outcomes consistent with people’s expectations.
(Hetherington, 1998; Miller, 1974; Stokes, 1962). People are more likely to have increased political trust when their government produces outcomes consistent with their expectations (Zhang & Wang, 2010). A critical expectation people have of their government is providing protection from harm when faced with an external threat (Levi & Stoker, 2000). Since external threats can involve a pronounced level of uncertainty and risk, people also expect government authorities to prepare for and respond to the threat (FEMA, 2010). Thus, people are more likely to trust government authorities when the expectations of protection, preparedness, and response to an external threat are met. High trust in the government results in societies that are more likely to be cooperative and compliant with government decisions, policies, and demands (see Levi & Stoker, 2000 for review). Thus, having high trust in authorities for protection against external threats can lead to compliance to authority recommendations that can mitigate the negative impacts that the threat can cause, ultimately reestablishing societal stability. For example, if someone trusts the local police, they are more likely to comply with the recommended curfew due to the escalated violence in their city. Complying with the curfew would decrease the likelihood that they would get in harm’s way.

1.2 Measuring Political Trust

Although a number of trust scales have been developed (see Robinson, Shaver, & Wrightsman, 1999), none are sufficient for examining trust in local and federal authorities for protection against external threats, which is one of the goals of the current study. The most commonly used trust scale is from the American National Election Studies (ANES) (Miller, 1974); the scale consists of five items (e.g., “How much of the time do you think you can trust the government in Washington to do what is right: just about always, most of the time, or only some the time?”). Internal consistency of the scale has ranged from .57 to .90 (Miller, 1974; Hill,
1982; Abramson & Finifter, 1981). However, the ANES trust scale is subject to a number of limitations. For example, many items on the ANES scale refer to “the people running the government”; such wording may confuse respondents because the wording fails to identify the specific government body under evaluation (Mishler & Rose, 1997). Some people may respond to the question thinking about the president while others may be thinking about other politicians. Another limitation of the trust scale is that it assesses general political trust rather than whether people trust authorities with regard to particular domains or activities (Levi & Stoker, 2000). Measuring a respondent’s general trust in the government fails to distinguish the different components of trust in different contexts such as trust in authorities for protection from drunk drivers versus trust in authorities for protection from military invasion. Furthermore, the scale fails to assess respondents’ trust in their local government. The studies that do examine local government trust revise the ANES federal government trust questions and often only use a 1-item scale (Rahn & Rudolph, 2005; Zhang and Wang, 2010). A Trust in Local Government Scale was developed by Baldassare (1985) but the scale measures specific local governmental performance such as an official’s efficiency in using tax money and attentiveness to the public’s policy preferences. Even though this scale clearly specifies the type of trust that is being assessed, it does not examine trust in authorities for protection against external threats and therefore is inadequate for use in the current study.

Another major limitation of the ANES trust scale is its use of the general term ‘government’, which ignores variations in trust across different political levels and institutions (Mishler & Rose, 1997). For example, the scale does not distinguish between federal and local government levels; nor does the scale distinguish between types of governmental institutions, such as law enforcement agencies or taxing entities. Despite the high correlation between levels
of federal and local trust (using the single item ANES question for each level), Rahn and Rudolph (2005) found that factors that influence local political trust do not influence federal political trust such as local political efficacy and attitudes concerning perceived local conditions. Christensen and Legreid (2003) asked people to evaluate their level of trust (on a scale from 0 to 10) in various institutions (e.g. parliament, local councils) and found that the lowest correlations, ranging from .59 to .61, were between trust in local councils and the other types of institutions. These results suggest that trust in local political systems may be somewhat different than trust in federal political systems.

Although trust in different government institutions may be related, this does not imply that trust in all types of governmental authority is identical. Some researchers have suggested that the similarities in trust between different levels of government and different governmental institutions (e.g. the supreme court, the municipal courts, the military, the police) may be due to similar performances of those authorities instead of generalizing trust from one level or institution to another (Klingemann, 1999). For example, someone might have high trust in both the federal government and federal law enforcement for protection against a terrorism threat because both institutions have previously handled a threat of terrorism adeptly. Alternatively, the individual may trust the federal government and federal law enforcement agencies because the individual views the “government” as one amorphous construct and thus fails to distinguish conceptually between different governmental levels and institutions (Glaser & Denhardt, 1997; Mishler & Rose, 1997; Muller & Jukam, 1977). So, if someone trusts the military they may also trust the police even though the two entities represent different levels of government. The current study examines trust in authorities for protection against external threats, and different authorities have different responsibilities for handling threats. Thus, assessing trust in different
levels of government and assessing trust in different institutions of government can reveal which authorities are trusted more for protection against an external threat. Assessing trust by referring to the amorphous construct of ‘government’ would not allow these comparisons to be made. A study was first conducted to develop a trust in federal and local authorities scale that could be used to address the overall goal of the current study.
Chapter 2: Preliminary Study 1 - The Development of the Trust in Authorities and Attitudes Toward Authorities Scales

Due to the unsuitable federal and local trust measures currently available, Preliminary Study 1 was conducted to develop a trust scale for protection against external threats that could be used to evaluate respondents’ trust in both federal and local authorities. In addition, we wanted to develop a trust scale that could be applied to different types of external threats. To do this, we examined trust in four distinct government authorities: federal government, federal law enforcement, local government, and local law enforcement. A secondary objective was to develop a measure of attitudes toward authorities scale to determine whether attitudes and trust are distinct constructs since previous research has suggested that these constructs are highly related.

2.1 The Relationship Between Attitudes and Trust

Attitudes are typically defined as evaluative summary judgments that can be derived from qualitatively different types of information (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993; Petty & Cacioppo, 1986). Previous studies have shown that specific attitudes toward the government are related to the level of trust that respondents express toward authorities. Positive attitudes of the democratic process, government policy outcomes, the government’s decision-making process, and judging authorities as honest and competent have been shown to be associated with higher levels of trust in the government (Christensen & Legreid, 2003; Ulbig, 2002). Negative attitudes toward the political system, political leaders, and the economy have been shown to be associated with lower levels of trust in the government (Catterberg & Moreno, 2005; Citrin, 1974; Citrin & Green, 1986; Hetherington, 1998; Hetherington & Rudolph, 2008; Miller, 1974). Negative attitudes of how authorities have handled previous terrorism threats are also related to decreased trust in
authorities for handling future terrorism threats (Wray, Rivers, Whitworth, Jupka, & Clements, 2006). Collectively, this body of research reveals a positive relationship between attitudes toward the government and trust in the government. Accordingly, people who have positive attitudes toward authorities are more likely to trust in authorities for protection against the threat of cartel violence and terrorism in the local population.

While previous research has shown a relationship between specific government attitudes and general trust in the government, the current study investigated the relationship between general attitudes (an overall evaluation of authorities) and trust in authorities for protection against external threats. It is difficult to identify specific attitudes that might affect trust in authorities for protection against external threats because attitudes and trust are highly interwoven and interconnected (Christensen & Legreid, 2003). Using a general attitude scale toward different authority figures can provide a better understanding of how general attitudes toward authorities is related to trust in the same authorities for protection against future external threats. To determine whether general attitudes and trust in authorities for protection are distinct constructs, confirmatory factor analysis was used to determine the underlying factor structure of the attitudes and trust scales concurrently.

2.2 Preliminary Study 1 Method

2.2.1 Participants

Participants were 316 (216 female) University of Texas El Paso undergraduates enrolled in Introduction to Psychology. Their participation helped fulfill a requirement of their course. Ages ranged from 17 to 44 years ($M = 20.40; SD = 3.69$). The ethnic/racial composition was 90.1% Hispanic/Latino and 9.9% non-Hispanic/Latino. A total of 92% of the participants were United States citizens and 6.7% were Mexican Nationals.
2.2.2 Measures

Demographics. Participants completed an 8 item demographic questionnaire assessing age, gender, ethnicity, nationality, language(s) spoken, city of birth, city of current residence, and city of previous residence.

Trust in Authorities Scale (TIAS). The TIAS consists of 16 items measuring trust in four different authority targets: federal government (FG), federal law enforcement (FL), local government (LG), and local law enforcement (LL). Participants were asked to rate the extent to which each of the four authority targets are distrustful or trustful, incompetent or competent, dishonest or honest, and unsupportive or supportive in times of an external threat. Ratings were made on a 7-point bipolar continuum, ranging from -3 to 3, with 0 (neutral) serving as a center point. The four components of trust were selected by reviewing several trust measures (Robinson, Shaver, & Wrightsman, 1999) and identifying attributes related to trust in authorities that are important in times of external threats.

Attitude towards Authorities Scale (ATAS). The ATAS scale consists of 12 items measuring attitudes toward the same authority targets from the TIAS (FG, FL, LG, LL). Participants were asked to rate the extent to which they have negative or positive attitudes toward, dislike or like, and evaluate as bad or good the four authority targets. Ratings were made on a 7-point bipolar continuum, ranging from -3 to 3, with 0 (neither) serving as a center point. The general attitude items that were used display good internal consistency (alpha ranging from .90-.96) to a variety of attitude objects (Crites, Fabrigar, & Petty, 1994).

2.2.3 Procedure

Participants completed the experiment online using SurveyMonkey. Participants first received an email containing the link for the informed consent form and then were provided with
the link to the study. Participants first completed the TIAS and ATAS, which were counterbalanced and then participants completed the demographic questionnaire. The items within the TIAS and ATAS were not randomized. At the completion of the study, participants were debriefed.1

2.2.4 Power Analysis

To ensure adequate sample size to test the confirmatory factor analysis of whether the 16 TIAS items load onto four authority type factors, a power analysis ($df = 74; \alpha = .05; \beta = .20$) revealed that 162 participants were required. To test whether the 12 ATAS items load onto four authority type factors, a separate power analysis ($df = 30; \alpha = .05; \beta = .20$) revealed that 314 participants were needed. A test of close fit was performed for both of the power analyses (MacCallum, Browne, & Sugawara, 1996; Preacher & Coffman, 2006). The root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) was set to .05 under the null hypothesis and was tested against an alternative hypothesis that the value of the RMSEA statistic equaled 0.08. The RMSEA statistic is an index of model fit, where smaller values are better than larger values. A final power analysis ($df = 280; \alpha = .01; \beta = .01$) for when the two scales are combined to test whether the attitude items load on the four attitude authority factors and the trust items load onto the four trust authority factors revealed that 200 participants were required. A test of not close fit was performed for this power analysis (MacCallum, Browne, & Sugawara, 1996; Preacher & Coffman, 2006). The root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) was set to .05 under the null hypothesis and was tested against an alternative hypothesis that the value of the RMSEA statistic equaled 0.01. A total of 314 participants were recruited to complete the study.

---

1Due to a procedural problem, 20 participants took the survey more than once. Because their data could not be identified due to confidentiality purposes, data from both responses were included in the analysis.
2.2.5 Data Analysis

Data were prepared for analysis by imputing missing data (1.27% of the data were missing) with a single imputation\(^2\) in PRELIS 2.20 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2003). Due to significant violations of multivariate normality (Skew = 277.05, Kurtosis = 1317.92), an asymptotic variance-covariance matrix was created in PRELIS 2.20 and analyzed using robust maximum likelihood estimation in LISREL 8.80 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2003). Hu and Bentler’s (1999) suggested fit indices were used to evaluate the underlying factor structure of the TIAS and the ATAS. The following combination criteria were used to determine good model fit: when \( p > .05 \) for the Satorra-Bentler chi-square (S-B \( \chi^2 \))\(^3\), Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) < .08, Root Mean Square of Approximation (RMSEA) < .06, Non-Normed Fit Index (NNFI), and Comparative Fit Index (CFI) > .95. Furthermore, smaller values of the Akaike Information Criteria (AIC) are preferred and represent better model fit.

2.3 Preliminary Study 1 Results

2.3.1 Confirmatory Factor Analysis

A lower-order, eight-factor model (M1) was tested where eight latent factors were specified and items under each authority type were allowed to load only on its target factor: 1) Attitude towards Federal Government (AFG), 2) Attitude towards Federal Law Enforcement (AFL), 3) Attitude towards Local Government (ALG), 4) Attitude towards Local Law Enforcement (ALL), 5) Trust in Federal Government (TFG), 6) Trust in Federal Law Enforcement (TFL), 7) Trust in Local Government (TLG), and 8) Trust in Local Law Enforcement (TLL). All latent factors were allowed to correlate with each other. The error variances of syntactically similar items were allowed to correlate (e.g. the negative/positive

\(^2\)A single imputation may be used in cases in which missingness is approximately 1%-2% (Widaman, 2006).

\(^3\)The S-B \( \chi^2 \) is used as an index of fit rather than the standard chi-squared statistic when the raw data are skewed.
attitude items’ error variance for the four authority types were allowed to correlate) to take into account a method factor. If this model provided a good fit for the data, it would imply that it is important to distinguish authority levels as well as institutions. It would also imply that it is important to distinguish attitudes and trust.⁴ According to the fit criteria, M1 provided a good description of the data (see Table 1). In examining the unstandardized solution of this model, all items statistically loaded on their target factor in their expected direction (see Table 2). Inter-factor correlations ranged from .42-.80 (the lowest between AFL and TLG and the highest between TFG and TFL) (see Table 3). While this model provided an adequate fit to the data, a higher-order model was tested after examining the inter-factor correlations to determine whether a more parsimonious model⁵ would better describe the data.

Table 1

*Preliminary Study 1 - Confirmatory Factor Model Fit Indices*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>S-B $\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>90% CI</th>
<th>NNFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>AIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(M1) First-order,</td>
<td>357.47</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.019-.038</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>609.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eight-factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(M2) Second-order,</td>
<td>460.83</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.035-.050</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>684.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four-factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A higher-order, four-factor model (M2) was tested in which the eight latent factors in the lower-order model were nested⁶ within the higher-order model. This model allowed the eight lower-order latent factors to load onto four higher-order factors: Attitude towards Federal Authorities (AFA), Attitude towards Local Authorities (ALA), Trust in Federal Authorities (TFA), and Trust in Local Authorities (TLA). All higher-order latent factors were allowed to

---

⁴Three other lower-order models were tested: a lower-order, Attitude/Trust two-factor model; a lower-order, AttitudesFederal/AttitudesLocal/TrustFederal/TrustLocal four-factor model; and a multitrait, multimethod model (Eid, Lischetzke, Nussbeck, & Trierweiler, 2003). But according to the fit criteria, these models did not provide an adequate description of the data.

⁵A more parsimonious model is a less complex, more constrained model with more degrees of freedom. A less parsimonious model is a more complex model, less constrained model with fewer degrees of freedom.

⁶A model is considered to be nested if one model’s parameters are a subset of another model’s parameters.
correlate. As before, the error variances of syntactically similar items were allowed to correlate to take into account a method factor. Improved fit of this model over M1 would imply that it is important to distinguish authority level and attitudes and trust but authority institutions are synonymous. According to the fit criteria, the higher-order model provides a good description of the data (see Table 1). In examining the unstandardized solution of this model, all items statistically loaded on their target factor in their expected direction (see Table 2). Correlations among the higher-order factors ranged from .62-.89 (the lowest between ALA and TFA and the highest between TFA and TLA) (see Table 4).

To compare the two competing models, the Satorra-Bentler chi-squared ($\Delta S-B \chi^2$) difference test, change in CFI ($\Delta$CFI), change in RMSEA ($\Delta$RMSEA), and the Akaike Information Criteria (AIC) were used. A scaled difference chi-squared test statistic can be used to test the difference between $S-B \chi^2$ for nested models to determine which model is more parsimonious (Crawford & Henry, 2003; Satorra & Bentler, 2001). When the $S-B \chi^2$ difference test is significant, the less parsimonious model is preferred. To also compare nested models, it has been suggested that if the $\Delta$CFI greater than .01 and a $\Delta$RMSEA greater than .015 the models differ and the less parsimonious model is preferred (Chen, 2007; Cheung & Rensvold, 2002). If the change is less than these values, the models are not different and the more parsimonious model is preferred. The AIC statistic can also be used to compare nested and non-nested models where smaller AIC values represent enhanced model fit.

The lower-order, eight-factor model is superior to the higher-order model based on the $S-B \chi^2$ difference tests, ($\Delta S-B \chi^2(14, N = 316) = 114.73, p < .001$) and AIC values. However, based on the $\Delta$CFI and the $\Delta$RMSEA, the higher-order, four-factor model is superior to the lower-
order, eight-factor model. In summary, the lower-order, eight-factor model and the higher-order, four-factor model are equivalently good models and preferring one model to the other should be grounded in theoretical relevance. Both models support the prediction that it is important to distinguish authority levels as well as attitudes and trust.

Table 2

Preliminary Study 1 - Model 1 and Model 2 Unstandardized Factor Loadings for Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed Variable</th>
<th>Latent Factor</th>
<th>M1</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>M2</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FG Negative/Positive</td>
<td>AFG</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG Dislike/Like</td>
<td>AFG</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG Bad/Good</td>
<td>AFG</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL Negative/Positive</td>
<td>AFL</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL Dislike/Like</td>
<td>AFL</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL Bad/Good</td>
<td>AFL</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG Negative/Positive</td>
<td>ALG</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG Dislike/Like</td>
<td>ALG</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG Bad/Good</td>
<td>ALG</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL Negative/Positive</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL Dislike/Like</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL Bad/Good</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG Distrust/Trust</td>
<td>TFG</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG Incompetent/Competent</td>
<td>TFG</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG Dishonest/Honest</td>
<td>TFG</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG Unsupportive/Supportive</td>
<td>TFG</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL Distrust/Trust</td>
<td>TFL</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL Incompetent/Competent</td>
<td>TFL</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL Dishonest/Honest</td>
<td>TFL</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL Unsupportive/Supportive</td>
<td>TFL</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG Distrust/Trust</td>
<td>TLG</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG Incompetent/Competent</td>
<td>TLG</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG Dishonest/Honest</td>
<td>TLG</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG Unsupportive/Supportive</td>
<td>TLG</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL Distrust/Trust</td>
<td>TLL</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL Incompetent/Competent</td>
<td>TLL</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL Dishonest/Honest</td>
<td>TLL</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL Unsupportive/Supportive</td>
<td>TLL</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three other higher-order nested models were tested: a higher-order, GeneralAttitude one-factor model; a higher order, FederalAuthority/LocalAuthority two-factor model; and a higher-order Attitudes/Trust two-factor model. According to the fit criteria, all of these higher-order models provided a good description of the data. However, based on the collective statistics to compare nested models, M1 was superior to all of these higher-order models.
Table 3

Preliminary Study 1 - Model 1 Latent Factor Correlations, Mean of Observed Score, and Reliabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. AFG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. AFL</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ALG</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ALL</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. TFG</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. TFL</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. TLG</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. TLL</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All correlations are significant ($p < .001$)

2.3.2 Scale Reliabilities

Since the focus of the current study is to compare attitudes towards and trust in federal and local authorities, we prefer the higher-order, four-factor model to the lower-order, eight-factor model. Furthermore, we did not have any specific hypotheses about the differences between government and law enforcement institutions. Thus, four composite subscales were created. The attitudes toward federal government and federal law enforcement items were summed to create the AFA subscale (scale scores range from -18 to 18). The attitudes toward local government and local law enforcement items were summed to create the ALA subscale (scale scores range from -18 to 18). The trust in federal government and federal law enforcement items were summed to create the TFA subscale (scale scores range from -24 to 24). The trust in local government and local law enforcement items were summed to create the TLA subscale (scale scores range from -24 to 24). Each of the four subscales demonstrated good internal consistency reliability, ranging from .92-.95 (see Table 4).
Table 4

Preliminary Study 1 - Model 2 Latent Factor Correlations, Mean of Observed score, and Reliabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. AFA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.93-.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ALA</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.477</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.94-.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. TFA</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.91-.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. TLA</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.93-.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All correlations are significant \( (p < .001) \)

2.3.3 Scale Mean Differences

The average of each attitude and trust scale were first computed before mean difference analyses were conducted (scale scores range from -3 to 3). A repeated measures MANOVA was conducted to assess federal and local judgment rating differences for attitudes and trust. The results showed a significant difference between authority level judgment, \( F(2, 314) = 11.50, p < .001 \). Univariate tests revealed that attitudes toward local authorities \( (M = .366, SE = .079) \) were lower than attitudes toward federal authorities \( (M = .557, SE = .075) \), \( F(1, 315) = 7.433, p = .007; d = .14 \). Also, trust in local authorities \( (M = .432, SE = .075) \) were lower than trust in federal authorities \( (M = .662, SE = .070) \), \( F(1, 315) = 23.06, p < .001; d = 1.8 \). Overall, local authority ratings were lower than federal authority ratings. However, it seems that generally people have positive attitudes toward federal and local authorities and also have trust in federal and local authorities for protection against external threats when the type of threat is not specified.\(^8\)

2.4 Preliminary Study 1 Discussion

The confirmatory factory analysis of the TIAS and the ATAS revealed that a second-order, four-factor model was a good description of the data. Four subscales were created in

\(^8\)Comparing differences by citizenship was not examined because of the limited Mexican Nationals sample \( (n = 21) \).
which government and law enforcement institutions were combined for federal and local attitudes and trust. The overall goal of the current study is to determine differences in federal and local authority levels. Thus, the distinction between government and law enforcement institutions were not the primary concern. However, if researchers are interested in the distinctions between government and law enforcement institutions, the eight subscales can be used to assess institution judgment differences. The model supports the notion that trust in federal and local authorities are different, which is consistent with previous research (Christensen & Legreid, 2003). Furthermore, results revealed that trust in federal authorities is higher than trust in local authorities. If only government trust is measured, some people might interpret this as local and others as federal. Thus, one cannot simply measure trust in ‘government’ and assume it applies to both local and federal authorities because trust in the different levels may be dissimilar depending on the context.

Although the correlations among the attitude higher-order factors and the correlations among the trust higher-order factors were fairly high, ratings of authority types were significantly different. Attitudes and trust in local authorities were lower than federal authorities, which is opposite to previous findings (Jennings, 1998; Rahn & Rudolph, 2005; Torney-Purta, Richardson, & Barber, 2004). One explanation is that previous studies examined trust in a general sense while this study examine trust for protection. People may feel that the federal authorities are more responsible in dealing with external threats than local authorities and thus trust federal authorities more than local authorities for protection against the external threat. Furthermore, when assessing people’s perceptions of authorities in regards to external threats, it is important to take into consideration the local political climate (Rahn & Rudolph, 2005). Local authorities in El Paso may be viewed less favorably than federal authorities because of the drug
cartel violence in Ciudad Juárez, Mexico that has also affected local El Paso residents (Hixson, 2009; Taylor, 2011). The current study attempted to further elucidate the differences between federal and local attitudes and trust in authorities for protection against the specific threat of cartel violence and terrorism.

This preliminary study also supports the idea that attitudes toward and trust in authorities are distinct constructs, extending previous research (Catterberg & Moreno, 2005; Chanley, Rudolph, & Rahn, 2000; Citrin, 1974; Miller, 1974; Heatherington, 1998; Hetherington & Rudolph, 2008, Ulbig, 2002). Although the correlations between attitudes and trust factors were high, confirmatory factor models that combined attitudes and trust latent factors and items did a worse job at explaining the data compared to when attitudes and trust were separated into their own latent factors. Furthermore, assessing the antecedents and determinants of attitudes toward authorities compared to trust in authorities for protection may be different. Thus, examining the two constructs separately will allow any differences between them to be revealed.

The results of this preliminary study provide baseline federal and local attitude and trust ratings for the current sample without being presented with a specific type of external threat. While the TIAS was used to assess trust in authorities for protection against external threats in a general sense, examining how specific external threats influence trust in federal and local authorities can provide a better understanding of the role of contextual factors. Presumably, federal authorities are expected to respond to different types of threat than local authorities (e.g., national security threat vs. a neighborhood murder). Thus, the external threat of terrorism may elicit different effects on trust in local authorities compared to federal authorities and these effects may be different for the threat of cartel violence. The research on specific external threats has suggested that trust in government decreases during or after an external threat (Borunda,
However, different levels of government were not examined and external threats were not compared. Examining federal and local authorities concurrently will extend this research and provide a better understanding of how different external threats influence trust in different authority levels. Thus, the TIAS can be modified and used to examine how these specific external threats influence trust in federal and local authorities.

The major implication of this preliminary study is that the TIAS and ATAS are reliable measures that could be used in the current study to investigate how threat type, threat experience, emotions, and attitudes affect trust. The current study also used these scales to determine the different effects attitudes and trust have on behaviors. Extending this research on attitudes toward and trust in authorities will provide a better understanding of the similarities and differences between the two constructs and further validate the scales.
Chapter 3: Preliminary Study 2 - The Influence of Threat Type and Threat Experience on the Emotions of Fear and Anger

3.1 The Effect of External Threats on Trust

Criminal violence, terrorism, and natural disasters are prevalent threats in our society and people’s trust in the government can be affected during or after the occurrence of the harmful event. Some events may increase positive government judgments while others may decrease positive judgments depending on when the judgment is being made and the type of threat. Research on judgments that are made immediately after a terrorist attack has shown that people have increased positive government judgments. For example, immediately after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, there was a dramatic increase in presidential support and approval (Mueller, 1970). This is an example of a “rally ‘round the flag effect” and has been documented to occur following catastrophic crisis involving the whole nation (Mueller, 1970). Findings on the relationship between the rally effect and trust in government concerning the Persian Gulf War has shown that higher pre-crisis trust predicted increased rally effects and increased trust immediately after the crisis (Chatagnier, 2012). These findings are based on judgments immediately following the threatening event but the research on judgments regarding future threats have shown to have opposite effects.

A qualitative study explored respondent’s trust in the government in the context of future terrorist attacks (Wray et al., 2006). The study consisted of 32 focus groups with a total of 341 participants from rural and urban locations in the Southeast, Midwest, Southwest, and West Coast of the United States. Participants were an average age of 44, 61% were female, and were of the following ethnicities: 27% were Caucasian, 18% were Hispanic, 18% were African American, 19% were Asian/Pacific Islanders, and 13% were Native American. Qualitative
results revealed that people lacked trust in the government to effectively respond to future terrorist attacks. Furthermore, people were less likely to trust the federal government than the local government to respond to the terrorist threat. Survey research has also shown that after Hurricane Katrina, public trust in the government decreased, which can be attributed to the lack of government response to the event (The Pew Research Center, 2010). A survey study (\(N = 557\)) using a “random digit dialing” sampling design examined attributions of blame nine months after Hurricane Katrina (Gomez & Wilson, 2008). Results revealed that people with higher levels of political sophistication were less likely to blame the federal government and more likely to blame the local government. However, people with lower levels of political sophistication were more likely to blame the president. These findings suggest that political sophistication and trust in federal and local authorities for protection against future threats may be related to which authorities are blamed for the problems in handling previous crises.

In addition to terrorism and natural disaster research, increases in criminal violence is also associated with lower trust in the government. Trust research concerning criminal violence has found that high murder rates, increased public concern about crime, political scandals, and corruption are related to low trust in the government (Anderson & Tverdova, 2003; Catterberg & Moreno, 2005; Chanley, 2002; Chanley, Rudolph, & Rahn, 2000; Hetherington & Rudolph, 2008; Roth, 2009). Hence, the drug cartel violence (a form of criminal violence) that is a prevalent threat in the local border population of Ciudad Juárez encompasses the factors that would lead to low trust in the government. Indeed, a 2009 public opinion poll conducted in Juárez showed that 52% of respondents distrusted all Mexican authorities and 97% of respondents felt unsafe (Borunda, 2010). However, it is empirically unknown whether the low trust in authorities is directly related to cartel related violence.
**Drug cartel violence.** To better understand how cartel violence has affected trust in authorities for protection, it is first essential to understand the local conditions as a result of the violence. Due to the cartel violence, Juárez has become one of the most dangerous cities in the world (CNN World, 2010) having the highest number of homicides in all of Mexico (Valencia & Chacon, 2011). El Paso is the sister city of Juárez so the two cities are physically proximal, and therefore overlap exists in familial relationships, business, and education. For example, many people commute back and forth on a daily basis between the two cities (Taylor, 2011). This interconnection leads the violence in Juárez to indirectly affect El Paso and has contributed to the development of community wide psychological distress in both Juárez and El Paso (Hixson, 2009; Taylor, 2011). Furthermore, the prevalent negative economic and political effects due to the violence have affected community/government relationships (O’Neil, 2008).

Both Mexican and American authorities have employed several methods in an attempt to decrease the violence. For example, United States and Mexico relations have focused on security issues leading to the development of the Merida Initiative in 2007, a U.S. assistance effort to help Mexico to combat drug trafficking and crime (Seelke, 2009). Furthermore, the former President of Mexico, Felipe Calderón, relied on military force to combat the violence due to the high rates of corruption of local Mexican authorities such as the police, which some believe escalated the violence (Beittel, 2009; Padgett, 2011). However, the Mexican government has claimed success in reducing the violence even though according to a 2010 public opinion poll, 59% of Mexicans believed that the cartels were winning the drug war (Beittel, 2011) and remained skeptical about the efficacy of crime-fighting strategies (Valencia & Chacon, 2011).

It is possible that one of the reasons government strategies to reduce the violence have been perceived to be unsuccessful is because people do not trust the government authorities.
Having trust in government authorities is important for the local community because trust in the government can lead to more social stability. Public support of government policies and compliance with government demands are sometimes necessary to implement change and improve societal conditions (Chanley, Rudolph, & Rahn, 2000). The primary goal of the current study is to identify important antecedents that are associated with decreased trust in American authorities for protection against the threat of cartel violence. The findings from the current study can subsequently be used to understand how to improve trust in authorities, which can ultimately help reduce cartel violence.

3.2 Threat Experience and Trust

An important antecedent that can influence trust in authorities for protection against cartel violence is prior threat experience. Terrorism research has found that people lacked trust in the government to effectively respond to future terrorism attacks, which was based on people’s past experiences of terrorist attacks (Wray et al., 2006). Experience of an external threat can encompass both people’s personal experience of the event and their personal experience with government authorities that respond to the event. When people’s experience with the government is negative, they tend to trust the government less (Boukaert & Van de Walle, 2001; Kumlin, 2002). Thus, people who have experienced the negative affects of an external threat may have less trust in authorities for protection against a future threat because the authorities were unable to prevent the previous crisis.

3.3 Emotions and Trust

Negative emotional reactions to an external threat is another important antecedent that may influence trust in authorities for protection against future threats. Research on terrorism, natural disasters, and crime (e.g., robbery) has found that these events lead people to experience
negative emotions such as anger and fear (Jackson, 2004; Kamans, Otten, & Gordijn, 2010; Lambert, Scherer, Schott, Olson, Andrews, O’Brian, & Zisser, 2010; Lerner, Gonzales, Small, & Fischhoff, 2003; Zaalberg, Midden, Meijnders, & McCalley, 2009). Interpersonal trust research has shown that when people are angry and fearful they are less likely to trust others (Dunn & Schweitzer, 2005; Myers & Tingley, 2010). Hence, the threat of cartel violence is expected to elicit anger and fear, which can decrease trust in authorities for protection against the threat. However, these negative emotions may also play a mediating role between prior threat experience and trust in authorities.

People who have more prior experience of an external threat may respond with more anger and fear to a future threat than people who have had less prior experience of the threat. Negative emotions elicited by terrorism threat have been shown to be moderated by proximity to the threatening event, with those in closer proximity (i.e., those with more personal experience) expressing more negative emotions (Huddy, Feldman, Taber, & Lahav, 2005). Likewise, experiencing a natural disaster, such as a flood, elicits stronger negative emotions when presented with the possibility of a future flood (Zaalberg et al., 2009). These findings have implications for understanding the effects of cartel violence. It is expected that people who have more experience with cartel violence would respond in greater anger and fear to a future threat, which could subsequently decrease their trust in authorities for protection against the threat.

3.4 The Difference Between Anger and Fear

Although anger and fear are expected to influence trust in authorities, the two emotions may have distinct influences on trust. Anger and fear have the same valence (negative) but the two emotions differ in the cognitive appraisals of certainty and control (Smith & Ellsworth, 1985). Certainty appraisals are characterized by feelings of certainty, understanding of what is
happening in the situation, and feeling able to predict what will happen next, while uncertainty appraisals tend to be characterized by feelings of uncertainty about a situation, lack of understanding of what is happening, and not feeling certain about what will happen next. Control reflects the extent to which the situation is controlled by circumstances (situational control) or by any human agent (self or other). Anger has been found to be associated with perceptions of certainty and other-person control, while fear has been found to be associated with uncertainty and situational control. Several studies have confirmed that anger and fear differ along the cognitive dimensions of certainty and control when recalling past events (Cheng, Kuan, Li, & Ken, 2010; Dunn & Schweitzer, 2005, Lerner & Keltner, 2001). For example, people who recalled events that elicited fear also appraised the situation as having high situational control and certainty, while people who recalled events that elicited anger appraised the situation as having high other-person control and certainty. These underlying cognitive perception differences of the two emotions have shown to produce different effects on future risk assessment judgments (Lerner et al., 2003; Lerner & Keltner, 2001). Fear was found to increase perceived risk estimations and increase precautionary planning but anger had the opposite effect.

Even though people can experience both anger and fear in response to a future threat, anger and fear may have distinct effects on trust judgments as a result of an external threat. For example, people who respond with more anger to an external threat may think the authorities have more control of the threatening event and are more certain that the threat will occur. In contrast, people who respond with more fear to the external threat may think that authorities have less control over the threatening event and are less certain that the threat will occur. Therefore, based on the different underlying control and certainty perceptions of anger and fear, anger is expected to decrease trust in authorities for protection against external threats more than fear.
The second preliminary study examined how different types of threat and threat experience influence people’s emotions in the local population of El Paso. Initial comparisons of cartel violence threat to terrorism and natural disaster threats were expected to provide a better understanding of the distinct influences each threat type have on emotions and whether threat experience increases negative emotions. Comparing the prevalent cartel violence threat to terrorism and natural disaster threats (two relatively non-prevalent threats in the local population) was expected to provide a better understanding of the relationships between threat type, threat experience, and negative emotions which further guided the current study on how these factors influence trust in authorities for protection against external threats.

A second objective of Preliminary Study 2 was to determine whether perceptions of control and certainty of future threats align with the underlying cognitive dimensions that differentiate anger and fear when recalling previous events. If this were the case, these results would further support the prediction that anger would decrease trust in authorities more than fear.

3.5 Preliminary Study 2 Method

3.5.1 Participants

Participants were 210 (138 female) University of Texas El Paso undergraduates enrolled in psychology courses. Their participation helped fulfill a requirement of their course. Ages ranged from 17 to 50 ($M = 20.54; SD = 4.76$). The ethnic/racial composition was 87.6% Hispanic/Latino and 12.4% non-Hispanic/Latino. Of those who indicated that they were Hispanic/Latino, 83.2% were Mexican Americans, 11.4% were Mexican Nationals, and 5.4% were other. At the time of the study, 95.2% of the participants lived in El Paso, 4.3% lived in

---

9A power analysis ($df = 37; \alpha = .05; \beta = .20$) revealed that 267 participants were required to ensure adequate sample size to test the measured variable path model. However, data was only available from 210 participants since the data was pre-collected, making the study somewhat underpowered.
Juárez, and 0.5% of the participants indicated that they lived in both cities. Of those that lived in El Paso, 31.0% indicated that they have lived in Juárez before. Responses for the number of years participants lived in Juárez before are the following: 8.7% lived in Juárez for less than 1 year, 13.0% for 1-2 years, 20.3% for 3-5 years, 21.7% for 6-10 years, and 36.2% more than 10 years.

3.5.2 Measures

Demographics. Participants completed a 10 item demographic questionnaire assessing age, gender, ethnicity, nationality, language(s) spoken, and city of birth, city of current residence, how many years they have lived in their current city, and whether they have ever lived in Juárez before and if so for how many years (for frequencies, see above).

Threat Articles. Three threat scenarios were created for the local population to measure the emotions elicited by threat of cartel violence, terrorism, and natural disaster (see Appendix A). The three threat scenarios were based on the scenarios used by Heilbrun et al. (2010), which consisted of news reports of crime by armed youthful offenders, a bioterrorist attack, and a hurricane. The crime violence and natural disaster scenarios were revised to reflect local events that respondent’s were more likely to have experienced in the local population. The crime violence scenario was a news report about the drug cartel threatening to increase kidnappings in Juárez. The terrorism scenario was a news report about a terrorist organization threatening to infect the water supply with a chemical. The natural disaster scenario was a news report about the threat of an ice storm in the local area. Participants were randomly assigned to read one of the three threat scenarios.

Emotion self-report. Participants were asked to rate on a 7-point scale ranging from 0 (not at all) to 6 (extremely) the extent to which they felt eight different emotions (anger,
amusement, sadness, happiness, disgust, surprise, fear, & joy; Dunn & Schweitzer, 2005; Gross & Levenson, 1995; Lerner & Keltner, 2001) while reading the threat scenario.

**Appraisal measure.** Items that were originally created by Smith and Ellsworth (1985) were used to measure perceptions of control and certainty. Questions 1-3 of the Appraisal Measure measures control appraisals (high scores indicate other-person control, low scores indicate situational control) and questions 4-6 measure certainty appraisals (high scores indicate certainty, low scores indicate uncertainty). Ratings were based on a 7-point scale ranging from 0 (not at all) to 6 (very much). The original items asked participants to rate their perceptions of control and certainty about a past event. In the current study, the questions were reworded to ask about their perceptions of control and certainty to a future threatening event that might occur (see Appendix B). The original three-item scale for control and three-item scale for certainty for past events were used in Lerner and Keltner’s (2001) study. Only the reliability of the certainty scale was reported having low reliability ($\alpha = .63$). Tiedens and Linton (2001) used the original three item certainty scale for past events and found it to be reliable ($\alpha = .79$).

**Threat experience measure.** The Threat Experience Measure assessed participants’ prior experience with each type of threat to determine whether individual differences in experience influence emotions elicited by the threat induction. Participants were asked to rate on a 7-point scale ranging from 0 (not at all) to 6 (very much) how much each type of threat has affected their family and affected them personally.

### 3.5.3 Procedure

Participants were first given an informed consent form and instructed to read it thoroughly. If they agree to participate, they were randomly assigned to one of the threat induction conditions. All participants completed the survey in pencil and paper format.
Participants first completed a demographic questionnaire. They then completed the threat induction by reading about one type of future threat. Participants were next asked to rate the extent to which they felt eight different emotions (anger, amusement, sadness, happiness, disgust, surprise, fear, & joy) while reading the threat scenario. Participants were next asked to rate their perceptions of control and certainty of the future threat scenario. The last questionnaire assessed participants’ experience with each type of threat (terrorism, cartel violence, natural disaster). At the completion of the study, participants were debriefed.

3.5.4 Data Analysis

Data were prepared for analysis by imputing missing data (0.54% of the data were missing) with a single imputation in PRELIS 2.20 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2003). Due to significant violations of multivariate normality (Skew = 39.24, Kurtosis = 312.09), an asymptotic variance-covariance matrix was created in PRELIS 2.20 and analyzed using robust maximum likelihood estimation in LISREL 8.80 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2003). Descriptive and coefficient alpha reliability statistics were calculated using SPSS 19.

Dummy code variables were created for the terrorism threat condition (n = 30) and the natural disaster threat condition (n = 30), making cartel threat the comparison condition (n = 150). A model was constructed to represent the hypothesized relationships, which included the following variables: terrorism dummy, disaster dummy, years lived in Juarez, experience with terrorism (family), experience with terrorism (personal), experience with cartel violence (family), experience with cartel violence (personal), experience with natural disaster (family), experience with natural disaster (personal), anger, fear, control, and certainty. The proposed relationships were estimated with a measured variable path analysis, with a single indicator for each variable (see Figure 1). As in Preliminary Study 1, Hu and Bentler’s (1999) combination
criteria were used to determine good model fit: when \( p > .05 \) for the S-B \( \chi^2 \), SRMR < .08, RMSEA < .06, NNFI and CFI > .95.

### 3.6 Preliminary Study 2 Results

#### 3.6.1 Measure Reliabilities

As a whole, the measure of threat experience demonstrated fair internal consistency (\( \alpha = .79 \)). In examining the reliabilities for the different types of threat experience, the measures of both terrorism and cartel violence threat experience exhibited fair reliability (\( \alpha \)'s = .77 and .79, respectively), while the measure of disaster threat experience demonstrated lower reliability (Cronbach’s \( \alpha = .69 \)). The measures of control and certainty, however, demonstrated poor reliability (Cronbach’s \( \alpha \)'s = .42 and .27, respectively).

#### 3.6.2 Measured Variable Path Analysis

Given the poor reliabilities for both the control and certainty measures, a single item for control (In the scenario that you just read, to what extent are the events beyond anyone’s control? reverse coded) and a single item for certainty (In the scenario that you just read, how uncertain are you about what might happen in various situations? reverse coded) were selected for inclusion in the model. These items were selected based on their direct relevance to the constructs of interest (control and certainty), assessed from item wording.

According to Hu and Bentler’s (1999) recommended fit indices, the model provides a good description of the data (see Figure 1), S-B \( \chi^2(37, N = 210) = 49.28, p = .085, \) SRMR = 0.055, RMSEA = 0.04 (90% CI – 0.0 ; 0.067), NNFI = 0.97, CFI = 0.99. Additionally, the modeled relationships among variables accounts for 33% of the observed variance in anger, 19% of the observed variance in fear, 17% of the observed variance in family experience of cartel violence threat, 10% of the observed variance in certainty, 7% of the observed variance in
personal experience of cartel violence threat, and 3% of the observed variance in family experience of terrorism threat.
Figure 1. Preliminary Study 2 modeled relationships among variables. Significant pathways and correlations are in bold while non-significant pathways and correlations are dashed. S-B $\chi^2(37, N = 210) = 49.28$, $p = .085$, SRMR = 0.055, RMSEA = 0.04 (90% CI – 0.0 ; 0.067), NNFI = 0.97 CFI = 0.99.
Results showed that participants who read the terrorism threat scenario expressed experiencing less anger (B = -0.83, SE = .38, \( p < .05 \))\(^{10}\) and more fear (B = 1.04, SE = .37, \( p < .01 \)) than participants who read the cartel violence threat scenario. Participants who read the natural disaster threat scenario expressed experiencing less anger (B = -2.58, SE = .26, \( p < .001 \)) and fear (B = -1.25, SE = .31, \( p < .001 \)) than participants who read the cartel violence threat scenario (see Table 5 for all negative emotion means by threat condition). Years lived in Juárez was positively related to family experience with cartel violence threat (B = 0.46, SE = .06, \( p < .001 \)), personal experience with cartel violence threat (B = 0.29, SE = .06, \( p < .001 \)), and family experience with terrorism threat (B = 0.18, SE = .07, \( p < .01 \)), but was unrelated to personal experience with terrorism threat. Personal experience with cartel violence was positively related to both anger (B = 0.33, SE = .09, \( p < .001 \)) and fear (B = 0.35, SE = .10, \( p < .001 \)), but there were no other significant relationships between threat experience and the emotions of anger and fear. While fear was negatively related to certainty (B = -0.26, SE = .07, \( p < .001 \)), there were no other significant relationships between anger and fear and the cognitive appraisals of control and certainty.

Table 5

*Preliminary Study 2 - Mean Emotion ratings by Threat Condition*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Angry</th>
<th>Fearful</th>
<th>Disgusted</th>
<th>Sad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cartel (n = 150)</td>
<td>3.41 (1.84)</td>
<td>2.89 (2.05)</td>
<td>4.26 (1.90)</td>
<td>3.83 (1.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism (n = 30)</td>
<td>2.83 (2.15)</td>
<td>4.07 (2.05)</td>
<td>3.77 (2.33)</td>
<td>2.70 (2.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster (n = 30)</td>
<td>.93 (1.17)</td>
<td>1.77 (1.36)</td>
<td>.57 (0.82)</td>
<td>1.47 (1.63)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Standard deviations are presented in the parentheses.

To examine the differences in the level of prior threat experience to each type of threat, personal and family experience were summed to create an overall experience index for each type of threat. Paired samples t-tests revealed that prior experience of cartel violence (\( M = 4.97, SE = \))

\(^{10}\)Beta values from a Lisrel output are provided only with the standard error and t-value and not with the exact \( p \) value.
.256) was not significantly different from prior experience of terrorism \((M = 4.77, SE = .238), t(209) = 0.89, p = .377; d = 0.06. However, people had significantly more prior experience of cartel violence, \(t(209) = 7.29, p < .001; d = 0.60\) and terrorism, \(t(209) = 7.03, p < .001; d = 0.57\) compared to natural disaster \((M = 2.97, SE = .199)\).

### 3.7 Preliminary Study 2 Discussion

The measured path analysis was a good description of the data. Overall, the threat of cartel violence elicited more anger and fear than the natural disaster threat and more anger than the terrorism threats. But the threat of terrorism elicited more fear than cartel violence threat. These finding imply that prevalent ongoing threats such as cartel violence elicit more anger and non-prevalent threats elicit more fear. Anger and fear were also predicted by personal experience of cartel violence, but not by any other type of threat experience. This finding is in line with previous research on terrorism threat, which demonstrated that negative emotions are elicited to a greater extent in those who are in closer proximity to the threat (Huddy et al., 2005). Given the proximity of the local population to cartel violence threat, it makes sense that personal experience with this threat would be most predictive of anger and fear.

Results also revealed that amount of prior experience of cartel violence and terrorism were not different from each other. This suggests that even though terrorism threat is not a prevalent threat in the local population, people have had just as much experience with this type of threat since it has affected the whole nations security policies and has also received excessive media attention (Lecount & Washburn, 2009). Or it may be the case that people consider cartel violence a type of terrorism. Not surprisingly, people had the least experience with natural disasters and the disaster condition elicited the least amount of negative emotions thus the current study will only examine the threats of cartel violence and terrorism and further
investigate how personal experience and the emotions elicited by these two threats influence trust in authorities for protection against these threats.

Lastly, the cognitive appraisal of certainty was significantly predicted by fear; the more fear that was experienced, the less certain participants were regarding the occurrence of future threats. However, certainty was not negatively related to anger and control was not predicted by either anger or fear. Previous research on the relationships between cognitive appraisals of control/certainty and anger/fear have manipulated these emotions directly. Doing so may cause anger and fear to be much more salient than in the present research, where anger and fear were measured rather than manipulated and participants were asked to report their level of anger and fear along with their experience of several other emotions (e.g., joy, surprise, sadness). Thus, the third preliminary study sought to manipulate the emotions of fear and anger to different types of external threats.
Chapter 4: Preliminary Study 3 - Manipulating Fear and Anger to External Threats

The primary objective of this study was to manipulate the emotions of anger and fear for each type of threat. If the emotion manipulation is successful, we would then be able to test the prediction that anger would decrease trust in authorities for protection against external threats more than fear. This is based on the research that has shown that fear is associated with having situational control and uncertainty of the event while anger is associated with other-person control and being more certain of the event. So people who are made to feel more angry about a future threat should have less trust in authorities for protection compared to people who are made to feel more fearful because anger would lead people to perceive the authorities as having more control in preventing the threat and more certain that the threat will occur. The secondary objective of this study was to examine how perception of threat severity was associated with the emotions elicited by the external threat and threat preparedness behaviors.

4.1 Emotions and Perception of Threat Severity

Anger and fear to a future threat can also be influenced by people’s perception of severity of the threat. Perception of threat severity is strongly related to how people respond to threats and can depend on the frequency that the event actually occurs (Huddy, Feldman, Capelos, & Provost, 2002). An external threat may be an infrequent occurrence for some people but may represent an ongoing risk for others. For example, the threat of a hurricane is very frequent for people who live close to the Gulf Coast but not as frequent for people who live in New York. So people would perceive a hurricane threat in New York less severe than a hurricane threat in Mississippi. Similarly, the threat of cartel violence is more frequent for people who live in Juárez or have family ties there than for people who have no connections to Juárez. Research has found
that people who perceive a threat as more severe are more likely to respond with greater negative emotions (Arian & Gordon, 1993; Huddy et al., 2005). Therefore, people who perceive cartel violence threat as more severe would respond in greater anger and fear to a future threat. In addition to prior threat experience, perception of threat severity is also expected to influence the degree of anger and fear elicited to a future threat.

4.2 Perception of Threat Severity and Behaviors

Compliance behaviors can also be influenced by people’s perceptions of threat severity. Severity of threat has shown to predict recommended hurricane preparedness activities (Sattler, Kaiser, & Hittner, 2006) and decisions to comply with evacuation requests during a hurricane threat (Riad, Norris, & Ruback, 1999). People who did not evacuate did not perceive the threat as severe. A study that compared all three threat types (crime, terrorism, and natural disasters) showed that under high risk of threat compared to low risk, people were more likely to change their daily activities, relocate, and secure their homes in response to the threat (Heilbrun et al., 2010). Accordingly, people who perceive the external threat to be more severe are expected to comply with authority recommendations to prepare for the threat in an effort to decrease the possible negative consequences of the threat.

4.3 Preliminary Study 3 Method

4.3.1 Participants

Participants were 155 (96 female) University of Texas El Paso undergraduates enrolled in psychology courses. Their participation helped fulfill a requirement of their course. Ages ranged from 18 to 51 ($M = 20.47; SD = 4.28$). The ethnic/racial composition was 87.7% Hispanic/Latino and 12.3% were non-Hispanic/Latino. Of those who were Hispanic/Latino, 85.9% were Mexican Americans and 6% were Mexican Nationals.
4.3.2 Measures

**Demographics.** Participants completed a 8 item demographic questionnaire that assessed age, gender, ethnicity, nationality, language(s) spoken, and city of birth, city of current residence, and city of previous residence.

**Emotion threat induction.** Six newspaper articles were created for the local population to measure the emotions elicited by terrorism threat, cartel violence threat, and natural disaster threat (see Appendix C). The content of the articles were based on actual newspaper articles. Also, the pictures that were shown with the articles were taken from actual newspaper articles. Recent research has found that inducing emotions using pictures is a better method than using text (Lench, Flores, & Bench, 2011). Thus, the study also included pictures as a method for emotion induction. The terrorism articles were about the 9/11 terrorist attack and people either responding in anger or fear. The crime violence articles were about the drug cartel violence and people either responding in anger or fear. The natural disaster articles were about the 2006 flood in El Paso and people either responding in anger or fear. This study elected to use the flood event instead of the ice storm, which was used in Preliminary Study 2, in an effort to strengthen the natural disaster threat induction. All articles contained content that suggested that there is a high possibility of the event happening again to elicit the perception of a future threat. After reading the article, participants were asked to write a paragraph about what makes them either angry or fearful (depending on the emotion condition) of the future threat posed in the article. The directed writing task has been used in previous research to induce the emotions of anger and fear (Dunn and Schweitzer, 2005; Lerner et al., 2003; Lerner & Keltner, 2001).

**Emotion self-report.** The Emotion Self-Report measured the emotions elicited by the threat induction to assess whether anger and fear were the primary emotions elicited (see
Appendix D). Participants were asked to rate on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely) the extent to which they felt several types of emotions (Dunn & Schweitzer, 2005; Gross & Levenson, 1995; Lerner & Keltner, 2001). Several emotion adjectives were added to describe each target emotion, which was expected to provide a better measure of each emotion (Dunn & Schweitzer, 2005). The following are the adjectives that were used for the negative emotions of anger, fear, disgust, and sad. The five angry adjective items were angry, mad, furious, irritated, and frustrated. The three fearful adjective items were fearful, nervous, and anxious. The three disgusted adjective items were disgusted, repulsed, and grossed out. The three sad adjective items were sad, upset, and downhearted. The emotion adjective items were randomly presented to participants.

**Risk perception questionnaire.** The four items that were originally created by Heilbrun et al. (2010) were used to measure perceptions of risk of each type of threat (see Appendix E). Participants were asked to rate on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all serious) to 5 (very serious) their perception of severity of the threat posed in the article they had read. They also rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (very unlikely) to 5 (very likely) their likelihood of relocating, securing their home, and changing their daily activity if the threat were to occur.

### 4.3.3 Procedure

Participants completed the experiment online using SurveyMonkey. Participants first received an email containing the link for the informed consent form and then were provided with the link to the study. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the six emotion threat induction conditions. Participants first completed a demographic questionnaire. Next they read the newspaper article and completed the writing task. After the threat induction, participants
completed the Emotion Self-Report, and the Risk Perception questionnaire. At the completion of the study, participants were debriefed.

4.3.4 Data Analysis

Data were prepared for analysis by imputing missing data (0.86% of the data were missing) with a single imputation in PRELIS 2.20 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2003). Due to significant violations of multivariate normality (Skew = 569.57, Kurtosis = 1817.91), an asymptotic variance-covariance matrix was created in PRELIS 2.20 and analyzed using robust maximum likelihood estimation in LISREL 8.80 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2003). Descriptive, analysis of variance, and coefficient alpha reliability statistics were calculated using SPSS 19.

As in Preliminary Study 1 and 2, Hu and Bentler’s (1999) suggested fit indices were used to evaluate the underlying factor structure of each type of negative emotion. The following combination criteria were used to determine good model fit: when $p > .05$ for the S-B $\chi^2$, SRMR < .08, RMSEA < .06, NNFI and CFI > .95.

4.4 Preliminary Study 3 Results

4.4.1 Confirmatory Factor Analysis

A lower-order, four-factor model was tested where four latent factors were specified and items under each emotion type were allowed to load only on its target factor: 1) Angry, 2) Fearful 3) Disgusted, 4) Sad. All emotion factors had three emotion adjective items except for angry which had five emotion adjectives. All emotion latent factors were allowed to correlate with each other. According to Hu and Bentler’s (1999) recommended fit indices, the proposed model was good fit to the observed data, S-B $\chi^2(71, N = 155) = 145.23, p < .001, \text{RMSEA} = 0.082 (90\% \text{ CI} - 0.063 ; 0.101), \text{CFI} = 0.99, \text{SRMR} = 0.042, \text{NNFI} = 0.97$. In examining the

---

11Due to a procedural problem, 7 participants took the survey more than once. Because their data could not be identified due to confidentiality purposes, data from both responses were included in the analysis.
unstandardized solution of this model, all items statistically loaded on their target factor in their expected direction (see Table 6).

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed Variable</th>
<th>Latent Factor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mad</td>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furious</td>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irritated</td>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustrated</td>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearful</td>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervous</td>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxious</td>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disgusted</td>
<td>Disgust</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repulsed</td>
<td>Disgust</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grossed Out</td>
<td>Disgust</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad</td>
<td>Sad</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upset</td>
<td>Sad</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downhearted</td>
<td>Sad</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.2 Scale Reliabilities

Four composite emotion scales were created. The five angry adjective items (angry, mad, furious, irritated, frustrated) were summed to create an Angry scale (scale scores range from 5 to 35). The three fearful adjective items (fearful, nervous, anxious) were summed to create a Fearful scale (scale scores range from 3 to 21). The three disgusted adjective items (disgusted, repulsed, grossed out) were summed to create a Disgusted scale (scale scores range from 3 to 21). The three sad adjective items (sad, upset, downhearted) were summed to create a Sad scale (scale scores range from 3 to 21). Each of the four emotion scales demonstrated good internal consistency reliability, ranging from .83-.94 (see Table 7).
Table 7

**Preliminary Study 3 - Emotion Latent Factor Correlations, Mean of Observed score, and Reliabilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Angry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.72</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.93-.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fearful</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.82-.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Disgusted</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.78-.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sad</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.13</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.82-.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All correlations are significant ($p < .001$)

4.4.3 Emotion Manipulation Check

The average of each emotion scale was computed to examine the degree each emotion was elicited for each of the six conditions (see Table 8 for emotion means).

Table 8

**Preliminary Study 3 - Mean Emotion ratings by Threat Condition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Angry</th>
<th>Fearful</th>
<th>Disgusted</th>
<th>Sad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cartel Anger ($n = 21$)</td>
<td>5.23 (1.66)</td>
<td>4.05 (1.44)</td>
<td>4.78 (1.60)</td>
<td>5.25 (1.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartel Fear ($n = 26$)</td>
<td>4.15 (1.93)</td>
<td>4.00 (1.71)</td>
<td>4.00 (2.01)</td>
<td>4.49 (1.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism Anger ($n = 32$)</td>
<td>4.46 (1.61)</td>
<td>3.61 (1.54)</td>
<td>3.68 (1.53)</td>
<td>4.55 (1.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism Fear ($n = 32$)</td>
<td>3.64 (1.70)</td>
<td>3.70 (1.74)</td>
<td>3.21 (1.53)</td>
<td>4.25 (1.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Anger ($n = 20$)</td>
<td>3.09 (1.63)</td>
<td>2.92 (1.88)</td>
<td>2.28 (1.26)</td>
<td>3.42 (1.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Fear ($n = 24$)</td>
<td>3.03 (1.43)</td>
<td>3.86 (1.67)</td>
<td>2.58 (1.34)</td>
<td>4.22 (1.57)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Standard deviations are presented in the parentheses*

If the emotion manipulation was successful, anger in the anger threat conditions should be significantly higher than anger in the fear threat conditions. Likewise, fear in the fear threat conditions should be significantly higher than fear in the anger threat conditions. A more stringent alpha level ($p < .01$) was used for significance of the test to control for Type I error rates. Results that were not significant at this level will not be elaborated upon. A one-way MANOVA was conducted to determine whether the emotion manipulation was successful at eliciting the target emotion. The results showed a main effect for condition, $F(10, 296) = 4.99, p < .001$. Univariate tests revealed that fear was not significantly different across threat conditions,
$F(5, 149) = 1.30, p = .269$. However, anger was significantly different across threat conditions, $F(5, 149) = 5.90, p < .001$. Post-hoc comparisons revealed that anger in the Cartel Anger condition was not significantly different than in the Cartel Fear condition ($p = .444$). Anger in the Terrorism Anger condition was not significantly different than in the Terrorism Fear condition ($p = .771$). Finally, anger in the Disaster Anger condition was not significantly different than in the Disaster Fear condition ($p = 1.00$). In summary, the emotion manipulation was not successful in eliciting the target emotion of anger and fear.

### 4.4.4 Risk Perception Judgments

A more stringent alpha level ($p < .01$) was used for significance of the test to control for Type I error rates. A one-way MANOVA was conducted to determine whether risk perception judgments differed by threat condition. The results showed a main effect for condition, $F(20, 485.18) = 1.85, p = .014$. Univariate tests revealed that perception of severity differed across threat conditions, $F(5, 149) = 4.52, p = .001$ (see Table 9 for all risk perception means). Post-hoc comparisons revealed that participants in the Cartel Anger and Cartel Fear conditions perceived the threat as more severe than participants in the Disaster Anger condition ($p = .001$ and $p = .006$, respectively). Collapsing across threat conditions, perceived severity was positively correlated with all four negative emotions ($r$’s ranged from .40-.42, $p$’s < .001).

Univariate tests also revealed that likelihood to relocate was found to differ across the threat conditions $F(5, 149) = 3.90, p = .002$. However, likelihood to secure the home and likelihood to change daily activities if the threat occurred did not differ across the threat conditions, $F(5, 149) = 1.74, p = .129$ and $F(5, 149) = 2.52, p = .032$, respectively. Again
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12Participants in the Terrorism Fear condition were more likely to relocate than participants in the Disaster Anger condition ($p = .012$).
collapsing across threat conditions, perceived severity was positively correlated with all three threat preparedness behaviors \((r\text{'s ranged from } .36-.41, p\text{'s }< .001\)).

Table 9

**Preliminary Study 3 - Mean Risk Perception ratings by Threat Condition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Relocate</th>
<th>Securing Home</th>
<th>Daily Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cartel Anger ((n = 21))</td>
<td>4.29 (0.90)</td>
<td>3.43 (1.25)</td>
<td>4.24 (1.18)</td>
<td>3.62 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartel Fear ((n = 26))</td>
<td>4.08 (0.97)</td>
<td>3.35 (1.23)</td>
<td>3.96 (1.04)</td>
<td>3.73 (1.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism Anger ((n = 32))</td>
<td>3.66 (0.94)</td>
<td>2.91 (1.06)</td>
<td>3.72 (0.96)</td>
<td>3.28 (1.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism Fear ((n = 32))</td>
<td>3.72 (0.85)</td>
<td>3.44 (1.13)</td>
<td>3.84 (1.14)</td>
<td>3.75 (1.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Anger ((n = 20))</td>
<td>3.00 (1.34)</td>
<td>2.25 (1.33)</td>
<td>3.40 (1.05)</td>
<td>2.75 (1.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Fear ((n = 24))</td>
<td>3.42 (1.06)</td>
<td>2.58 (1.35)</td>
<td>3.50 (1.18)</td>
<td>3.38 (1.06)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Standard deviations are presented in the parentheses*

### 4.6 Preliminary Study 3 Discussion

The results of this preliminary study showed that the emotions of anger and fear could not be successfully manipulated in the current study for the threats of cartel violence, terrorism, and natural disaster. Thus, anger and fear were both elicited to the same degree within each type of threat. Since the emotion manipulation was not successful, it would be unreasonable to test the prediction that anger compared to fear would decrease trust in authorities for protection against external threats. Therefore, the current study will not be able to clearly identify the distinct effects that each type of emotion has on trust in authorities for protection against an external threat in the current study.

This preliminary study was however beneficial in elucidating the relationship between perception of threat severity and the emotions of anger and fear. Consistent with previous research, people who perceived the external threat as more severe also experienced more anger and fear in response to a future threat (Arian & Gordon, 1993; Huddy et al., 2005). Also consistent with previous research, people who perceived the external threat as more severe were more likely to engage in preparedness behaviors if the threat were to occur (Heilbrun et al., 2010). These results were expected to be replicated in the current study examining how
perceptions of severity of cartel violence and terrorism threat influence emotions and compliance
to federal and local recommendations to prepare for the external threat if it were to occur.
Chapter 5: The Present Research

Although the literature reviewed provides evidence that attitudes toward authorities, prior experience of threat, and emotions are related to trust in authorities, the shared influence of these variables on trust in authorities for protection against external threats has not been explored. The mediating effect that emotions have between threat experience and trust judgments has also not been examined. Most importantly, there is a lack of empirical studies investigating the factors that influence trust in authorities as a result of cartel violence and the behavioral consequences of trust in authorities for protection against an external threat.

5.1 Trust and Behaviors

In addition to assessing the antecedents of trust in authorities for protection against cartel violence, examining the consequences of trust is also important. General political trust has shown to have several behavioral outcomes such as public support for policies, increased government spending and activity (Chanley et al., 2000; Hetherington, 2005; Rudolph & Evans, 2005). Political trust can also affect compliance behaviors such as complying to pay taxes (Scholz & Lubell, 1998). Within the organizational behavior research, people who trust an organization are more likely to accept unfavorable outcomes and more willing to comply with organization directives and regulations (Kramer 1999; Tyler, 1994). Since authorities are responsible for protecting the public from harm, they often make recommendations to the public on how to prepare and respond to an external threat such as securing their home or relocating. If people comply with these recommendations, they are less likely to experience the unnecessary negative consequences if the event were to occur. People are more likely to respond to authority recommendations to prepare for an external threat when they trust the source of the information (Slovic, 1999). Since trust in authorities can lead to compliance with authority demands, it is
important to examine how trust in authorities for protection influences people’s compliance behaviors to authority recommendations to prepare for a threat. It is expected that increased trust in authorities for protection will increase compliance to authority recommendations.

While political trust can have behavioral consequences, not all political behaviors are affected by political trust. Rahn and Rudolph (2005) found that local political trust was unrelated to civic engagement. Ulbig (2002) found that federal political trust performs poorly at predicting political participation and feelings of obligation to obey the law. Instead, specific attitudes were more strongly related to these behavioral outcomes. These findings are also consistent with Fishbein and Ajzen’s (1975) research showing that specific attitudes are better predictors of behavior than general attitudes. Thus, trust in authorities for protection (a specific evaluation) may be a better predictor of compliance behavior (a specific behavior) while attitudes toward authorities (a general evaluation) may be a better predictor of general political behaviors. Since attitudes can influence trust, trust is expected to mediate the relationship between attitudes and compliance behaviors so that people with more positive attitudes will have higher trust in authorities for protection, which will then lead the increased likelihood to comply to authority threat preparedness recommendations.

In summary, the goal of the current study is to investigate the antecedents and consequences of trust in federal and local authorities for protection against threat from cartel violence threat and terrorism. Student and community were recruited to complete the online study to provide a more representative sample of the El Paso population and were randomly assigned to either the cartel violence threat condition or the terrorism threat condition. Participants were first asked to complete a political behavior measure. Participants then read the cartel violence threat article or the terrorism article and completed questions assessing their
perceptions of the threat severity, likelihood to comply to authority recommendations, attitude and trust judgments, emotional reactions, and their experience with the threat that was posed in the article. Participants also completed several other questionnaires for exploratory analyses. It is expected that prior threat experience, anger and fear elicited by the threat, and attitudes toward authorities will all affect trust in authorities for protection against the external threat. Trust in authorities and perceptions of threat severity will predict people’s compliance with authority recommendations to prepare for the threat but attitudes toward authorities will predict general political behaviors. Knowing the relations and mediation of these constructs can help identify which factors are most important in decreased trust in authorities in an effort to determine how to increase trust. The findings from this study can also be used to guide research on investigating how other cities have been impacted by prevalent threats in their community. Based on the literature reviewed and the three preliminary study results, the following hypotheses were proposed and tested:

H1: Attitudes toward and trust in local authorities will be less positive than toward federal authorities.

H2: Trust in both federal and local authorities for protection will be lower for cartel violence threat than for terrorism threat.

H3: Cartel violence threat will elicit more anger than terrorism threat but terrorism threat will elicit more fear than cartel violence threat.

H4: People with more positive attitudes toward federal and local authorities will be more likely to engage in positive political behaviors.

H5a-c: The association between prior threat experience and trust in federal authorities will be partially mediated by the emotions of anger and fear. The following are the indirect and
direct hypothesized effects: H5a: People with more threat experience will be more angry and fearful of the future threat. H5b: Anger and fear elicited by reading about a future threat will decrease trust in both the federal authorities for protection against the external threat. H5c: People with more prior threat experience will be less likely to trust in federal authorities for protection against an external threat.

H6a-c: The association between prior threat experience and trust in local authorities will be partially mediated by the emotions of anger and fear. The following are the indirect and direct hypothesized effects: H6a: People with more threat experience will be more angry and fearful of the future threat. H6b: Anger and fear elicited by reading about a future threat will decrease trust in local authorities for protection against the external threat. H6c: People with more prior threat experience will be less likely to trust in authorities for protection against an external threat.

H7a-c: The association between attitudes toward federal authorities and federal compliance will be partially mediated by trust in federal authorities. The following are the indirect and direct hypothesized effects: H7a: People with more positive attitudes toward federal authorities will have increased trust in federal authorities for protection against the external threat. H7b: People with increased trust in federal authorities for protection will be more likely to comply with federal authority recommendations to prepare for the threat. H7c: People with more positive attitudes toward federal authorities will be more likely to comply with federal authority recommendations to prepare for the threat.

H8a-c: The association between attitudes toward local authorities and local compliance will be mediated by trust in local authorities. The following are the indirect and direct hypothesized effects: H8a: People with more positive attitudes toward local authorities will have increased trust in local authorities for protection against the external threat. H8b: People with
increased trust in local authorities for protection will be more likely to comply with local authority recommendations to prepare for the threat. H8c: People with more positive attitudes toward local authorities will be more likely to comply with authority recommendations to prepare for the threat.

5.2 Method

5.2.1 Power Analysis

A power analysis \((df = 28; \alpha = .05; \beta = .20)\) revealed that 331 participants were required to test the proposed measured variable path analysis.\(^{13}\) Degrees of freedom for the model was calculated based on the number of parameters estimated in each model.\(^{14}\) A test of close fit was performed for the power analyses in which the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) was set to .05 under the null hypothesis and was tested against an alternative hypothesis that the value of the RMSEA statistic equaled 0.08 (Preacher & Coffman, 2006).

5.2.2 Participants

The final sample consisted of 592 participants (203 community participants and 389 University of Texas El Paso undergraduates enrolled in Introduction to Psychology). There were 366 females and 220 males (6 participants did not indicate gender) and ages ranged from 18 to 77 \((M = 23.25; SD = 8.82; 7 \text{ participants did not indicate age})\). The ethnic/racial composition was 75.8% Hispanic/Latino, 14% White/Caucasian, and 10.3% other (5 participants did not indicate race). Of those who indicated that they were Hispanic/Latino, 83.3% were Mexican Americans 8.8% were Mexican Nationals, and 7.9% were other.

\(^{13}\)The initial power analysis that was conducted consisted of 30 degrees of freedom requiring 314 participants per condition. Because we wanted to determine the different effects that attitudes and trust might have on political behavior, the proposed model was revised by adding paths from trust in federal and local authorities to political behavior. As a result, the degrees of freedom changed to 28 requiring 331 participants.

\(^{14}\)Using Bollen’s (1989) t-rule, the number of degrees of freedom was calculated. The proposed model has 11 observed indicators (2 exogenous variables and 9 endogenous variables). A total of 38 parameters are being estimated resulting in 28 degrees of freedom.
Inclusion and exclusion criteria. There were a total of 703 survey responses (481 UTEP undergraduates enrolled in Introduction to Psychology and 222 community participants). The eligibility criteria to complete the survey were that the participants must be fluent in reading and writing English, must be 18 years or older, and that it was their first time completing the survey. If participants responded “no” to any of these initial survey questions, they were automatically exited from the survey and a message appeared stating why they could not complete the rest of the survey.

A total of 111 out of the 703 survey responses were excluded for the following reasons. A total of 20 survey responses were excluded because participants did not meet the eligibility criteria by self-reporting in the beginning of the study. Although participants were initially asked if it was their first time completing the survey, 46 survey responses were excluded because they were repeat responses of when the participants took the survey a second time. These repeat responses were identified by using a participant code that was created by asking participants’ birth date, last four digits of their telephone number, and their zip code. A total of 12 survey responses were excluded because they were between 67%-82% incomplete (participant stopped taking the survey at a certain point).

After 78 surveys were excluded for the reasons described above, a total of 625 survey responses remained (412 UTEP undergraduates enrolled in psychology courses and 213 community). Survey responses were then excluded based on the Threat Article Check questions criteria (see below under Article Check Questions section). Article check questions contained questions about the content of the article to ensure that participants read the article. The

---

There was a total of 79 repeat survey responses and 46 repeat responses were excluded which were participants’ responses in their second attempt. However, 33 survey responses were included in the data analysis based on the criteria that these responses were from participants’ first attempt and taking the survey a second time did not influence the first attempt survey responses.
exclusion criteria of survey responses based on the Threat Article Check questions was that participants who received less than 3 correct answers out of 5 were excluded. A total of 33 participants were excluded based on this exclusion criterion (2 got 0 questions correct, 6 got 1 question correct, 25 got 2 questions correct, 56 got 3 questions correct, 169 got 4 questions correct, and 367 participants got all 5 article questions correct). Thus, 592 survey responses remained after the exclusion of survey responses (389 UTEP undergraduates enrolled in Introduction to Psychology and 203 community participants; see Figure 2 for flowchart of excluded responses).16

---

16Initially, the Language History Questionnaire (see Appendix K) was used to determine exclusion of responses based on English reading proficiency (LEAP-Q; Marian, Blumenfeld, & Kaushanskaya, 2007). Participants who rated their English reading proficiency as less than 5 on the scale ranging from 1-10 (lower numbers indicating less proficient) would be considered less than intermediately proficient and would be excluded. However, the four participants that rated their English proficiency less than 5 met the Article Check question inclusion criteria of having a total score of 3 out of 5. This suggests that these participants were still able to read and understand the article and recall the information. Because it is more important to ensure that the participants are reading and understanding the article to complete the rest of the survey, the four participants were not excluded based on their English reading proficiency score.
Figure 2. Flow chart of excluded and included survey responses based on eligibility criteria's, repeat responses, incomplete surveys, and article check score criteria.
Recruitment. Student participants were recruited from among students enrolled in Introduction to Psychology courses at UTEP. Their participation helped fulfill a requirement of their psychology course or earned them extra credit. A description of the study and eligibility requirements was listed on utep.sona-systems.com, where students had the opportunity to choose the experiment and complete it online using SurveyMonkey. Community participation incentive was available from the UTEP Doctoral Dissertation Grant. Funds were available to recruit 210 community participants. In return for their participation, community participants received a $10 Walmart gift card. A study flyer was used for community recruitment, which consisted of general information about the study, compensation for participating, eligibility requirements to participate in the study, and the researcher’s contact information (see Appendix H). Community participants were recruited at several recruitment sites and employing different recruitment methods (e.g., posting flyers, distributing flyers, emailing the flyer; see Appendix F for detailed description of community recruitment procedures and documents). The recruitment sites and recruitment methods were chosen out of convenience and also due to the notion that a large number of community members could be recruited at the particular site or by the type of recruitment method (e.g., email). Permission was first granted from off-campus recruitment sites from the appropriate superior (e.g., supervisor, pastor, manager) and then the study flyer was either posted or distributed at the location. Community members who contacted the researcher to participate in the study were sent an email containing general information about the study and the online study link.
5.2.3 Measures

The survey measures were first pilot tested with a small sample ($n = 17$) of psychology research assistants and graduate students to assess how people respond to each of the threat articles, understanding of questions wording, and the length of time to complete the survey. Question wordings were revised based on the feedback provided.

There were several measures that asked about judgments of different authority types and participants were first provided with the following examples of those authority types. The following examples were provided of federal authorities in the United States: the President, the Vice President, Senators, Congressmen and Congresswomen, federal Judges, federal Police, the Military, Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, Border Patrol, Federal Bureau of Investigation, et cetera. The following examples were provided of local authorities in the United States in which state and city authorities were combined to represent local authorities: Governor, Lieutenant Governor, state Senators, state House of Representatives, Mayor, members of the City Council, county Judges, local Police, state Police, Highway Patrol, Deputy Sheriffs, Firefighters, State Bureau of Investigation, et cetera. Some questionnaires distinguished between federal and local government and federal and local law enforcement authorities. Thus, the examples for each of the four authorities were separated. The following examples were provided of people who are a part of the federal government in the United States: the President, the Vice President, Senators, Congressmen and Congresswomen, federal Judges, et cetera. The following examples were provided of people who are a part of the local government in the Unites States: Governor, Lieutenant Governor, state Senators, state House of Representatives, Mayor, members of the City Council, county Judges, et cetera. The following examples were provided of people

---

17The order of the measures in the appendix is in the order they were presented in the study. Thus, a reference to a measure within the paper may not be in chronological order.
who are a part of the federal law enforcement in the United States: federal Police, the Military, Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, Border Patrol, Federal Bureau of Investigation, et cetera. The following examples were provided of people who are a part of the local law enforcement in the United States: local Police, state Police, Highway Patrol, Deputy Sheriffs, Firefighters, State Bureau of Investigation, et cetera.

**Measures used in main analyses.** The following measures were used in the main analyses of the study.

**Your government question** (see Appendix L). Participants’ were asked whether they consider the United States government or the Mexican government to be their government. If they considered both to be their government, they were asked to select the country that they identified with more.

**Threat articles** (see Appendix P and R). The cartel violence and terrorism threat newspaper articles that were used in Preliminary Study 3 were modified for the current study to assess the emotions elicited by cartel violence threat and terrorism threat. Both articles were modified by removing all text consisting of people either responding in anger or fear to the threatening event posed in the original articles. The terrorism article was modified by including information about recent terrorist plots. Participants were only asked to read the article and were not asked to complete the writing task after reading the article, which was done in Preliminary Study 3. The content of the articles were based on actual newspaper articles. Also, three pictures that were shown with each article were taken from actual newspaper articles. The articles were also matched on the number of words (cartel violence article = 307 words and terrorism article = 308 words). Both articles contained content that suggested that there was a possibility of the event happening again to elicit the perception of a future threat. Participants were asked to read
the article very carefully and even more than once if they needed to because they would be asked several questions about the article in the rest of the survey.

**Severity of threat questions** (see Appendix T). The risk perception item originally created by Heilbrun et al. (2010) was modified to measure participants’ perceptions of the severity of an external threat. Participants were asked to rate on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all severe) to 7 (very severe) how severe they think the threat of cartel violence, terrorism, and natural disaster threats are in El Paso.

**Likelihood to comply measure** (see Appendix U). The three risk behavior items originally created by Heilbrun et al. (2010) were modified to measure compliance to authority recommendations if the threat in the article were to occur. Participants were asked to rate on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (no chance) to 7 (definitely) their likelihood of following United State’s federal and El Paso’s local authority recommendations to relocate, secure their home, and change their daily activity if the event in the article they read about were to occur. Examples of federal and local authorities in the United States were first provided so participants knew the distinction between each type of authority.

The three federal authority items were summed to create an index of federal compliance with scores ranging from 3 to 21. Higher scores indicate more likely to follow federal authority recommendations. These items demonstrated good internal consistency reliability ($\alpha$’s = .849, .856, .844 for combined conditions, cartel violence condition, and terrorism condition, respectively). Likewise, the three local authority items were summed to create an index of local compliance with scores ranging from 3 to 21. Higher scores indicate more likely to follow local authority recommendations. These items demonstrated good internal consistency reliability ($\alpha$’s
= .887, .865, and .908 for combined conditions, cartel violence condition, and terrorism condition, respectively).

**Political behavior measure** (see Appendix O). Participants’ political behavioral intentions were assessed by asking them on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (no chance) to 7 (definitely) their likelihood to engage in nine types of common political behaviors (e.g., vote, volunteer for a campaign, contribute money to a candidate, et cetera). Items were identified and modified to be relevant to future behaviors (see Pritzker, 2008 for a review of political behavior measures). The nine items were summed with scores ranging from 9 to 63. Higher scores indicate more likely to engage in future political behaviors. These items demonstrated good internal consistency reliability ($\alpha$’s = .898, .902, and .895 for combined conditions, cartel violence condition, and terrorism condition, respectively).

**Attitudes towards authorities scale** (see Appendix V). The Attitudes towards Authorities Scale (ATAS) that was developed in Preliminary Study 1 was used in the current study to assess general attitudes toward authorities. The scale was slightly modified by inserting either United State or El Paso before the authority target. The scale consists of 12 items measuring attitudes toward four types of authority figures: the United States’ federal government, El Paso’s local government, United States’ federal law enforcement, and El Paso’s local law enforcement. Examples of each of the four types of authority figures in the United States were first provided so participants knew the distinction between each type.

Participants were asked to rate on a 7-point bipolar continuum that ranges from -3 to 3, with 0 (neither) serving as a center point, the extent to which they have negative or positive attitudes toward, dislike or like, and evaluate as bad or good the four authority targets. The three federal government items and the three federal law enforcement items were summed to create an
index of attitudes toward federal authorities with scores ranging from -18 to 18. Higher scores indicate more positive attitudes toward federal authorities. These items demonstrated good internal consistency reliability ($\alpha$’s = .949, .953, and .945 for combined conditions, cartel violence condition, and terrorism condition, respectively). Likewise, the three local government items and the three local law enforcement items were summed to create an index of attitudes toward local authorities with scores ranging from -18 to 18. Higher scores indicate more positive attitudes toward local authorities. These items demonstrated good internal consistency reliability ($\alpha$’s = .953, .957, and .948 for combined conditions, cartel violence condition, and terrorism condition, respectively).

**Trust in authorities scale** (see Appendix W). The Trust in Authorities Scale (TIAS) that was developed in Preliminary Study 1 was used in the current study to assess trust in authorities for protection against the external threat of cartel violence or terrorism (depending on the threat condition). The scale was slightly modified by inserting either United State or El Paso before the authority target and by also specifying protection against the type of threat as either cartel violence or terrorism threat. Examples of each of the four types of authority figures in the United States were first provided so participants knew the distinction between each type.

The scale consists of 16 items and participants were asked to rate on a 7-point bipolar continuum that ranges from -3 to 3, with 0 (neutral) serving as a center point, the extent to which the United States’ federal government, El Paso’s local government, United States’ federal law enforcement, and El Paso’s local law enforcement are distrustful or trustful, incompetent or competent, dishonest or honest, and unsupportive or supportive. The four federal government items and the four federal law enforcement items were summed to create an index of trust in federal authorities with scores ranging from -24 to 24. Higher scores indicate more trust in
federal authorities for protection against cartel violence or terrorism threat (depending on the threat condition). These items demonstrated good internal consistency reliability (α’s = .943, .944, and .942 for combined conditions, cartel violence condition, and terrorism condition, respectively). Likewise, The four local government items and the four local law enforcement items were summed to create an index of trust in federal authorities with scores ranging from -24 to 24. Higher scores indicate more trust in local authorities for protection against cartel violence or terrorism threat (depending on the threat condition). These items demonstrated good internal consistency reliability (α’s = .960, .964, and .956 for combined conditions, cartel violence condition, and terrorism condition, respectively).

**Emotion self-report** (see Appendix X). The Emotion Self-Report measured the emotions elicited by the threat induction. This measure was used in Preliminary Study 3. Participants were asked to rate on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely) the extent to which they felt several types of emotions while reading the news article. Several emotion adjectives (e.g., furious, mad, irritated; Dunn & Schweitzer, 2005) were used describe each target emotion (e.g., anger). The five angry adjective items (angry, mad, furious, irritated, frustrated) were summed to create an index of anger with scores ranging from 5 to 35. Higher scores indicate more anger in response to the threat article. These items demonstrated good internal consistency reliability (α’s = .938, .939, and .934 for combined conditions, cartel violence condition, and terrorism condition, respectively). The three fearful adjective items (fearful, nervous, anxious) were summed to create an index of fear with scores ranging from 3 to 21. Higher scores indicate more fear in response to the threat article. These items demonstrated good internal consistency reliability (α’s = .858, .873, and .836 for combined conditions, cartel violence condition, and terrorism condition, respectively). Participants were also asked to rate on a 7-point scale ranging
from 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely) how difficult, unpleasant and intense it was for them to read the article. These items were used in exploratory analyses.

**Threat experience measure** (see Appendix Z). The Threat Experience Measure assessed participants’ experience of the type of threat that was presented to them in the article (cartel violence or terrorism) to determine whether individual differences in threat experience influence emotions elicited by the threatening article. Participants were asked to rate on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much) the extent to which the type of threat has affected them personally, their family, and their friends. They were also asked rate on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all negative) to 7 (very negative) how negative their experience has been with the specific type of threat. The four threat experience items were summed to create an index of threat experience with scores ranging from 4 to 28. Higher scores indicate more experience with the particular type of threat presented in the article. These items demonstrated good internal consistency reliability (α’s = .891, .897, and .885 combined conditions, cartel violence condition, and terrorism condition, respectively).

**Demographics questionnaire** (see Appendix AA). Participants completed the Demographic Questionnaire that assessed their gender, age, ethnicity, city of birth, current and previous city of residence, how many years they have lived in their current and previous city, how many days a week they are in Ciudad Juárez, and percentage of family and friends that live in Ciudad Juárez. Participants were also asked common questions that are asked in General Social Survey and National Election Studies such as their marital status, number of children, level of education, employment status, type of employment, household income, computer usage, political orientation, political views, and religious affiliation.
Measures used in exploratory analyses. The following measures were used in the exploratory analyses in the study.

Baseline attitude and trust questions (see Appendix M). Participants’ baseline attitudes toward and trust in federal and local authorities in the United States were assessed before the threat manipulation. Examples of federal and local authorities in the United States were first provided so participants knew the distinction between each type of authority.

Participants were asked to rate on a 7-point bipolar continuum that ranged from -3 to 3, with 0 (neither) serving as a center point, the extent to which they have negative or positive attitudes toward the United States’ federal and El Paso’s local authorities. Participants were also asked to rate on a 7-point bipolar continuum that ranges from -3 to 3, with 0 (neutral) serving as a center point, the extent to which they distrusted or trusted the United States’ federal and El Paso’s local authorities to protect their community against an external threat. An external threat was defined as a natural or man-made occurrence that can cause potential harm to people’s lives such as natural disasters, terrorism, and criminal violence. Assessing baseline attitudes and trust in federal and local authorities allowed us to determine how the threat article influenced people’s attitudes and trust in authorities as a result of reading about a future threat of cartel violence or terrorism.

Political sophistication questionnaire (see Appendix N). Participants’ political knowledge was measured by asking them to identify the offices held by several political actors. The political sophistication questionnaire has been used by Gomez and Wilson (2008). Items were scored as 1 for incorrect, 0.5 for partly correct (e.g., senator instead of Texas Senator), and 0 for incorrect to create an index ranging from 0 to 8. Higher numbers represent more political
knowledge. Responses to this questionnaire were used in exploratory analysis to investigate how political sophistication affects attitudes, trust, and behaviors.

*Attribution of responsibility questionnaire* (see Appendix Y). The first three questions of the Attribution of Responsibility Questionnaire were modified questions that were originally used by Schneider (2008) who examined which government actors people think should take the lead in dealing with problems before, during, and after a natural disaster. The questions were modified by asking which authority actor (United State’s federal government, El Paso’s local government, United State’s federal law enforcement, or El Paso’s local law enforcement) should take the lead in dealing with the problems associated with the external threat that the participant read about in the news article.

The next four questions were modified questions originally used by Gomez and Wilson (2008). The researchers examined which government actors were responsible for the problems surrounding the Katrina relief effort. The questions were modified and participants were asked if the event in the article they read occurred, how much each authority actor (United State’s federal government, El Paso’s local government, United State’s federal law enforcement, and El Paso’s local law enforcement) was responsible for failing to prevent the event. Examples of each of the four types of authority figures in the United States were first provided to remind participants the distinction between each type. Participants were asked to rate the level of responsibility on a 7-point continuous scale ranging from 1 (not at all responsible) to 7 (very responsible). Responses to these questions were used in exploratory analysis to investigate how attribution of responsibility affects attitudes, trust, and compliance behaviors.

**Measures used for exclusion of responses.** The following measures were used to exclude survey responses in the study.
Threat article check questions (see Appendix Q and S). After reading the threat article, participants were asked to answer five questions about the article to make sure that they had read the article thoroughly. Items were scored as correct or incorrect to create an index ranging from 0 to 5. The exclusion criterion of 2 or less correct questions out of 5 was used to represent a participant’s inability to recall information from the article.

5.2.4 Procedure

Participants completed the study online using the survey software SurveyMonkey and were provided with the online link for the study. Two survey links were created to ensure confidentiality of participant names and their survey responses. Participants were first required to go to the consent form link and read the consent form and then sign their names. They were then provided with another link to the survey so their names could not be associated with their survey responses. A third online link, the Gift Card Information link, was created for community participants in which they were asked to provide their mailing information so their gift card could be sent to them and were also asked how they were recruited for the study. This also ensured confidentiality in which their survey responses could not be associated with their mailing address and recruitment information. The gift card and a gift card receipt were mailed to the community participants within 7-14 business days. The gift card receipt included a receipt number, participant’s name, researcher’s name and signature, date, and instructions to go to the Gift Card Confirmation link to confirm the receipt of the gift card. The researcher also kept a copy of the receipt.

After reading and signing the consent form, participants started the survey and were randomly assigned to either the Cartel Threat condition or the Terrorism Threat condition. They were first asked about their eligibility criteria and if they were met they were asked personal
identification questions so a participant code could be created for them. Participants then completed the Language History Questionnaire, Your Government Question, Baseline Attitude and Trust Questions (the four items were randomly presented), Political Sophistication Measure, and the Political Behavior Measure. These questionnaires were presented first because they were not related to the threat article. Next, participants read the cartel threat news article or the terrorism threat news article based on being randomly assigned to one of the two threat conditions. After reading the article, they completed the article questions to make sure that they had read the article. Then participants completed the Severity of Threat Questions (the three items were randomly presented) and the Likelihood to Comply Measure. They then completed the Attitudes toward Authorities Scale and the Trust in Authorities Scale, which were counterbalanced. Participants then completed the Emotion Self-Report measure (the emotion items were randomly presented), Attribution of Responsibility Questionnaire, and the Threat Experience Measure (the four items were randomly presented). Finally, participants completed the Demographic Questionnaire. The study approximately took 30-45 min to complete.

At the completion of the study, participants were provided details about the goal of the study. Participants were also informed that the possibility of the external threat occurring in their community as stated in the article was completely fictional. Participants were also provided with the contact information for the UTEP Counseling Center and the Family Service of El Paso incase the study had distressed them in any way and they wanted to talk to a professional. Community participants who completed the study online then completed the Gift Card Information link. The one community participant who completed the study in person was given their gift card in person.
5.3 Results

5.3.1 Data Preparation

Missing data were imputed using the stochastic regression single imputation method in SPSS 20 (0.56% of the data were missing). In the stochastic regression single imputation method, regression equations predict the incomplete variables from the complete variables and predicted scores from the regression equations replace the missing values (Enders, 2010). Furthermore, random residuals are added to each predicted value from a normal distribution with a mean of zero and a variance equal to the residual variance from the preceding regression analysis. This type of imputation produces parameter estimates that are unbiased and yield similar estimates to maximum likelihood and multiple imputation. However, a limitation is that standard errors are too small and Type I error rates are higher. Missing data was not imputed for demographic variables and categorical variables.

5.3.2 Participant Characteristics

Participants were asked to indicate whether they considered the United States’ government or Mexican government as their government. A total of 565 out of 592 participants indicated the United States’ government, 24 indicated the Mexican government, and 3 did not answer the question. Participants were also asked questions about their current city of residence and whether they ever lived in Juárez before. At the time of the study, 96.6% of the participants lived in El Paso, 1% lived in Juárez, 1.5% of participants lived in both cities, and .9% lived in another city (e.g., Las Cruces, NM). Of those who indicated that they did not currently live in Juárez, 19.9% indicated that they had previously lived in Juárez ranging from 1 to 21 years ($M = 8.68; SD = 6.01$). Participants were also asked how many days per week on average they spend time in Juárez. A total of 86.1% indicated 0 days, 5.5% indicated 1 day, 3.4% indicated 2 days,
1.5% indicated 3 days, .9% indicated 4 days, 1.2% indicated .3% 6 days, and 1% indicated 7 days. Participants were also asked to estimate the percentage of their family and friends that live in Juárez. On average 18.3% of participants’ family lived in Juárez ($SD = 25.51$) and 11.5% of participants’ friends lived in Juárez ($SD = 20.00$).

Participants’ level of education ranged from no schooling completed to acquiring a Ph.D. degree with 85.2% of participants indicating some college credit or higher degree. A total of 62.2% of participants indicated that they were a student. A total 4.9% of participants indicated they were a local government employee, 3.7% indicated they were a state government employee, and 3.5% indicated they were a federal employee. Participants were also asked about their political party affiliation. A total of 44.5% indicated they were either a strong Democrat, not so strong Democrat or independent leaning Democrat. A total of 15% indicated they were either a strong Republican, not so strong Republican or independent leaning Republican. A total of 13.6% indicated they were an Independent, 2.9% indicated other, and 24% indicated that they did not know. When asked about their political views, 4.3% were very conservative, 16% were conservative, 43% were moderate, 27.8% were liberal, and 8.9% were very liberal. Finally, the majority of participants (48.4%) indicated that they were Roman Catholic when asked about their religious affiliation.

5.3.3 Variable Descriptives

Descriptives of the variables used in primary and exploratory analyses are provided in Table 10 and are separated by each threat condition, cartel violence and terrorism. Average scores were first computed for threat experience, anger, fear, attitudes toward federal authorities, attitudes toward local authorities, trust in federal authorities, trust in local authorities, federal compliance, local compliance, and political behaviors as there were multiple items for these
measures.

Table 10

*Means, Standard Deviations, and Scale Range for Variables used in the Primary and Exploratory Analyses Separated by Threat Condition*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cartel Violence (N = 300)</th>
<th>Terrorism (N = 292)</th>
<th>Scale Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Threat Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Threat Severity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartel Violence Threat Severity</td>
<td>4.54 1.86</td>
<td>4.51 1.73</td>
<td>1 to 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism Threat Severity</td>
<td>3.89 1.74</td>
<td>4.27 1.68</td>
<td>1 to 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Disaster Threat Severity</td>
<td>2.81 1.47</td>
<td>2.8 1.61</td>
<td>1 to 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>3.83 1.94</td>
<td>3.23 1.76</td>
<td>1 to 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>3.29 1.75</td>
<td>3.08 1.55</td>
<td>1 to 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>2.03 1.64</td>
<td>1.97 1.46</td>
<td>1 to 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpleasant</td>
<td>3.61 2.05</td>
<td>2.68 1.89</td>
<td>1 to 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intense</td>
<td>3.53 2</td>
<td>2.92 1.87</td>
<td>1 to 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Federal Authority Attitude</td>
<td>1.33 1.45</td>
<td>1.21 1.49</td>
<td>-3 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Local Authority Attitude</td>
<td>1.04 1.62</td>
<td>0.8 1.66</td>
<td>-3 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Towards Federal Authorities</td>
<td>1.09 1.32</td>
<td>1.02 1.30</td>
<td>-3 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Towards Local Authorities</td>
<td>0.73 1.49</td>
<td>0.49 1.43</td>
<td>-3 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Federal Authority Trust</td>
<td>1.48 1.45</td>
<td>1.53 1.36</td>
<td>-3 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Local Authority Trust</td>
<td>1.09 1.54</td>
<td>0.9 1.6</td>
<td>-3 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Federal Authorities</td>
<td>0.94 1.38</td>
<td>1.15 1.27</td>
<td>-3 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Local Authorities</td>
<td>0.84 1.48</td>
<td>0.69 1.36</td>
<td>-3 to 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Compliance</td>
<td>5.34 1.25</td>
<td>5.44 1.14</td>
<td>1 to 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Compliance</td>
<td>5.18 1.24</td>
<td>5.15 1.32</td>
<td>1 to 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Behaviors</td>
<td>3.61 1.20</td>
<td>3.61 1.19</td>
<td>1 to 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Sophistication</td>
<td>3.12 2.25</td>
<td>3.35 2.17</td>
<td>0 to 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution of Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>5.27 1.65</td>
<td>5.5 1.49</td>
<td>1 to 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Law Enforcement</td>
<td>5.39 1.63</td>
<td>5.46 1.57</td>
<td>1 to 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>5.49 1.61</td>
<td>4.2 1.79</td>
<td>1 to 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Law Enforcement</td>
<td>5.54 1.64</td>
<td>4.21 1.84</td>
<td>1 to 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.4 Mean Difference Analyses

Since several tests were conducted, a more stringent alpha level ($p < .01$) was used for significance of the test to control for Type I error rates. Results that were not significant at this level will not be elaborated upon. Mean difference analyses will be initially discussed to address Hypotheses 1 to 3. However, before going into the main analyses, an analysis to explore whether the threat being posed in the article had an effect on attitudes toward and trust in authorities will be discussed. Thus, mean difference analyses were conducted to make comparisons between authority judgments before reading the threat article and authority judgments that were made after reading the threat article.

Comparing pre- and post-threat article judgments. An exploratory analysis was conducted to determine the differences between baseline ratings of attitudes and trust (pre-threat article) and attitude and trust ratings after reading the threat article (post-threat article). The baseline trust questions were asked in regards to an external threat but the trust questions after reading the threat article were asked in regards to either cartel violence threat or terrorism threat. Also, the baseline attitude questions consisted of one item (negative/positive) each for federal and local authorities. Likewise, the baseline trust question consisted of one item (distrust/trust) each for federal and local authorities. The attitude ratings after reading the threat article consisted of 3 items for each of the 4 authority types and the trust ratings consisted of 4 items for each of the 4 authority types. To compare the first and second ratings, for the second ratings the negative/positive items were only used for the attitude ratings and the distrust/trust items were used for the trust ratings. Furthermore, federal government and federal law enforcement items were averaged to create a federal authority rating and local government and local law enforcement items were averaged to create a local authority rating.
A repeated measures mixed design ANOVA was conducted for attitudes to determine if federal and local attitude judgments for both cartel violence and terrorism conditions changed after reading the threat article. A 2 (Attitude Judgment Time: pre-threat article vs. post-threat article) by 2 (Authority Level: federal vs. local) by 2 (Threat Condition: cartel violence vs. terrorism) mixed design ANOVA was conducted. The main effect for attitude judgment time was significant, \( F(1, 590) = 21.58, p < .001 \). Attitude judgments before reading the threat article \( (M = 1.09, SE = .056) \) were significantly higher than attitude judgments after reading the threat article \( (M = 0.90, SE = .053) \). The main effect for condition and the interaction of time and condition were not significant, \( F^{'s} < 1.94 \). Thus, the significant main effect for time and the absence of the interaction of time and condition suggest that both federal and local attitudes toward authorities declined after reading both the cartel violence and terrorism threat articles.

Another repeated measures mixed design ANOVA was conducted for trust to determine if federal and local trust judgments for both cartel violence and terrorism conditions changed after reading the threat article. A 2 (Trust Judgment Time: pre-threat article vs. post-threat article) by 2 (Authority Level: federal vs. local) by 2 (Threat Condition: cartel violence vs. terrorism) mixed design ANOVA was conducted. The main effect for trust judgment time was significant, \( F(1, 590) = 12.31, p < .001 \). Trust judgments before reading the threat article \( (M = 1.25, SE = .054) \) were significantly higher than trust judgments after reading the threat article \( (M = 1.10, SE = .054) \). The main effect for condition and the interactions of time and condition and time and authority level were not significant, \( F^{'s} < 1.94 \). Thus, the significant main effect for time and the absence of the interaction of time and condition suggest that that both federal and local trust in authorities declined after reading both the cartel violence and terrorism threat articles.
Although these exploratory analyses were limited due to assessing baseline attitudes and trust judgments using only one item, the findings suggest that a future threat of cartel violence and terrorism decrease attitudes toward authorities and trust in authorities for protection against the external threat. The findings extend correlational trust research concerning criminal violence in which high murder rates, concern about crime, and corruption are related to low trust in government (Anderson & Tverdova, 2003; Catterberg & Moreno, 2005; Chanley, 2002; Chanley, Rudolph, & Rahn, 2000; Hetherington & Rudolph, 2008; Roth, 2009). This study found that posing a threat of cartel violence (a form of criminal violence) decreases trust in authorities for protection against cartel violence. Thus, lower levels of trust in authorities is directly related to cartel related violence and this finding may explain in part the 2009 public opinion poll conducted in Juárez that 52% distrusted all Mexican authorities (Borunda, 2010). The findings also extend trust research concerning terrorism and are consistent with previous survey research showing that people lacked trust in government to respond to a future terrorist attack (Wray et al., 2006).

**Comparing federal and local attitudes and trust.** The next goal is to determine whether post-threat judgments differ by authority level. Thus, the next set of analyses will focus on post-threat judgments examining the differences in federal and local authority attitudes and trust judgments as well as attribution of responsibility judgments to address Hypotheses 1 and 2. The first mean difference hypothesis was that attitudes toward and trust in local authorities would be less positive than toward federal authorities (Hypothesis 1). In addition to the main effect of authority level for trust, the second mean difference hypothesis was a main effect for threat condition in which trust in both federal and local authorities for protection will be lower for cartel violence threat than for terrorism threat (Hypothesis 2).
A 2 (Authority Level: federal vs. local) by 2 (Threat Condition: cartel violence vs. terrorism) mixed design MANOVA was conducted to test Hypothesis 1 and 2. The results showed a significant interaction between authority level and threat condition, $F(2, 589) = 7.53, p = .001$. The univariate test for attitudes revealed a significant main effect for authority level, $F(1, 590) = 87.98, p < .001$. Attitudes toward local authorities ($M = 0.61, SE = .060$) were significantly less positive than attitudes toward federal authorities ($M = 1.06, SE = .054$); $d = .32$, which supports Hypothesis 1. The interaction of authority level and threat condition was not significant $F(1, 590) = 2.21, p = .073$ (see Figure 3). Thus, for both cartel violence and terrorism conditions, attitudes toward local authorities were less positive than attitudes toward federal authorities.

![Attitude Ratings](image)

*Figure 3. Attitude ratings for federal and local authorities for each threat condition.*

The univariate test for trust revealed a significant main effect for authority level, $F(1, 590) = 37.65, p < .001$. Trust in local authorities ($M = 0.76, SE = .058$) was significantly lower than trust in federal authorities ($M = 1.05, SE = .054$); $d = .20$, which also supports Hypothesis 1. The main effect of threat condition was not significant $F(1, 590) = 0.10, p = .754$. However, the interaction of authority level and threat condition was significant, $F(1, 590) = 14.91, p < .001$. An independent-samples t-test revealed that trust in federal authorities for the cartel violence condition ($M = 0.94, SE = .079$) was significantly lower than for the terrorism condition ($M =$...
1.15, \( SE = .074 \), \( t(590) = -1.93, p = .055 ; d = .36 \), which supports Hypothesis 2. However, trust in local authorities for the cartel violence condition (\( M = 0.84, SE = .085 \)) was not significantly different than for terrorism condition (\( M = 0.69, SE = .079 \), \( t(590) = 1.24, p = .216 \), which does not support Hypothesis 2 (see Figure 4). Overall, Hypothesis 2 was partially supported in which trust in federal authorities for protection against cartel violence was lower than trust in federal authorities for protection against terrorism. But trust in local authorities for protection against cartel violence and terrorism threat did not differ.

*Figure 4.* Trust ratings for federal and local authorities for each threat condition.

In summary, attitudes toward and trust in local authorities were significantly lower than attitudes toward and trust in federal authorities across threat conditions. This replicates the findings of Preliminary Study 1 in which a specific type of external threat was not provided. These findings support the notion that local political trust moves independently from federal political trust (Jennings, 1998) and extends this effect to trust in federal and local authorities for protection against an external threat. However, the findings are in contrast with previous findings that local trust tends to be higher than federal trust (Jennings, 1998; Rahn & Rudolph, 2005; Torney-Purta, Richardson, & Barber, 2004). Local political trust differs by cities and is influenced by different individual and contextual factors (Rahn & Rudolph, 2005). Some factors
that are relevant to the current study are local political efficacy and attitudes concerning perceived local conditions. When people are exposed to a possibility of a threatening event occurring in their community, they may be less likely to feel a sense of control in their community and more likely to feel negatively about their local conditions. Therefore, a threatening event in the local community results in less favorable judgments toward local authorities than federal authorities.

The trust in authorities findings comparing cartel violence and terrorism threat revealed that federal authorities are trusted more for protection against a terrorist attack than cartel violence but trust in local authorities for protection were not different for the two types of threat. These findings can be explained by the pervasiveness of the two types of threat. Cartel related violence has been unceasing in Juárez for several years, which both Mexican and United States authorities have been dealing with (Seelke, 2009). However, a major terrorist attack in the United States has not occurred since the 9/11 attacks and the possibility of a terrorist attack occurring in the local community is rare. Thus, federal trust for protection against the cartel violence threat is lower than a threat of terrorism because cartel violence is more prevalent than a terrorist attack.

Taken together, the findings regarding federal and local attitudes and trust suggest that there are distinctions between the authority level, the judgment being made, and the threat being posed. A factor that can further elucidate these findings is people’s perception of which authority type is most responsible in dealing with the problems before the threatening event.

**Comparing attribution of responsibility for each authority type.** An exploratory analyses of the frequencies of each authority type for each threat condition was examined to determine which authority type was perceived to be most responsible when dealing with the
problems before the threatening event, during the threatening event, and the time period immediately following the threatening event (see Table 11 for frequencies). For the cartel violence condition, a chi-squared test revealed that attribution of responsibility for each authority type before the threatening event did not significantly differ, $\chi^2(3) = 3.04, p = .385$. Thus, all authority types were perceived to be equally responsible in dealing with the problems before the threat of cartel violence (see Figure 5). However, for the terrorism condition, a chi-squared test revealed that attribution of responsibility for each authority type before the threatening event significantly differed, $\chi^2(3) = 196.86, p < .001$. Specifically, the federal government was perceived to be most responsible in dealing with the problems before the threat of terrorism (see Figure 5). Overall, these findings suggest that attribution of responsibility before the threatening event depends on the type of threat. In connecting these findings to the trust results shows that people perceived all authorities to be equally responsible in dealing with the problems before the threat of cartel violence but had higher trust in federal authorities for protection than local authorities. However, people perceived the federal authorities to be more responsible in dealing with the problems before the threat of a terrorist attack and accordingly, trusted the federal authorities for protection against a terrorist attack more than the local authorities because they were held more responsible.

The results examining attribution of responsibility for each authority type during and immediately following the threatening event revealed similar results for both types of threat. For the cartel violence condition, a chi-squared test revealed that authority type responsibility during and immediately following the threatening event were significantly different, $\chi^2(3) = 100.59, p < .001$ and $\chi^2(3) = 117.95, p < .001$, respectively. Also, for the terrorism condition a chi-squared test revealed that authority type responsibility during and immediately following the threatening
event were significantly different, $\chi^2(3) = 145.83$, $p < .001$, and $\chi^2(3) = 246.52$, $p < .001$, respectively. For both types of threat, federal authorities were held more responsible during and immediately following the event than local authorities (see Figure 6 and 7). Overall, these findings suggest that for cartel violence even though all authorities are perceived to be responsible in dealing with the problems before the threat of cartel violence, federal authorities are more responsible for dealing with the problems during and immediately following cartel violence. Also, federal authorities were found to be trusted more for protection against the threat of cartel violence than local authorities. For terrorism, federal authorities are perceived to be more responsible for dealing with the problems before, during, and immediately following a terrorist attack and are also trusted more than local authorities for protection.

Table 11

*Frequencies and Percentages of Attribution of Responsibility Before, During, and Following the Threatening Event*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cartel Violence</th>
<th></th>
<th>Terrorism</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Before</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Law Enforcement</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Law Enforcement</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>During</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>44.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Law Enforcement</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Law Enforcement</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Following</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Law Enforcement</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Law Enforcement</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5. Frequencies of authority type who is most responsible in dealing with the problems before the threatening event for each threat condition.

Figure 6. Frequencies of authority type who is most responsible in dealing with the problems during the threatening event for each threat condition.
An exploratory analysis was conducted to determine how responsible each authority type would be held for failing to prevent the threatening event if it were to occur. A 4 (Authority Type: federal government, federal law enforcement, local government, local law enforcement) by 2 (Threat Condition: cartel violence vs. terrorism) mixed design ANOVA was conducted. The interaction for authority type by threat condition was significant, $F(3, 590) = 84.23, p < .001$. For the cartel threat condition, the local government ($M = 5.49, SE = .093$) and the local law enforcement ($M = 5.54, SE = .094$) were held significantly more responsible than the federal government ($M = 5.27, SE = .095$); $d = .14$ and $d = .16$, respectively. For the terrorism condition, the federal government ($M = 5.50, SE = .087$) was held more responsible than the local government ($M = 4.20, SE = .105$) and local law enforcement ($M = 4.21, SE = .108$); $d = .79$ and $d = .77$, respectively. Also, the federal law enforcement ($M = 5.46, SE = .092$) was held more responsible than the local government ($M = 4.20, SE = .105$) and local law enforcement ($M = 4.21, SE = .108$); $d = .75$ and $d = .73$, respectively. Overall, attribution of responsibility for failing to prevent the threat depends on the threat type. Local authorities were held more
responsible for not preventing the threat of cartel violence but federal authorities were held more responsible for not preventing the threat of a terrorist attack.

In summary, the trust in authorities and attribution of responsibility findings depend on the type of threat. For cartel violence, people trusted the federal authorities more than the local authorities for protection against the threat, expected both federal and local authorities to deal with the problems before the threat, expected federal authorities to deal with the problems during and after the threat, and held the local authorities more responsible in not preventing the threatening event if it occurred. For terrorism, people trusted the federal authorities more than the local authorities for protection against the threat, expected the federal authorities to deal with the problems before, during, and after the threat, and also held federal authorities more responsible in not preventing the threatening event if it occurred. Hence, the relationship between trust in authorities and attribution of responsibility for cartel violence is more complex than for terrorism.

To further elucidate the differences between cartel violence and terrorism threat, the mean difference analyses regarding emotions will be discussed to address Hypotheses 3.

**Comparing emotions for cartel violence threat and terrorism threat.** The third mean difference hypothesis was that cartel violence threat would elicit more anger than terrorism threat but terrorism threat would elicit more fear than cartel violence threat (Hypothesis 3). An independent-samples t-test was conducted to assess anger rating differences across threat conditions. Anger ratings for the cartel violence threat condition \((M = 3.83, SE = .112)\) were significantly higher than for the terrorism threat condition \((M = 3.23, SE = .103)\), \(t(587.08) = 3.91, p < .001; d = .32,^{18}\) which supports the Hypothesis 3. An independent-samples t-test was
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conducted to assess fear rating differences across threat conditions. Fear ratings for the cartel violence threat condition \((M = 3.29, SE = .101)\) were not significantly different than for the terrorism threat condition \((M = 3.08, SE = .090)\), \(t(584.29) = 1.55, p = .122; d = .13\),\(^{19}\) which does not support the Hypothesis 3. An exploratory analysis was conducted to assess how the threat conditions differed in difficulty, unpleasantness, and intensity. Independent-samples t-tests revealed that the difficulty of the cartel article \((M = 2.03, SE = .094)\) was not significantly different than for the terrorism article \((M = 1.97, SE = .086)\), \(t(590) = .514, p = .607\). However, the cartel article was rated as being more unpleasant to read \((M = 3.61, SE = .118)\) than the terrorism article \((M = 2.68, SE = .111)\), \(t(590) = .514, p < .001; d = .47\). The cartel article was also rated as being more intense to read \((M = 3.53, SE = .116)\) than the terrorism article \((M = 2.92, SE = .110)\), \(t(590) = .514, p < .001; d = .31\). Overall, cartel violence threat elicited more anger than terrorism threat but both cartel violence and terrorism threat elicited the same level of fear. However, the cartel violence article was more unpleasant to read and more intense to read than the terrorism article.

In summary, the level of negative emotions elicited depends on the type of threat. Anger was elicited stronger in response to a cartel violence threat than a terrorism threat, which replicates the findings of Preliminary Study 2. However, fear was elicited to the same degree in response to both cartel violence and terrorism threat, which is inconsistent to the findings of Preliminary Study 2. In Preliminary Study 2, fear was elicited stronger for terrorism than cartel violence threat but different terrorism threats were used in the two studies. In Preliminary Study 2, the terrorism threat was about a terrorist organization threatening to infect the water supply.

\(^{19}\) The Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances was significant, thus results for equal variances not assumed are reported.
with a chemical instead of a terrorist attack on Fort Bliss. Thus, the topic of the terrorism threat may explain the inconsistent findings.

**Comparing perceptions of severity for cartel violence and terrorism threat.** An exploratory analysis was conducted to assess the differences in perception of threat severity for each threat condition. A 2 (Threat Type: cartel violence vs. terrorism) by 2 (Threat Condition: cartel violence vs. terrorism) mixed design ANOVA was conducted. The main effect for threat type was significant, $F(1, 590) = 46.27, p < .001$. The perception of cartel violence severity ($M = 4.53, SE = .074$) was perceived to be more severe than the perception of terrorism severity ($M = 4.08, SE = .070$); $d = .26$. The interaction of threat type and threat condition was significant, $F(1, 590) = 9.40, p = .002$. Perception of cartel violence threat severity did not differ for the cartel violence condition ($M = 4.54, SE = .107$) than from the terrorism condition ($M = 4.51, SE = .101$), $t(590) = 1.82, p = .856; d = .02$. However, perception of terrorism threat severity was significantly higher for the terrorism condition ($M = 4.27, SE = .098$) than for the cartel violence condition ($M = 3.89, SE = .101$), $t(590) = 2.67, p = .008; d = .22$. Overall, perception of cartel violence threat severity was higher than perception of terrorism severity. However, people who read the cartel violence article did not differ from people who read the terrorism article on how severe they thought the threat of cartel violence was in El Paso. But, people who read the terrorism article perceived the threat of terrorism to be more severe in El Paso than people who read the cartel violence article.

**5.3.5 Measured Variable Path Analysis**

In addition to the mean difference hypotheses, there were several hypotheses examining the relationships between the different constructs that were tested using a measured variable path analysis. A measured variable path model (Model 1) was constructed to represent the
hypothesized relationships, which included the following variables: threat experience, perception of severity, anger, fear, attitudes toward federal authorities, attitudes toward local authorities, trust in federal authorities, trust in local authorities, federal compliance, local compliance, and political behavior (see Figure 8).\textsuperscript{20} Threat experience and perception of severity were allowed to correlate. The measurement error of anger and fear were allowed to correlate. The measurement error of attitudes toward federal authorities and attitudes toward local authorities were allowed to correlate. The measurement error of trust in federal authorities and trust in local authorities were allowed to correlate. Lastly, the measurement error of federal compliance and local compliance were allowed to correlate. Because the proposed relationships were expected to be the same for both the cartel violence condition and the terrorism condition, the proposed relationships were estimated with one measured variable path analysis combining the two threat conditions. The threat experience variable consisted of the cartel violence threat experience responses from the cartel violence condition and the terrorism violence threat experience responses from the terrorism condition. The perception of severity variable consisted of the severity of cartel violence threat response from the cartel violence condition and the severity of terrorism threat from the terrorism condition (see Table 12 for descriptives and correlations of measured variables).

Due to significant violations of multivariate normality (Skew = 9.88, Kurtosis = 171.28), an asymptotic variance-covariance matrix was created in PRELIS 2.20 and analyzed using robust maximum likelihood estimation method in LISREL 8.80 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2003). Hu and Bentler’s (1999) suggested fit indices were used to evaluate model fit. The following combination criteria was used to determine good model fit: when $p > .05$ for the Satorra-Bentler

\textsuperscript{20} It was first demonstrated that the parameters of the estimated model were identified using a set of identification rules (Bollen, 1989; Rigdon, 1995). Each of the 5 blocks was identified so the whole system was identified too.
chi-square statistic, SRMR < .08, RMSEA < .06, NNFI and CFI > .95. Also, smaller AIC values are preferred. According to the fit standards, the model provides a good description of the data (see Figure 9), Satorra-Bentler $\chi^2(28, N = 592) = 100.62, p = 0.00$, SRMR = 0.073, RMSEA = 0.066 (90% CI: 0.053 ; 0.081), NNFI = 0.95, CFI = 0.98, Model AIC = 198.62. Furthermore, the modeled relationships among the variables accounted for 11% of the observed variance in anger, 12% of the observed variance in fear, 43% of the observed variance in trust in federal authorities, 53% of the observed variance in trust in local authorities, 23% of the observed variance in federal compliance, 26% of the observed variance in local compliance, and 2% of the observed variance in political behavior. Model 1 was used to address Hypotheses 4.

The effect of severity on emotions and compliance. The first two model association results regarding the effect of perception of threat severity on emotions and compliance serve as a manipulation check as these results have been found consistently in previous research and were also replicated in Preliminary Study 3. As expected, increased perception of threat severity significantly predicted increased anger and fear elicited by the future threat ($B = .74, SE = .21, p < .01$ and $B = .70, SE = .10, p < .01$, respectively; see Figure 9). This finding replicates Preliminary Study 3 and is also consistent with previous research, which found that people who perceive a threat as more severe are more likely to respond with greater negative emotions (Arian & Gordon, 1993; Huddy et al., 2005). Results also revealed that increased perception of threat severity significantly predicted increased compliance to federal and local authority recommendations to prepare for the threat ($B = .46, SE = .08, p < .01$ and $B = .42, SE = .09, p < .05$, respectively; see Figure 9). This finding is consistent with Preliminary Study 3 results in

---

21 An exploratory model was tested in which anger and fear predicted attitudes toward federal and local authorities instead of trust in federal and local authorities. This model was also a good fit to the observed data, Satorra-Bentler $\chi^2(28, N = 592) = 101.70, p = .00$, SRMR = .066, RMSEA = 0.067 (90% CI: 0.053 ; 0.081), NNFI = .95, CFI = .98, Model AIC = 199.70. However, the paths from emotions to attitudes were not significant.
which people who perceived the threat of cartel violence and terrorism as more severe were more likely to engage in preparedness behaviors. These findings are also consistent with previous research in which people who perceive the threat as more severe are more likely to change their daily activities, relocate, and secure their homes in response to the threat and also engage in recommended authority preparedness activities (Heilbrun et al., 2010; Riad, Norris, & Ruback, 1999; Sattler, Kaiser, & Hittner, 2006). However, the previous studies did not examine whether people would follow both federal and local authority recommendations. Overall, perception of threat severity increases negative emotions in response to a future threat of cartel violence and terrorism and extends the previous research by finding that people are more likely to follow both federal and local authority preparedness recommendations to prepare for the threat.

**The effect of attitudes toward authorities on political behavior.** The first model association hypothesis was that *people with more positive attitudes toward federal and local authorities would be more likely to engage in positive political behaviors (Hypothesis 4).* Results revealed that positive attitudes toward federal significantly predicted increased political behaviors ($B = .24, SE = .11, p < .05$). However, positive attitudes toward local authorities did not significantly predict increased political behaviors ($B = -.04, SE = .10, p > .05$; see Figure 11). Thus, Hypothesis 4 was partially supported. Furthermore, trust in federal and local authorities did not significantly predict increased political behaviors ($B = -.06, SE = .07, p < .05$ and $B = -.01, SE = .07, p < .05$, respectively). Overall, these findings are consistent with previous research showing that government attitudes were related to general political behaviors but federal and local political trust were unrelated to general political behaviors (Rahn & Rudolph, 2005; Ulbig, 2002). However, the previous studies did not examine the differences between federal and local attitudes and their relationship to political behaviors. Results from this study suggest that federal
but not local attitudes are related to political behaviors. One explanation is that the political behavior questions were more related to federal political behaviors instead of local political behaviors thus attitudes toward federal authorities was a significant predictor. It may be the case that questions specifically about local political behaviors would be predicted by attitudes toward local authorities.
Table 12

**Measured Variable Path Model - Measured Variable Correlations, Mean of Measured Variable, and Reliabilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measured Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. TE</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td>.876-.905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PTS</td>
<td>.161**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Anger</td>
<td>.298**</td>
<td>.185**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.68</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td>.929-.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fear</td>
<td>.245**</td>
<td>.283**</td>
<td>.661**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td>.837-.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. AFA</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.175**</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td>.942-.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ALA</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.087*</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.647**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>.947-.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. TFA</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.105*</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.683**</td>
<td>.500**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td>.936-.950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. TLA</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.551**</td>
<td>.746**</td>
<td>.664**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td>.960</td>
<td>.955-.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. FC</td>
<td>.101*</td>
<td>.296**</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.214**</td>
<td>.440**</td>
<td>.262**</td>
<td>.409**</td>
<td>.246**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.16</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>.827-.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. LC</td>
<td>.133**</td>
<td>.237**</td>
<td>.124**</td>
<td>.207**</td>
<td>.340**</td>
<td>.446**</td>
<td>.326**</td>
<td>.428**</td>
<td>.708**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.887</td>
<td>.870-.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. PB</td>
<td>.151**</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.143**</td>
<td>.141**</td>
<td>.106**</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.174**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>32.49</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>.898</td>
<td>.886-.910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01. Note. TE = Threat Experience, PTS = Perception of Threat Severity and consists of only 1 item, AFA = Attitudes Towards Federal Authorities, ALA = Attitudes Towards Local Authorities, TFA = Trust in Federal Authorities, TLA = Trust in Local Authorities, FC = Federal Compliance, LC = Local Compliance, PB = Political Behavior.
Figure 8. Proposed measured variable path analysis model for combined cartel violence and terrorism threat conditions.
Figure 9. Model 1 measured variable path analysis results for combined threat conditions. All paths coefficients are unstandardized estimates. Significant pathways (p < .05) are in bold while nonsignificant pathways are dashed. Percentages are amount of variance explained for each outcome variable. Satorra-Bentler $\chi^2(28, N = 592) = 100.62, p = 0.00$, SRMR = 0.073, RMSEA = 0.066 (90% CI: 0.053; 0.081), NNFI = 0.95, CFI = 0.98, Model AIC = 198.62.
5.3.6 Mediation Analyses

Within Model 1 there are several mediation hypotheses but testing these mediations using the model parameters in the measured variable path analysis are limited and result in increased risk of Type I error (Hayes, 2009). Thus, a better statistical approach was used to test the individual mediation Hypotheses 5 to 8. There are six meditational (indirect) hypotheses and there are several different methods that can be used to test the mediation analyses (see MacKinnon, Lockwood, Hoffmann, West, & Sheets, 2002, for an overview). A common method is the causal steps approach derived by Baron and Kenny (1986) but this method has many problems. First, it requires that the total effect be statistical. Second, it never directly tests the indirect effect. Lastly, there is an increased chance of type I errors (Morera & Castro, 2013; Hayes, 2009). A better method is the Sobel test which directly tests the $ab$ cross product (Sobel, 1982), however, this test assumes that the sampling distribution of the $ab$ cross products are normally distributed, which is only the case in large samples. Alternative methods include the distribution of the product approach (MacKinnon, Lockwood, & Williams, 2004), Monte Carlo simulations (Preacher & Selig, 2012), and bootstrapping approaches. The bootstrapping approach is a distribution-free resampling method that is preferred over the causal steps approach and the Sobel test because it has higher power and has reasonable control over type I error (Preacher & Hayes, 2008).

Because there were several mediations being tested and type I error was a concern, the bootstrapping approach was utilized to test the meditational analyses using Andrew Hayes’ PROCESS SPSS macro (Hayes, 2012). Bootstrapping involves treating the sample as a population by randomly resampling from the sample data. For a mediation analysis, $k$ number of randomly generated indirect effect estimates are created that estimates the sampling distribution
of the indirect effect. A point estimate and a 95% or 99% confidence interval (using a percentile approach) are constructed for the indirect effect (Hayes, 2009; Preacher, Rucker & Hayes, 2007). If 0 is not a part of the CI, the indirect effect is statistically different from 0. Often the sampling distribution that is derived can be skewed but a bias correction can adjust the upper and lower bound estimates surrounding the indirect effect (Fritz & Mackinnon, 2007; Preacher & Hayes, 2004). The PROCESS SPSS macro also allows testing of multiple mediators, which is more advantageous than separate mediation tests because it is more precise and parsimonious (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). For each mediation analysis, 5000 bootstrap samples were requested.

The effects of threat experience and emotions on trust in federal authorities. The first meditational hypothesis is that the association between prior threat experience and trust in federal authorities will be partially mediated by the emotions of anger and fear (Hypothesis 5a-c). The following are the indirect and direct hypothesized effects: H5a: People with more threat experience will be more angry and fearful of the future threat, H5b: Anger and fear elicited by reading about a future threat will decrease trust in federal authorities for protection against the external threat, H5c: People with more prior threat experience will be less likely to trust in federal authorities for protection against an external threat.

A multiple mediation bootstrapping resampling approach was used to test whether anger and fear mediated the relationship between threat experience and federal authorities (k= 5000 bootstrap samples; see Figure 10). Perception of Threat Severity, Trust in Local Authorities, Attitudes Toward Local authorities, and Attitudes Toward Federal Authorities were included as covariates to control for their influence. Results revealed that more threat experience predicted increased anger ($a_1 = .40, SE = .054, p < .001$) and fear ($a_2 = .18, SE = .029, p < .001$) elicited by the future threat, which supports Hypothesis 5a. However, Hypothesis 5b was not supported.
Anger and fear elicited by the future threat did not predict trust in federal authorities \( (b_1 = -.03, SE = .039, p = .402 \) and \( b_2 = .01, SE = .073, p = .923 \), respectively). Also, Hypothesis 5c was not supported. Threat experience did not predict trust in federal authorities \( (c' = -.05, SE = .042, p = .204) \). The relationship between threat experience and trust in federal authorities was not mediated by anger or fear \( (a_1b_1 = -.01, BootSE = .019, 99\% \text{ bias-corrected bootstrap CI} = -.053; .021 \text{ and } a_2b_2 = .00, BootSE = .015, 99\% \text{ bias-corrected bootstrap CI} = -.028; .033) \).

\[\text{Figure 10. Threat Experience, Emotions, and Trust in Federal Authorities Mediation.} \quad p < .001**. k = 5000\text{ bootstrapped samples. All paths coefficients are unstandardized estimates. Significant pathways are in bold while nonsignificant pathways are dashed. Perception of Threat Severity, Trust in Local Authorities, Attitudes Toward Local authorities, and Attitudes Toward Federal Authorities were included as covariates to control for their influence. Direct Effect} = c'.\]

The effects of threat experience and emotions on trust in local authorities. The second meditational hypothesis is that the association between prior threat experience and trust in local authorities will be partially mediated by the emotions of anger and fear (Hypothesis 6a-c). The following are the indirect and direct hypothesized effects: \( H6a: \) People with more threat experience will be more angry and fearful of the future threat, \( H6b: \) Anger and fear elicited by reading about a future threat will decrease trust in local authorities for protection against the external threat, \( H6c: \) People with more prior threat experience will be less likely to trust in local authorities for protection against an external threat.
A multiple mediation bootstrapping resampling approach was used to test whether anger and fear mediated the relationship between threat experience and local authorities (k = 5000 bootstrap samples; see Figure 11). Perception of Threat Severity, Trust in Federal Authorities, Attitudes Toward Federal Authorities, and Attitudes Toward Local authorities were included as covariates to control for their influence. Results revealed that more threat experience predicted increased anger (a₁ = .40, SE = .054, p < .001) and fear (a₂ = .18, SE = .029, p < .001) elicited by the future threat, which supports Hypothesis 6a. However, Hypothesis 6b was not supported. Anger and fear elicited by the future threat did not predict trust in local authorities (b₁ = .02, SE = .038, p = .681 and b₂ = .03, SE = .071, p = .721, respectively). Also, Hypothesis 6c was not supported. Threat experience did not predict trust in local authorities (c' = -.03, SE = .041, p = .516). The relationship between threat experience and trust in local authorities was not mediated by anger or fear (a₁b₁ = .01, BootSE = .017, 99% bias-corrected bootstrap CI = -.027 ; .042 and a₂b₂ = .00, BootSE = .012, 99% bias-corrected bootstrap CI = -.020 ; .029).

Overall, the two meditational findings revealed that anger and fear do not mediate the relationship between threat experience and trust in federal and local authorities for protection.
against a threat. However, the findings of Preliminary Study 2 were replicated in which people who had more experience of the threatening event experienced greater anger and fear in response to the future threat. This is also in line with previous terrorism research in which people who were closer in proximity to the 9/11 terrorist attacks experienced more negative emotions (Huddy et al., 2005) and in line with previous natural disaster research in which people who experienced a flood experienced more negative emotions to the possibility of a future flood (Zaalberg et al., 2009). Thus, the findings from the current study extend previous work by finding the same effects between threat experience and negative emotions with the threat of cartel violence.

Threat experience did not predict trust in federal and local authorities for protection against the threat. These findings are inconsistent with previous terrorism research, which found that people with past experience of terrorist attacks lacked trust in the government to respond to a future terrorism attack. Another factor that has shown to influence trust in government is people’s satisfaction of government services (Boukaert & Van de Walle, 2001; Kumlin, 2002). For example, when the government efficiently delivers quality services such as health care benefits people are more likely to trust the government. Thus, it is expected that satisfaction with how authorities handled a previous crisis would increase trust in authorities for protection against a future crisis. The current study did not examine people’s satisfaction of government services and the relationship between satisfaction and threat experience. It may be the case that the interactive effects of people’s threat experience and satisfaction of how the authorities handled the previous threat influences trust in authorities for protection against a future threat. Trust in authorities for protection against an external threat may only be decreased if people have more
threat experience and are less satisfied about how the authorities handled the previous threatening event.

The emotions of anger and fear elicited by the future threat did not predict trust in federal and local authorities for protection against the future threat. Research on interpersonal trust has shown that when people are angry and fearful they are less likely to trust others (Dunn & Schweitzer, 2005; Myers & Tingley, 2010). However, this relationship is moderated by the familiarity of the trustee. Interpersonal trust research examines trust in acquaintances and strangers, thus the trust judgment is made towards another person and not towards government institutions. The difference between interpersonal trust and political trust might explain why negative emotions did not have an effect on trust in authorities for protection against an external threat.

**The effects of attitudes toward and trust in federal authorities on federal compliance.** The third meditational hypothesis is that the association between attitudes toward federal authorities and federal compliance will be partially mediated by trust in federal authorities (Hypothesis 7a-c). The following are the indirect and direct hypothesized effects:

**H7a:** People with more positive attitudes toward federal authorities will have increased trust in federal authorities for protection against the external threat, **H7b:** People with increased trust in federal authorities for protection will be more likely to comply with federal authority recommendations to prepare for the threat, **H7c:** People with more positive attitudes toward federal authorities will be more likely to comply with federal authority recommendations to prepare for the threat.

The bootstrapping resampling approach was used to test the mediation hypotheses for federal compliance (k= 5000 bootstrap samples; see Figure 12). Threat Experience, Perception of
Threat Severity, Anger, Fear, Trust in Local Authorities, Attitudes Toward Local Authorities, Local Compliance, and Political Behavior were included as covariates to control for their influence. The indirect and direct effect hypotheses were all supported. More positive attitudes toward federal authorities predicted increased trust in federal authorities for protection against the external threat (a₁ = .75, \(SE = .047, p < .001\)), which supports Hypothesis 7a. Increased trust in federal authorities for protection predicted increased compliance with federal authority recommendations to prepare for the threat (b₁ = .08, \(SE = .014, p < .001\)), which supports Hypothesis 7b. More positive attitudes toward federal authorities predicted increased compliance with federal authority recommendations to prepare for the threat (c' = .12, \(SE = .019, p < .001\)), which supports Hypothesis 7c. The relationship between attitudes toward federal authorities and federal compliance was mediated by trust in federal authorities (a₁b₁ = .06, BootSE = .014, 99% bias-corrected bootstrap CI = .031 ; .087). Overall, trust in federal authorities mediates the relationship between attitudes toward federal authorities and federal compliance.

\[ \text{Figure 12. Attitudes Toward Federal Authorities, Trust in Federal Authorities, and Federal Compliance Mediation.} \]
\[ p < .001**, k = 5000 bootstrapped samples. \] All paths coefficients are unstandardized estimates. Significant pathways are in bold while nonsignificant pathways are dashed. Threat Experience, Perception of Threat Severity, Anger, Fear, Trust in Local Authorities, Attitudes Toward Local Authorities, Local Compliance, and Political Behavior were included as covariates to control for their influence. Direct Effect = c'.

The effects of attitudes toward and trust in local authorities on local compliance.

The fourth meditational hypothesis is that the association between attitudes toward local authorities and local compliance will be mediated by trust in local authorities (Hypothesis 8a-c).

The following are the indirect and direct hypothesized effects: H8a: People with more positive
attitudes toward local authorities will have increased trust in local authorities for protection against the external threat, H8b: People with increased trust in local authorities for protection will be more likely to comply with local authority recommendations to prepare for the threat, H8c: People with more positive attitudes toward local authorities will be more likely to comply with authority recommendations to prepare for the threat.

The bootstrapping resampling approach was used to test the mediation hypotheses for local compliance (k= 5000 bootstrap samples; see Figure 13). Threat Experience, Perception of Threat Severity, Anger, Fear, Trust in Federal Authorities, Attitudes Toward Federal Authorities, Federal Compliance, and Political Behavior were included as covariates to control for their influence. The indirect and direct effect hypotheses were all supported. More positive attitudes toward local authorities predicted increased trust in local authorities for protection against the external threat (a₁ = .80, SE = .040, p < .001), which supports Hypothesis 8a. Increased trust in local authorities for protection predicted increased compliance with local authority recommendations to prepare for the threat (b₁ = .08, SE = .015, p < .001), which supports Hypothesis 8b. More positive attitudes toward local authorities predicted increased compliance with local authority recommendations to prepare for the threat (c‘ = .11, SE = .019, p < .001), which supports Hypothesis 8c. The relationship between attitudes toward local authorities and local compliance was mediated by trust in local authorities (a₁b₁ = .07, BootSE = .017, 99% bias-corrected bootstrap CI = .037 ; .102). Overall, trust in local authorities mediates the relationship between attitudes toward local authorities and local compliance.
Figure 13. Attitudes Toward Local Authorities, Trust in Local Authorities, and Local Compliance Mediation. $p < .001**$, $k = 5000$ bootstrapped samples. All paths coefficients are unstandardized estimates. Significant pathways are in bold while nonsignificant pathways are dashed. Threat Experience, Perception of Threat Severity, Anger, Fear, Trust in Federal Authorities, Attitudes Toward Federal Authorities, Federal Compliance, and Political Behavior were included as covariates to control for their influence. Direct Effect = $c'$. 

In summary, the findings revealed that trust in authorities for protection against an external threat mediates the relationship between attitudes toward authorities and compliance to authority recommendations. When people have more favorable attitudes toward authorities, they are also more likely to have trust in authorities for protection against a future threat, and are also more likely to comply with authority recommendations to engage in preparedness behaviors before the threatening event. This is consistent with previous research in which people who trust organizations and authority figures more are more likely to comply with authority demands and recommendations (Kramer 1999; Scholz & Lubell, 1998; Slovic, 1999; Tyler, 1994). The current findings extend the previous work by showing that trust in authorities for protection is a mediator between attitudes and compliance and that the relationship holds for both federal and local authorities.

5.3.7 Exploratory Measure Variable Path Analyses

Several exploratory measured path analyses were tested to determine whether other models did a better job at describing the data. For all exploratory measured variable path analyses, an asymptotic variance-covariance matrix was created in PRELIS 2.20 and analyzed using robust maximum likelihood estimation method in LISREL 8.80 (Jöreskog & Sörbom,
2003), due to significant violations of multivariate normality. Table 13 provides a summary of all measured variable path analyses fit indices.

**Measured variable path analyses for each threat condition.** The proposed measured path analyses was analyzed for each threat condition to determine if there were different effects for each condition. There were 300 participants in the cartel violence measured variable path analysis (Model 2). According to the fit standards, the model provides a good description of the data (see Figure 14), Satorra-Bentler $\chi^2 (28, N = 300) = 63.80, p = 0.00$, SRMR = 0.070, RMSEA = 0.066 (90% CI: 0.044 ; 0.087), NNFI = 0.95, CFI = 0.98, Model AIC = 161.80. Furthermore, the modeled relationships among the variables accounted for 13% of the observed variance in anger, 13% of the observed variance in fear, 40% of the observed variance in trust in federal authorities, 48% of the observed variance in trust in local authorities, 21% of the observed variance in federal compliance, 23% of the observed variance in local compliance, and 1% of the observed variance in political behavior. All of the significant effects in the combined threat model were significant in the cartel violence model with one exception. The significant effect from attitudes toward federal authorities to political behavior in the combined model is nonsignificant in this model that includes only the cartel threat.

There were 292 participants in the terrorism measured variable path analysis (Model 3). According to the fit standards, the model provides an adequate description of the data (see Figure 15), Satorra-Bentler $\chi^2 (28, N = 292) = 71.72, p = 0.00$, SRMR = 0.088, RMSEA = 0.074 (90% CI: 0.053 ; 0.095), NNFI = 0.94, CFI = 0.97, Model AIC = 169.72. Furthermore, the modeled relationships among the variables accounted for 8% of the observed variance in anger, 10% of

---

22 The cartel condition sample was underpowered due to adding 2 model parameters and the exclusion of participant responses.

23 The terrorism condition sample was underpowered due to adding 2 model parameters and the exclusion of participant responses.
the observed variance in fear, 49% of the observed variance in trust in federal authorities, 58% of the observed variance in trust in local authorities, 26% of the observed variance in federal compliance, 29% of the observed variance in local compliance, and 2% of the observed variance in political behavior. The only differences between the combined measured path analysis model and the terrorism measured path analysis model are that the effect from perception of threat severity to anger is now nonsignificant but the path from fear to trust in federal authorities is now significant. Specifically, fear elicited by the future threat of terrorism significantly predicted increased trust in federal authorities for protection against terrorism ($B = .27, SE = .12, p < .05$).

Overall, the findings of the relationships between the constructs in the measured variable path analysis separately for each threat condition were similar to the findings when the relationships were tested combining the two threat conditions. The primary difference was that for the cartel violence condition attitudes toward federal authorities did not predict political behaviors and for the terrorism condition perception of threat severity did not predict anger but fear predicted increased trust in federal authorities for protection against the threat of terrorism. This suggests that the relationship between fear and trust in federal authorities for protection is different for cartel violence than for terrorism.
Figure 14. Model 2 measured variable path analysis results for cartel violence threat. All paths coefficients are unstandardized estimates. Significant pathways (p < .05) are in bold while nonsignificant pathways are dashed. Percentages are amount of variance explained for each outcome variable. Satorra-Bentler $\chi^2(28, N = 300) = 63.80, p = 0.00$, SRMR = 0.07, RMSEA = 0.066 (90% CI: 0.044 ; 0.087), NNFI = 0.95, CFI = 0.98, Model AIC = 161.80.
Figure 15. Model 3 measured variable path analysis results for terrorism threat. All paths coefficients are unstandardized estimates. Percentages are amount of variance explained for each outcome variable. Significant pathways (p < .05) are in bold while nonsignificant pathways are dashed. $\chi^2(28, N = 292) = 71.72, p = 0.00, \text{SRMR} = 0.088, \text{RMSEA} = 0.074 (90\% \text{ CI: } 0.053 ; 0.095)$, $\text{NNFI} = 0.94, \text{CFI} = 0.97$, Model AIC = 169.72.
**Measured variable path analyses emotion interaction.** A measured variable path analysis was tested in which the interaction effects of anger and fear were examined (Model 4). Anger and fear were first mean centered to more easily interpret the results. According to the fit standards, the model provides a good description of the data (see Figure 16), Satorra-Bentler $\chi^2(38, N = 592) = 120.39$, $p = 0.00$, SRMR = 0.071, RMSEA = 0.061 (90% CI: 0.049 ; 0.073), NNFI = 0.95, CFI = 0.97, Model AIC = 224.39. However, the interaction of anger and fear did not significantly predicted trust in federal and local authorities, ($B = -.01, SE = .01, p > .05$ and $B = -.01, SE = .01, p > .05$, respectively). Overall, this suggests that the interaction of anger and fear does not have an effect on trust in federal and local authorities for protection against an external threat.

---

$24^{\text{When the interaction model was tested not centering anger and fear, the interaction was significant and higher AngerXFear predicted decreased trust in federal and local authorities, ($B = -.01, SE = .00, p < .01$ and $B = -.01, SE = .00, p < .05$, respectively). However, theoretically the interpretation of this interaction is not substantive because the interaction is significant when the main effects of anger and fear are held at 0.}}$
Figure 16. Model 4 measured variable path analysis results for the interaction of anger and fear. Anger and Fear were first mean centered. All paths coefficients are unstandardized estimates. Significant pathways (p < .05) are in bold while nonsignificant pathways are dashed. Percentages are amount of variance explained for each outcome variable. Satorra-Bentler $\chi^2(38, N = 592) = 120.39, p = 0.00$, SRMR = 0.071, RMSEA = 0.061 (90% CI: 0.049 ; 0.073), NNFI = 0.95, CFI = 0.97, Model AIC = 224.39.
**Measured variable path analyses with trust predicting attitudes.** A measured variable path analysis was tested in which trust predicted attitudes (Model 5) instead of attitudes predicting trust, such as in Model 1. Specifically, trust in federal authorities predicted attitudes toward federal authorities and trust in local authorities predicted attitudes toward local authorities. According to the fit standards, the model provides a good description of the data, Satorra-Bentler $\chi^2(28, N = 592) = 97.69, p = .00, \text{SRMR} = .068, \text{RMSEA} = 0.065 (90\% \text{ CI: } 0.051 ; 0.079), \text{NNFI} = .96, \text{CFI} = .98, \text{Model AIC} = 195.69.$ This suggests that this model in which trust predicts attitudes instead of attitudes predicting trust also does a good job at describing the data. Based on this finding, a model with reciprocal effects between attitudes and trust would seem to describe the relationships better. However, a reciprocal model could not be tested.\(^{25}\) Therefore, a statistical method to compare the beta coefficients of when attitudes predicts trust to when trust predicts attitudes was used. Two additional models were tested to determine whether the relationship between attitudes and trust is better described by attitudes predicting trust or by trust predicting attitudes. Because the effect from trust in federal authorities to attitudes toward federal authorities was significant in Model 5, ($B = .49, SE = .02, p < .05$), a model (Model 6) was tested in which this effect was not estimated and constrained to $B = .49$. The constrained model was then compared to Model 1 in which the effect between attitudes toward federal authorities was not constrained, $B = .85, SE = .04, p < .05$. The constrained model was not a good fit to the observed data, Satorra-Bentler $\chi^2(29, N = 592) = 165.97, p = .00, \text{SRMR} = .11, \text{RMSEA} = 0.090 (90\% \text{ CI: } 0.077 ; 0.100), \text{NNFI} = .91, \text{CFI} = .96, \text{Model AIC} = 261.97.$ Furthermore, the Satorra-Bentler $\chi^2$ scaled difference test revealed that the constrained model

\(^{25}\)A model with reciprocal effects between attitudes and trust for both federal and local authorities could not be tested. Because this model was a nonrecursive model, each block of the model needs to be identified (Bollen, 1989; Rigdon, 1995). The block with the reciprocal effects was not identified based on the order condition. Trying to identify the model by adding additional parameters (e.g., threat experience to attitudes toward federal and local authorities) were unsuccessful and were based mathematics grounds instead of theoretical grounds.
was significantly worse than the unconstrained model, \( \Delta \text{Satorra-Bentler} \chi^2(1, N = 592) = 62.35, p < .001 \). This suggests that the model in which attitudes toward federal authorities predicts trust in federal authorities does a better job at describing the data than the model in which trust in federal authorities predicts attitudes toward federal authorities.

Likewise, because the effect from trust in local authorities to attitudes toward local authorities was significant in Model 5, \( (B = .54, SE = .02, p < .05) \), a model (Model 7) was tested in which this effect was not estimated and constrained to \( B = .54 \). The constrained model was then compared to Model 1 in which the effect between attitudes toward local authorities was not constrained, \( B = .91, SE = .04, p < .05 \). The constrained model was a not a good fit to the observed data, Satorra-Bentler \( \chi^2(29, N = 592) = 183.88, p = .00, \text{SRMR} = .12, \text{RMSEA} = 0.095 \) (90% CI: 0.082 ; 0.110), NNFI = .91, CFI = .95, Model AIC = 279.88. Furthermore, the Satorra-Bentler \( \chi^2 \) scaled difference test revealed that the constrained model was significantly worse than the unconstrained model, \( \Delta \text{Satorra-Bentler} \chi^2(1, N = 592) = 60.21, p < .001 \). This also suggests that the model in which attitudes toward local authorities predicts trust in local authorities does a better job at describing the data than the model in which trust in local authorities predicts attitudes toward local authorities.

Overall, these findings suggest that even though attitudes toward authorities and trust in authorities for protection against an external threat may have reciprocal effects, the model in which attitudes predict trust instead of trust predicting attitudes better describes the relationship between the two constructs. It is acknowledged that attitude judgments and trust judgments have mutual effects, so that attitudes can predict trust which then in turn can predict attitudes. However, in the current study the relationship in which attitudes predicts trust makes more sense because people’s current general attitudes toward authorities were assessed and these general
attitudes predicted trust judgments in authorities for protection against a *future* threat. If trust in authorities was assessed for a current event instead of for a future event, the relationship in which trust predicts attitudes may be a better relationship.

**Measured variable path analyses with emotions predicting compliance.** A measured variable path analysis was tested in which anger and fear predicted federal and local compliance behavior (Model 8). This model was different than Model 1 by anger and fear predicting federal and local compliance instead of trust in federal and local authorities. According to the fit standards, the model provides a good description of the data (see Figure 17), Satorra-Bentler $\chi^2(30, N = 592) = 84.57, p = .00$, SRMR = .066, RMSEA = 0.056 (90% CI: 0.042 ; 0.070), NNFI = .97, CFI = .98, Model AIC = 178.57. Anger did not significantly predict federal and local compliance, ($B = -.03, SE = .02, p > .05$ and $B = -.01, SE = .02, p > .05$, respectively). However, fear significantly increased federal and local compliance, ($B = .14, SE = .04, p < .01$ and $B = .12, SE = .04, p < .01$, respectively). When this model was compared to the model in which anger and fear predict trust in federal and local authorities (Model 1), Model AIC was smaller than in Model 1. This suggests that Model 8 in which anger and fear predict federal and local compliance is a better description of the data than Model 1 in which anger and fear predict trust in federal and local authorities.

Exploratory mediation analyses were conducted to determine whether fear mediated the relationship between perception of threat severity and federal and local compliance. The bootstrapping resampling approach was used to test the mediation for federal compliance ($k=5000$ bootstrap samples). Threat Experience, Anger, Attitudes Toward Federal Authorities, Attitudes Toward Local Authorities, Trust in Federal Authorities, Trust in Local Authorities, and Local Compliance were included as covariates to control for their influence. Increased perception
of threat severity predicted increased fear ($a_1 = .39, SE = .089, p < .001$). Increased fear predicted increased compliance with federal authority recommendations to prepare for the threat ($b_1 = .07, SE = .025, p = .007$). Increased perception of threat severity predicted increased compliance with federal authority recommendations to prepare for the threat ($c' = .16, SE = .055, p = .003$). The relationship between perception of threat severity and federal compliance was mediated by fear ($a_1b_1 = .03, BootSE = .012, 99\%$ bias-corrected bootstrap CI = $.007 ; .056$).

To test the mediation for local compliance, Threat Experience, Anger, Attitudes Toward Federal Authorities, Attitudes Toward Local Authorities, Trust in Federal Authorities, Trust in Local Authorities, and Federal Compliance were included as covariates to control for their influence. Increased perception of threat severity predicted increased fear ($a_1 = .36, SE = .089, p < .001$). However, fear did not predict compliance with local authority recommendations to prepare for the threat ($b_1 = .01, SE = .027, p = .680$). Perception of threat severity did not predict compliance with local authority recommendations to prepare for the threat ($c' = .05, SE = .060, p = .451$). The relationship between perception of threat severity and local compliance was not mediated by fear ($a_1b_1 = .00, BootSE = .010, 99\%$ bias-corrected bootstrap CI = $-.016 ; .027$).

Overall, fear in response to a future threat predicts increased federal and local compliance to authority recommendations to prepare for the threat. However, anger in response to a future threat does not predict federal and local compliance. These findings are consistent with previous terrorism research in which fear increased precautionary planning but anger has opposite effects (Lerner et al, 2003). The findings suggest that the emotions of anger and fear have different effects on compliance behavior. Based on the different cognitive appraisals of the two negative emotions people who respond in fear to the threat are appraising the threatening situation has having high situational control and are more uncertain about the threat. Research on emotions
and information processing has shown that people who are fearful are more likely to seek information and learning (Valentino, Hutchings, Banks, & Davis, 2008). Also, fear increases risk aversion because fearful people are motivated to reduce their fear (Lerner & Keltner, 2001). Thus, fearful people look for further guidance from authorities on how to best prepare for the threat and comply with those recommendations because they are uncertain about the situation and want to reduce their fear and uncertainty. Fear also mediated the relationship between perception of threat severity and federal compliance. So, people who perceive the threat as more severe respond in greater fear and are more likely to comply with federal authority recommendations. In contrast, people who respond with more anger to the threat are appraising the threatening situation as having high other-person control and are more certain about the threat. Research has shown that angry people are less likely to seek information from others (Valentino et al., 2008) and are more likely to engage in risk seeking behaviors (Lerner et al, 2003; Skitka, Bauman, Aramovich, & Morgan, 2006). Thus, people who respond in anger to a future threat do not look for guidance from authorities on how to prepare for the threat.
Figure 17. Model 8 measured variable path analysis results for anger and fear predicting federal and local compliance. All paths coefficients are unstandardized estimates. Significant pathways (p < .05) are in bold while nonsignificant pathways are dashed. Percentages are amount of variance explained for each outcome variable. Satorra-Bentler $\chi^2(30) = 84.57, p = 0.00$, SRMR = 0.066, RMSEA = 0.056 (90% CI: 0.042 ; 0.070), NNFI = 0.97, CFI = 0.98, Model AIC = 178.57.
Table 13

Summary of Measured Variable Path Analyses Model Fit Indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Satorra-Bentler $\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>RMSEA 90% CI</th>
<th>NNFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>Model AIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fit Criteria:</strong></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>≤ .09</td>
<td>≤ .06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1: CT</td>
<td>100.62</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>.053; .081</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>198.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2: Cartel</td>
<td>63.80</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.00013</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>.044; .087</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>161.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3: Terr</td>
<td>71.72</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>.053; .095</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>169.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4: CT Interaction</td>
<td>120.39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>.049; .073</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>224.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5: CT Tru-Att</td>
<td>97.69</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>.051; .079</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>195.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6: CT ConAtt-TruFed</td>
<td>165.97</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>.077; .100</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>261.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M7: CT ConAtt-TruLoc</td>
<td>183.88</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>.082; .110</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>279.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M8: CT Emot-Compl</td>
<td>84.57</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>.042; .070</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>178.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: M1 = cartel and terrorism threats combined, M2 = cartel violence threat, M3 = terrorism threat, M4 = cartel and terrorism combined with anger and fear interaction, M5 = cartel and terrorism combined with trust predicting attitudes, M6 = cartel and terrorism combined with federal attitudes and trust constrained, M7 = cartel and terrorism combined with local attitudes and trust constrained, M8 = cartel and terrorism combined with anger and fear predicting federal and local compliance.*
5.3.8 Correlations

Exploratory correlations were conducted as they were not hypothesized and thus not included in the measured variable path analyses.

**Correlations between political sophistication and emotions, attitudes, trust, behaviors, and attribution of responsibility.** Exploratory correlations were conducted to assess the relationship between political sophistication and emotions, attitudes, trust, compliance behaviors, political behaviors, and attribution of responsibility. Participants with more political sophistication were more likely to engage in positive political behaviors ($r = .306, p < .001$), were less fearful when reading the threat article ($r = -.090, p = .029$), and were less likely to blame El Paso’s local government for failing to prevent the threatening event if it were to occur ($r = -.084, p = .041$). No other correlations were significant. Overall, political sophistication is related to political behaviors, fear, and local government blame. The relationship between political sophistication and attribution of responsibility is somewhat inconsistent with previous findings regarding authority blame after Hurricane Katrina. People with higher levels of political sophistication were less likely to blame the federal government and more likely to blame the local government (Gomez & Wilson, 2008). The current study found that people with high political sophistication were less likely to blame the local government. Thus, the relationship between political sophistication may depend on the threat being posed and future work needs to be conducted to further examine these relationships.

**Correlations with attribution of responsibility.** Exploratory correlations were conducted to assess how attribution of responsibility for failing to prevent the threatening event for each authority type was related to emotions, attitudes, trust, behaviors, and threat experience (see Table 14). Overall attribution of responsibility for failing to prevent the threatening event is
significantly related to many of the constructs and thus future work is needed to further elucidate these relationships.

Table 14

*Attribution of Responsibility Correlations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attribution of Responsibility for Authority Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>.112**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>.114**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFA</td>
<td>.125**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALA</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFA</td>
<td>.158**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLA</td>
<td>.098*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Compliance</td>
<td>.235**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Compliance</td>
<td>.152**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Behavior</td>
<td>.110**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat Experience</td>
<td>.113**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01. Note. AFA = Attitudes Towards Federal Authorities, ALA = Attitudes Towards Local Authorities, TFA = Trust in Federal Authorities, TLA = Trust in Local Authorities.*

5.4 General Discussion

The current research examined the relations between multiple constructs that are relevant to cartel violence and terrorism threat and revealed several interesting findings that replicate and extend previous research. One primary goal of the study was to determine how attitudes toward and trust in authorities differed since previous research has shown that these constructs are highly interwoven (Christensen & Legreid, 2003). Comparisons among attitude and trust judgments indicated that even though the two constructs are highly correlated they predict different outcomes. Attitudes toward federal authorities only predicted political behaviors while local attitudes and federal and local trust did not. These findings first suggest that attitudes toward federal and local authorities are distinct and can have different behavioral outcomes. So if a person has positive attitudes toward local authorities, this does not imply that they will engage
in general political behaviors such as voting and contributing money to a campaign. People may have perceived the political behavior questions to be more relevant to federal politics instead of local politics as the general public is more cognizant of federal politics, thus local political behaviors such as voting in local elections may be predicted by attitudes toward local authorities.

More importantly, results revealed that trust in federal and local authorities for protection against the external threat did not predict general political behaviors but predicted federal and local compliance to authority recommendations if the threat were to occur. Thus, the specific trust judgment did not predict general behaviors but predicted a specific behavior, which is in line with previous research on the relationship between specific attitudes and behaviors (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; Ulbig, 2002). It is possible that general trust evaluations of authorities may predict general political behaviors and testing this relationship would extend this line of research on how specific and general evaluations predict distinct behavioral outcomes. Furthermore, the specific trust judgment regarding protection was a mediator between general attitudes and compliance to authority recommendations. So general evaluations of authorities influence specific trust judgments of protection which subsequently predict specific compliance behaviors. Although the reciprocal effects of attitudes and trust could not be directly tested, it is expected that these two constructs influence each other and change depending on the context and outcomes after a crisis occurs. For example, a person may have positive attitudes toward authorities which leads them to trust in authorities for protection against a terrorist attack and comply to their recommendations. However, if the authorities are unable to protect them against a terrorist attack, their general attitudes toward authorities may change and become less positive leading to decreased trust judgments for protection against a future attack. These findings can
guide future research to further extend how attitudes and trust differ and to test the cyclical effects of the two constructs.

In addition to the behavioral outcome differences of attitudes and trust, the current study also assessed the differences between federal and local authority attitude and trust judgments. Previous studies have mostly explored attitudes toward and trust in federal authorities. The few studies that have examined attitudes toward and trust in local authorities make limited comparisons to federal authorities (Rahn & Rudolph, 2005; Zhang & Wang, 2010). The measured variable path model relationships and mediations between attitudes, trust, and compliance to authority recommendations suggest largely the same effects for federal and local authorities but mean difference results suggest possibility of differences. Attitudes toward and trust in local authorities were lower than federal authorities which is in contrast to previous findings in which local judgments were more positive than federal judgments (Jennings, 1998; Rahn & Rudolph, 2005; Torney-Purta, Richardson, & Barber, 2004). The current study focused on federal and local trust in authorities for protection against an external threat, which has not been previously examined. When examining the effects of external threats, people may be more inclined to trust the federal authorities more than local authorities because of the possibility of widespread consequences that only federal authorities can handle such as a national terrorist attack. Thus, the type of threat can also influence which authority type will be trusted more for protection. In addition, attribution of responsibility before, during, after the crisis and which authorities are blamed for not preventing the crisis are also important factors related to trust in authorities and can vary depending on the threat type.

The current study revealed that trust in federal authorities was lower for the threat of cartel violence than with the threat of terrorism and these results were elucidated when
examining the exploratory attribution of responsibility findings. For cartel violence, people trusted the federal authorities more than the local authorities for protection against the threat, they expected both federal and local authorities to deal with the problems before the threat, expected federal authorities to deal with the problems during and after the threat, and held the local authorities more responsible in not preventing the threatening event if it occurred. For terrorism, people trusted the federal authorities more than the local authorities for protection against the threat, expected the federal authorities to deal with the problems before, during, and after the threat, and also held federal authorities more responsible in not preventing the threatening event if it occurred. Thus, for cartel violence people perceived both the federal and local authorities to play critical roles when dealing with the threat but for terrorism people perceived the federal authorities to play a more important role than local authorities. These findings extend previous research on attribution of responsibility and blame during different phases of Hurricane Katrina (Gomez & Wilson, 2008; Schneider, 2008). However, previous research did not examine how attribution of responsibility and blame were related to trust in authorities for protection against future threats. Thus, the exploratory findings of the current study suggest that when assessing attribution of responsibility and blame it is also important to examine trust in authorities. It is important for the public to understand the roles of local, state, and national government agencies during the possibility of an external threat so there are no misperceptions (Schneider, 2008. Misperceptions of authority roles can lead people to view the authorities as incompetent and failures at doing their job. These negative evaluations can decrease trust in authorities for protection against future threats and ultimately decrease people’s compliance to authority recommendations to prepare for the threat. Thus, it is critical that
authorities educate the public about their roles in times of an external threat to decrease possible negative consequences of misperceptions.

The prevalence of external threats can differ by city, state, region, or country so it is important to take into consideration the local population and the local political climate when assessing the effects of external threats. El Paso’s local population is unique because of its location on the border of Juárez, Mexico where drug cartel violence is ceaseless and there have not been any empirical studies examining how the threat of cartel violence influences judgments, emotions, and behaviors. When examining external threats, researchers have primarily focused on terrorism and natural disasters. Exploring the effects of cartel violence threat and comparing it to terrorism threat not only adds to the literature on terrorism but also extends the previous findings to a different kind of external threat that exists on the border population of Juárez and El Paso. Consistent with previous terrorism and criminal violence findings (Wray, et al., 2006), the current study found that when a future threat of terrorism or a cartel violence is posed people have decreased attitude and trust judgments of authorities. Thus, the threat itself influences perceptions of authorities.

Although many El Paso residents have been affected by the cartel violence, others are only have knowledge of the violence but no personal experience with it. So the threat of violence spilling over to El Paso is more severe for some people than for others. Furthermore, people may have more positive judgments of American authorities than Mexican authorities but the current study did not assess judgments of Mexican authorities. If the drug cartel violence spilled over into El Paso, people are more likely to trust American federal authorities for protection than local El Paso authorities. This relationship is the same for the threat of terrorism, thus American federal authorities are judged to be more capable of protection than El Paso local authorities.
However, if the study was conducted in Juárez, there may not be a difference between federal and local judgments due to corruption at both levels of government. Since satisfaction of government services influences trust in government (Boukaert & Van de Walle, 2001; Kumlin, 2002), the ongoing violence may have lead people to distrust all authorities since the authorities have not been successful at completely preventing the violence. This relationship is expected to be the same in other countries with widespread violence such as Iraq and Afghanistan.

In contrast to a continuous crisis, most crises are sudden and short-lived. Depending on the context of the event, people may have more positive judgments toward local authorities than federal authorities. For example, during the recent April, 2013 Boston bomb attacks, federal authorities were not aware of the planned attack and were not able to prevent its occurrence and local authorities were very responsive after the attack. Thus, Boston residents may have more positive judgments of local authorities than federal authorities and trust the local authorities more than federal authorities for protection against future attacks. This effect may also depend on attribution of responsibility in which federal authorities may be seen as more responsible and blamed more than local authorities for not preventing the attack. Thus, the context of the external threat and authority responsiveness to the crisis are critical factors that can influence trust in authorities for protection against a future threat and should be further examined.

The current study also examined the negative emotional responses to cartel violence and terrorism threat. Results revealed that previous threat experience and perception of threat severity were positively related to anger and fear elicited by the threat, which is consistent with previous findings (Arian & Gordon, 1993; Huddy et al., 2005; Zaalberg et al., 2009). However, threat experience, anger, and fear did not influence trust in federal and local authorities for protection against the threat, and therefore these factors were not antecedents of trust in
authorities for protection against external threats as expected. Instead fear directly predicted federal and local compliance to authority recommendations instead of being mediated by trust while anger had no effect on compliance. This is an important finding that extends previous research in which fear increased precautionary planning but anger had the opposite effect (Lerner et al, 2003). The non-significant effect of anger to compliance to authority recommendations may suggest that people who respond in anger are more likely to engage in risk seeking behaviors instead of risk aversive behaviors when posed with a future threat. So anger may effect revengeful behaviors such as supporting military action against the drug cartels or the terrorists as found in previous terrorist research (Skitka et al. 2006). Furthermore, trust in authorities abilities may impact the relationship between anger and military support. For example, people who respond in more anger to cartel violence threat may be more likely to trust the military’s abilities to capture the drug cartels and thus also support military action against the drug cartels. Thus, examining other types of behaviors would further elucidate the different behavioral outcomes anger and fear predict in response to a future crisis.

A strength of the current study was the inclusion of community samples in addition to student samples which provided a better representation of the local El Paso population. Exploratory analyses were conducted to determine whether there were sample differences in the proposed measured variable path analysis (Model 1) by creating a community sample dummy variable and comparing it to the student sample for emotions, attitudes, trust, compliance and political behaviors. The model did a good job of explaining the data and revealed three sample differences. The community sample had less positive attitudes toward local authorities than the student sample ($B = -1.74, SE = .79, p < .01$), had decreased trust in local authorities than the student sample ($B = -2.59, SE = 1.00, p < .01$) and were more politically sophisticated than the
student sample ($B = 2.95, SE = .95, p < .001$). However, it should be noted that the standard errors of these estimates are large and thus the effects are likely to be poor estimates. So the strength of recruiting community participants was also limited for several reasons. First, the community sample was half the size of the student sample due to limited recruitment funds. And second, many community members were recruited from the university campus who were not Introduction to Psychology students because of the slow recruitment of community members from off-campus sites. Thus, to have a more accurate representation of community members, better recruitment methods must be utilized. Two other limitations of the current study should be noted. First, the causality of the constructs in the measured variable path analyses cannot be accurately determined since the study was a survey study and the only factor that was manipulated was type of external threat. Second, the negative emotion variables were positively skewed while attitudes, trust, and compliance variables were negatively skewed. Thus, people were not likely to have strong negative emotional reactions in response to the threat article, were less likely to have negative attitudes toward authorities, were less likely to have low trust in authorities for protection against a future threat, and were more likely to comply to authority recommendations. These findings could be only representative of the current sample and future studies could try to manipulate these constructs to have a greater range of responses.

The final noteworthy applied finding from the current study involves the factors that increase compliance to authority recommendations to prepare for a future threat. The current study revealed several factors that increase compliance to authority recommendations. Federal and local compliance to authority recommendations is increased when people perceive the threat as more severe, when people respond in more fear to the future threat, when people have positive attitudes toward authorities, and when people trust in authorities for protection against the threat.
Public safety is the primary concern when there is a possibility of an external threat. Being able to avoid or lessen the negative consequences an external threat can cause depends on whether people take the appropriate measures to prepare for the crisis. Government authorities are responsible in protecting the public and thus provide critical recommendations to ensure their safety. Thus, when people are more likely to comply with these recommendations, they are less likely to experience the negative consequences the threat can present. In conclusion, the findings from this study can be utilized to further investigate the effects of external threats on judgments, emotions and behaviors. External threats are widespread and will continue to play a role in people’s lives. Any effort to decrease the negative consequences of these extremely harmful events can be beneficial to society as a whole.
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Appendix A
Preliminary Study 2 - Threat Induction Scenarios

**Cartel Threat Scenario**
You are at home watching the news when a reporter states that the drug cartel has made a threat to demonstrate their power by increasing the number of kidnappings for ransom in Ciudad Juarez, Mexico. If this were to occur, the resulting harm to the kidnapped could involve being badly injured or killed, adding to Mexico’s 40,000 drug-related homicides in the last five years.

**Terrorism Threat Scenario**
You are at home watching the news when a reporter states that a well-known terrorist organization has made a threat to demonstrate their power by infecting the water supply with a chemical that makes those who drink the infected water very sick, and may be fatal. If this were to occur, the resulting harm is expected to be severe and, in some cases, fatal.

**Natural Disaster Threat Scenario**
It is winter and you are at home watching the news when a reporter states that your area may be threatened by an ice storm over the next few days, with below freezing temperatures, causing power outages and water pipes to freeze. If this were to occur, the resulting effects are expected to be rolling blackouts, no water supply, icy roads, and traffic accidents.
Appendix B
Preliminary Study 2 - Cognitive Appraisal Questionnaire

1. In the scenario that you just read, to what extent do you typically feel that someone other than yourself has the ability to influence what might happen?

   Not at all   Very Much
   0           1           2           3           4           5           6

2. In the scenario that you just read, to what extent do you typically feel that someone else is to blame for what might happen in the situation?

   Not at all   Very Much
   0           1           2           3           4           5           6

3. In the scenario that you just read, to what extent are the events beyond anyone's control?

   Not at all   Very Much
   0           1           2           3           4           5           6

4. In the scenario that you just read, how well do you understand what might happen in the situation?

   Not at all   Very Much
   0           1           2           3           4           5           6

5. In the scenario that you just read, how uncertain are you about what might happen in various situations?

   Not at all   Very Much
   0           1           2           3           4           5           6

6. In the scenario that you just read, how well can you typically predict what is going to happen next?

   Not at all   Very Much
   0           1           2           3           4           5           6
Appendix C
Preliminary Study 3 - Emotion Threat Induction Articles

Cartel Anger Threat Scenario

On the other side of the César Chávez Border Highway lies the city of Ciudad Juárez, one of the most violent cities in the world as a result of the cartel drug war. Mexico has had 45,000 cartel related homicides since 2005. Since 2007, kidnappings have increased by 188%, armed robbery by 47%, and extortion by 101%. The violence has particularly affected the city of Juárez compared to other Mexican cities, with a record of 9,400 victims since 2008. One of the bloodiest years in the war was 2011 with an estimated 3,400 people killed in Juárez.

There has also been a sharp increase in drug-related violence in several US cities as the war against the Mexican drug cartels reaches catastrophic levels of violence across the border. “Violence from Mexican drug cartels has spilled over into El Paso and other parts of Texas”, said the Texas Homeland Security Director Steve McCraw on Monday. “Yes, I’m absolutely certain that it has occurred; there’s no question about it” McCraw said.

Many El Paso residents have family and business ties in Juárez and often commute back and forth between the two cities. The University of Texas-El Paso sits only a few hundred yards away from the line that straddles the neighboring countries. During the 2010-2011 school year, 1,400 Mexican nationals were enrolled, many crossing the border everyday. Many of these residents and students are already experiencing the negative affects of the violence. However, just recently the drug cartel threatened to demonstrate their power by extorting El Paso businesses and kidnapping El Paso residents for ransom. If this were to occur, it could significantly increase the number of drug-related homicides and crimes in El Paso, negatively affecting many more people on this side of the border.

The spill over of violence to El Paso has angered many people such as university student Alejandro Hernandez. “I am outraged that so many innocent people are being killed who have nothing to do with the drug war,” said Alejandro. “My uncle was shot multiple times and died at the scene. He was only 32 years old and left behind a young wife and an 8 year old son. It makes me so angry to know that the only reason he died is because he was at the wrong place at the wrong time.”

Yet the anger isn’t only about innocent people dying— it’s also about being set up by the Mexican cartels to smuggle drugs. American teenagers are being recruited by Mexican drug cartels to carry drugs across the U.S.-Mexico border, Texas law enforcement officials say. Over the past 10 years, 476 juveniles have been caught with drugs at a port of entry in El Paso County and 302 of them were U.S. citizens, according to the El Paso County attorney’s office. Involving children is what makes many people angry because they are innocent and become victims of the violence. The violence has affected thousands of people and continues to pose a threat to the border population.

The drug cartel violence has evoked a lot of emotion in people. We are particularly interested in what makes you most ANGRY about future violence. Please write 2-3 paragraphs describing in detail the one thing that makes you most ANGRY about future violence. Write as detailed a description of that thing as possible. If you can, write your description so that someone reading it might even get ANGRY from learning about the situation.

What aspect of future drug cartel violence makes you the most ANGRY?
Why does it make you so ANGRY?
Cartel Fear Threat Scenario

On the other side of the César Chávez Border Highway lies the city of Ciudad Juárez, one of the most violent cities in the world as a result of the cartel drug war. Mexico has had 45,000 cartel related homicides since 2005. Since 2007, kidnappings have increased by 188%, armed robbery by 47%, and extortion by 101%. The violence has particularly affected the city of Juárez compared to other Mexican cities, with a record of 9,400 victims since 2008. One of the bloodiest years in the war was 2011 with an estimated 3,400 people killed in Juárez.

There has also been a sharp increase in drug-related violence in several US cities as the war against the Mexican drug cartels reaches catastrophic levels of violence across the border. “Violence from Mexican drug cartels has spilled over into El Paso and other parts of Texas”, said the Texas Homeland Security Director Steve McCraw on Monday. “Yes, I’m absolutely certain that it has occurred; there’s no question about it” McCraw said.

Many El Paso residents have family and business ties in Juárez and often commute back and forth between the two cities. The University of Texas-El Paso sits only a few hundred yards away from the line that straddles the neighboring countries. During the 2010-2011 school year, 1,400 Mexican nationals were enrolled, many crossing the border everyday. Many of these residents and students are already experiencing the negative affects of the violence. However, just recently the drug cartel threatened to demonstrate their power by extorting El Paso businesses and kidnapping El Paso residents for ransom. If this were to occur, it could significantly increase the number of drug-related homicides and crimes in El Paso, negatively affecting many more people on this side of the border.

The spill over of violence to El Paso has made many people fearful such as university student Alejandro Hernandez. “I fear that my family might get hurt or killed. Most of my family lives in Juárez and when I hear stories about the violence I think that it could have been a member of my family.” Not only is Alejandro worried about his family, but he is also scared for his own life. “I’m afraid that I might get robbed or struck by bullets in a crossfire or maybe even kidnapped.”

Yet the panic isn’t only about being robbed or being shot– it’s the fear of being set up by the Mexican cartels to smuggle drugs. American teenagers are being recruited by Mexican drug cartels to carry drugs across the U.S.-Mexico border, Texas law enforcement officials say. Over the past 10 years, 476 juveniles have been caught with drugs at a port of entry in El Paso County and 302 of them were U.S. citizens, according to the El Paso County attorney’s office. Involving children is what makes many people scared because they are innocent and become victims of the violence. The violence has affected thousands of people and continues to pose a threat to the border population.

The drug cartel violence evoked a lot of emotion in people. We are particularly interested in what makes you most AFRAID about future violence. Please write 2-3 paragraphs describing in detail the one thing that makes you most AFRAID about future violence. Write as detailed a description of that thing as possible. If you can, write your description so that someone reading it might even get AFRAID from learning about the situation.

What aspect of future drug cartel violence makes you the most AFRAID? Why does it make you so AFRAID?
Terrorism Anger Threat Scenario

On September 11, 2001, 19 militants associated with the Islamic extremist group al-Qaeda hijacked four airliners and carried out suicide attacks against targets in the United States. Two of the planes were flown into the World Trade Center towers in New York City, a third plane hit the Pentagon just outside Washington, D.C., and the fourth plane crashed in a field in Pennsylvania. Referred to as 9/11, these attacks resulted in extensive death and destruction. Over 3,000 people were killed during the attacks in New York City and Washington, D.C., including more than 400 police officers and firefighters.

After 9/11 Fort Bliss was at a heightened state of security since it is the home of the United States Army Air Defense Artillery Center. It has served as one of the major deployment centers for troops bound for Iraq and Afghanistan. More than 40,000 military personnel have been deployed and redeployed from Fort Bliss since 9/11. “Fort Bliss is critical in the war on terror,” Governor Rick Perry said at a news conference in front of more than 200 National Guard soldiers preparing to deploy to Iraq. Since 9/11, 53 Fort Bliss soldiers have been killed in Afghanistan and Iraq.

The security at Fort Bliss was increased after the announcement of bin Laden’s death. "Threats to the security at Fort Bliss are a possibility," Major General Dana J.H. Pittard said. There are 27,000 soldiers on post, and Pittard said there could be as many as 34,000 in the next couple of years. This makes Fort Bliss susceptible to terrorism threats especially since the new al Qaeda chief Ayman al-Zawahiri, Osama bin Laden’s successor, pledged to avenge bin Laden’s death and plots to attack America again.

The threat of future attacks has angered many people such as university student Alejandro Hernandez. “My uncle worked at the World Trade Center’s north tower. I am outraged that he and so many other innocent people died for nothing. He was only 32 years old and left behind a young wife and an 8 year old son. It makes me so angry to know that another terrorist attack could kill more innocent people.” UTEP students are a part of the so-called 9/11 Generation, composed of people who were children during the terrorist attacks. “It angers me to think that my kids might grow up in another 9/11 generation like me. Children should not have to grow up in place where thousands of innocent people can get killed at any moment,” said another student.

Yet the anger isn’t only about innocent people dying– it’s also about how people’s daily lives have changed. Rosa Reyes says, “9/11 has influenced our safety, security, and personal freedom. Flying used to be so easy. Now flying is the biggest hassle that I don’t even want to plan family vacations where we have to fly. Americans don’t have the personal liberties like we use to before 9/11.” Terrorism has affected thousands of people and continues to pose a threat in our society.

The terrorist attacks evoked a lot of emotion in people. We are particularly interested in what makes you most ANGRY about future attacks. Please write 2-3 paragraphs describing in detail the one thing that makes you most ANGRY about future attacks. Write as detailed a description of that thing as possible. If you can, write your description so that someone reading it might even get ANGRY from learning about the situation.

What aspect of future terrorist attacks makes you the most ANGRY?
Why does it make you so ANGRY?
Terrorism Fear Threat Scenario

On September 11, 2001, 19 militants associated with the Islamic extremist group al-Qaeda hijacked four airliners and carried out suicide attacks against targets in the United States. Two of the planes were flown into the World Trade Center towers in New York City, a third plane hit the Pentagon just outside Washington, D.C., and the fourth plane crashed in a field in Pennsylvania. Referred to as 9/11, these attacks resulted in extensive death and destruction. Over 3,000 people were killed during the attacks in New York City and Washington, D.C., including more than 400 police officers and firefighters.

After 9/11 Fort Bliss was at a heightened state of security since it is the home of the United States Army Air Defense Artillery Center. It has served as one of the major deployment centers for troops bound for Iraq and Afghanistan. More than 40,000 military personnel have been deployed and redeployed from Fort Bliss since 9/11. “Fort Bliss is critical in the war on terror,” Governor Rick Perry said at a news conference in front of more than 200 National Guard soldiers preparing to deploy to Iraq. Since 9/11, 53 Fort Bliss soldiers have been killed in Afghanistan and Iraq.

The security at Fort Bliss was increased after the announcement of bin Laden’s death. "Threats to the security at Fort Bliss are a possibility," Major General Dana J.H. Pittard said. There are 27,000 soldiers on post, and Pittard said there could be as many as 34,000 in the next couple of years. This makes Fort Bliss susceptible to terrorism threats especially since the new al Qaeda chief Ayman al-Zawahiri, Osama bin Laden’s successor, pledged to avenge bin Laden’s death and plots to attack America again.

The threat of another terrorist attack at Fort Bliss or other parts of America has made many people fearful such as university student Alejandro Hernandez. “I fear that my family might get hurt or killed. My uncle is stationed at Fort Bliss and it’s scary to imagine that his life and many other lives could be taken away in an instant as before.” Another student had similar concerns, “I fear that me or one of my loved ones or even acquaintances will be a victim of a terrorist attack. Whether I am traveling a few miles to see my aunt, flying in an airplane for a vacation, or walking to the store, being a victim is always in the back of my mind.”

Yet the panic isn’t only about a terrorist attack, it’s the fear that family and friends who are deployed will never return home. Rosa Reyes and her 6-year-old daughter await the return of her husband who has been deployed for 3 years. “I don’t know what I’ll do if my husband doesn’t come back alive. Every time the doorbell rings, my heart stops cause I think it’s someone here to tell me that my husband is dead.” Terrorism has affected thousands of people and continues to pose a threat in our society.

The terrorist attacks evoked a lot of emotion in people. We are particularly interested in what makes you most AFRAID about future attacks. Please write 2-3 paragraphs describing in detail the one thing that makes you most AFRAID about future attacks. Write as detailed a description of that thing as possible. If you can, write your description so that someone reading it might even get AFRAID from learning about the situation.

What aspect of future terrorist attacks makes you the most AFRAID?
Why does it make you so AFRAID?
Natural Disaster Anger Threat Scenario

Flash flood warnings were issued after three days of continuous rain in the border city of El Paso during the summer of 2006. Rain soaked the area every day for a total of three weeks. The rain sent floodwaters through the city, triggering flash floods and rockslides, which forced hundreds of residents to evacuate their homes. “The city typically receives less than 10 inches of rain a year. Parts of El Paso received up to 15 inches of rain since that year, with nearly all of that falling in one week”, said Roger Mead with the National Weather Service.

The flooding destroyed as many as 300 homes and caused major damage to 455 other homes. “The damage caused an estimated $100 million in damage with about half of the damage occurring on the west side of the city, where quickly rising water and rock slides flooded homes and washed out roads”, Mayor John Cook said. One flood-related death was reported when a contractor clearing a flooded road was hit by a tractor-trailer, authorities said.

Officials said the aging dam across the U.S.-Mexico border became dangerously close to breaking and sending a tidal wave into the city. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers said the dam would not hold another flood like the one in 2006. If another flood like occurs, all of downtown and surrounding areas would be flooded causing even more severe damage to El Paso.

Many people lost most of their worldly possessions such as their houses and cars and had to move to a new and more expensive rental property. Alejandro Hernandez saw his car being swept away from his second story apartment. “I’m so mad that my new car that I saved up for months was completely gone and I couldn’t do anything about it.” Parts of the city were turned into disaster areas with water flowing down Mesa Street so deep and fast that large dumpsters and trucks were floating down the street.

Rosa Reyes and her 6-year-old daughter had to evacuate their mobile home. She was furious that they were harder hit than their neighbors because their mobile home was made of wood, while the siding on other families’ homes was made of metal. They were the only ones who had to evacuate their home from their trailer park and stay at the convention center for days. “I don’t even have the money to fix our home and now we have to move to a more expensive apartment.”

Only two years later similar floods occurred on Castellano Street and Mesa Street angering many people that a repeat of the 2006 flood would occur. As rain fell water levels quickly began to rise turning the street into a swift-moving river and destroying a wall. “There is a high possibility that there will be another severe flash flood this year due to the changing weather patterns over the globe”, said Mead from the National Weather Service, which could cause major damage to El Paso again.

The 2006 flood evoked a lot of emotion in people. We are particularly interested in what makes you most ANGRY about future floods. Please write 2-3 paragraphs describing in detail the one thing that makes you most ANGRY about future floods. Write as detailed a description of that thing as possible. If you can, write your description so that someone reading it might even get ANGRY from learning about the situation.

What aspect of future floods makes you the most ANGRY?
Why does it make you so ANGRY?
Natural Disaster Fear Threat Scenario

Flash flood warnings were issued after three days of continuous rain in the border city of El Paso during the summer of 2006. Rain soaked the area every day for a total of three weeks. The rain sent floodwaters through the city, triggering flash floods and rockslides, which forced hundreds of residents to evacuate their homes. “The city typically receives less than 10 inches of rain a year. Parts of El Paso received up to 15 inches of rain since that year, with nearly all of that falling in one week,” said Roger Mead with the National Weather Service.

The flooding destroyed as many as 300 homes and caused major damage to 455 other homes. “The damage caused an estimated $100 million in damage with about half of the damage occurring on the west side of the city, where quickly rising water and rock slides flooded homes and washed out roads”, Mayor John Cook said. One flood-related death was reported when a contractor clearing a flooded road was hit by a tractor-trailer, authorities said.

Officials said the aging dam across the U.S.-Mexico border became dangerously close to breaking and sending a tidal wave into the city. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers said the dam would not hold another flood like the one in 2006. If another flood like occurs, all of downtown and surrounding areas would be flooded causing even more severe damage to El Paso.

Over 22,000 calls were received through 911 during the high point of storm activity. At least 60 people fearing for their lives were rescued, some standing on rooftops and others atop cars. Alejandro Hernandez was stranded in his second story apartment on his own for 3 days. “I was lucky that I had enough food and water but other people may not have been so lucky and could have suffered.” Parts of the city were turned into disaster areas with water flowing down Mesa Street so deep and fast that large dumpsters and trucks were floating down the street. Nearly 1,000 El Paso residents sought refuge in the city’s convention center for days until it was safe to allow them to return home.

Rosa Reyes was given five minutes to evacuate with her 6-year-old daughter and a neighboring family after a rock wall behind her home collapsed. The tumbling wall punched a hole in the side of a house. "The material things can be replaced but I feared for my daughter’s life,” she said. "It sure didn’t feel like five minutes.”

Only two years later similar floods occurred on Castellano Street and Mesa Street triggering fears of a repeat of the 2006 floods. As rain fell water levels quickly began to rise turning the street into a swift-moving river and destroying a wall. “There is a high possibility that there will be another severe flash flood this year due to the changing weather patterns over the globe”, said Mead from the National Weather Service, which could cause major damage to El Paso again.

The 2006 flood evoked a lot of emotion in people. We are particularly interested in what makes you most AFRAID about future floods. Please write 2-3 paragraphs describing in detail the one thing that makes you most AFRAID about future floods. Write as detailed a description of that thing as possible. If you can, write your description so that someone reading it might even get AFRAID from learning about the situation.

What aspect of future floods makes you the most AFRAID?
Why does it make you so AFRAID?
Appendix D  
Preliminary Study 3 - Emotion Self-Report

Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements:

Currently, I feel…

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Angry
   Not at all
   1

2. Mad
   Not at all
   1

3. Furious
   Not at all
   1

4. Irritated
   Not at all
   1

5. Frustrated
   Not at all
   1

6. Disgusted
   Not at all
   1

7. Repulsed
   Not at all
   1

8. Grossed out
   Not at all
   1

9. Sad
   Not at all
   1

10. Upset
    Not at all
    1
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Downhearted</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Fearful</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Nervous</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Anxious</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Engaged</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Interested</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Amused</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Determined</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Proud</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Inspired</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E
Preliminary Study 3 - Risk Perception Questionnaire

1. What is your perception of the severity of the threat?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all serious</th>
<th>Not serious</th>
<th>Somewhat serious</th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Very Serious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What is the likelihood of you relocating if the event were to occur?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Possible</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What is the likelihood of you securing your home if the event were to occur?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Possible</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. What is the likelihood of you changing your daily activities if the event were to occur?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Possible</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Detailed Community Recruitment Information

To recruit El Paso community members for the current study, the researcher or research assistants contacted 27 recruitment sites in person, by phone, or by email. Out of the 27 sites, 7 sites did not contact the researcher back (see Table 15 for site information), 5 sites did not grant permission (see Table 16 for site information), and 15 sites granted permission to recruit from their site (see Table 17 for site information). For the sites that granted permission to recruit, the organization’s appropriate superior (e.g., supervisor, pastor, manager) was first told about the study and then asked to read and sign the Off-Campus Site Recruitment Permission Letter (see Appendix G). They were given a copy of the letter and the researcher kept a signed copy. The study flyer was then posted at the site, left on a table at the site, handed out at the site, or emailed out to community members. At 2 sites (Ardovino’s Dessert Crossing Farmer’s Market and Chalk The Block Arts Festival), community members could sign-up for the study at the site by providing their name, phone number, email, and preference of how to complete the study (e.g., online or paper).

Additional recruitment strategies were utilized because of the slow and limited community response from off-campus recruitment sites and the limited time to gather data. One complementary method of recruitment was the snowball sampling technique, which is the method of participants who completed the study to refer someone else to take part in the study (Biernacki & Waldorf, 1981). This method is usually used to study specific samples of interest that are hard to reach. However, for the current study it was used not to get a specific type of sample but to get a community sample that met the eligibility criteria’s. This method was employed by telling participants after they completed the gift card information link the
following: “If your family or friends are also interested in participating in this study, please tell them to contact the researcher by phone or email. DO NOT forward the study email to them, which you received with the study link. Also, please do not reveal the details of the study to them which may bias their responses if they choose to participate in the study.” Another recruitment method consisted of the researcher sending an email with the flyer to the Psychology department faculty, graduate students, undergraduate lab members, and friends asking to recruit their family and friends by forwarding them the flyer (see Table 17). A final method of recruitment was recruiting UTEP faculty, staff, and students on campus (see Table 18 for campus recruitment information). The flyer was slightly modified to be relevant for the campus and posted in campus buildings (see Appendix I for flyer) and handed out at campus locations (see Appendix J for flyer) by the researcher and research assistants.

Community members who were interested in completing the study could contact the researcher by email, phone, or sign-up at the site location when applicable. A total of 325 community members contacted the researcher to participate in the study (258 emailed the researcher, 45 signed-up to participate in the study at a site location, 20 left a phone message, and 2 called and directly talked to a research assistant). These community members were sent an email, which included eligibility criteria’s to participate in the study, general information about the study, information about how they would receive their gift card, deadline date to complete the study (approximately in one week), and the consent form online link to begin the survey. One participant did not have an email address and came in person to take the survey on a laboratory computer. If participants did not complete the study by the deadline, a reminder email was sent to complete the study by the extended deadline date (approximately in one week). A total of 19 community members completed the survey \( n = 15 \) or signed the consent form \( n = 4 \) but did
not initially contact the researcher. Thus, these participants did not receive the initial email by the researcher. These participants can be attributed to the snowball effect and are assumed to have gotten access to the study link by receiving the email or consent form online link from another participant.

A total of 210 completed the gift card information link and were mailed their gift cards, but only 93 confirmed the receipt of their gift card. Because community participants did not contact the researcher about not receiving their gift cards, it is assumed that the 117 community participants that did not confirm the receipt of their gift card actually received their gift card but did not confirm it using the online link provided. A total of 134 out of the 344 community members did not complete the survey for one of the following reasons: they chose not to complete the survey ($n = 88$), they only completed the consent form ($n = 23$), the survey was already closed because the required number of participants had been met ($n = 6$), they had technical difficulties accessing the survey link ($n = 7$), or the community member could not be contacted back ($n = 10$).

Descriptives were assessed to determine whether demographics of participants differed for each recruitment type. Recruitment information for community participants was collected in the separate Gift Card Information link than the survey responses to ensure confidentiality. Because the recruitment type was asked at the end of the study, this information was only available for participants who completed the Gift Card Information link. The survey response data set and the recruitment type data set had to be matched to determine whether demographics differed by recruitment type.\textsuperscript{26} The data sets were matched by using the date and time that the survey was completed and the date and time that the Gift Card Information link was started.

\textsuperscript{26}Participants’ name and address from the Gift Card Information data set were first deleted before matching recruitment type information to the survey response data set.
because they were completed in succession. For example, if the survey was completed on 8/11/2012 10:31:02 pm and the Gift Card Information link was started on 8/11/2012 10:31:30 pm, the two data responses were matched. This is not an ideal method to guarantee that each survey response is the exact match to the recruitment type but this was the only method to match them. Out of the 203 community survey responses, 199 recruitment type responses were matched. This left four community survey responses that did not have a recruitment type response. It is expected that these four participants completed the survey but did not complete the Gift Card Information link for unknown reasons. Recruitment type was coded into the following 6 categories: 1) UTEP Introduction to Psychology students, 2) off-campus site, 3) snowball method, 4) UTEP Psychology Department email, 5) UTEP campus, 6) other/unknown/unclear, and 7) not provided. Table 19 displays the participant demographics for each recruitment type.

Table 15

Recruitment Sites that Did Not Grant Permission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date of Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Walmart Supercenter</td>
<td>7555 N. Mesa</td>
<td>08/04/12 &amp; 10/3/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Target</td>
<td>801 Sunland Park</td>
<td>08/04/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Las Palmas Medical Center</td>
<td>1801 N. Oregon</td>
<td>9/12/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Library Judge Marquez</td>
<td>610 N. Yarbrough</td>
<td>11/21/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 YMCA El Paso Metropolitan Office</td>
<td>808 Montana Ave.</td>
<td>11/21/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16

Recruitment Sites that Did Not Contact Researcher Back

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date of Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Walmart Neighborhood Market</td>
<td>951 N. Resler</td>
<td>08/03/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Walgreens</td>
<td>2800 N. Mesa</td>
<td>08/04/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Walgreens</td>
<td>5900 N. Mesa</td>
<td>08/04/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Church of St. Clement</td>
<td>810 N. Campbell</td>
<td>08/04/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Library Main Downtown</td>
<td>501 N. Oregon</td>
<td>08/08/12, 08/10/12, &amp; 08/29/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Metropolitan Community Church</td>
<td>216 S. Ochoa</td>
<td>08/04/12, 08/29/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Professor at El Paso Community College (Northwest &amp; Transmountain Campus)</td>
<td>6701 South Desert Rd. &amp; 9570 Gateway Blvd. North</td>
<td>08/07/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 17

**Recruitment Site Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Recruitment Date</th>
<th>Recruitment Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library - Westside</td>
<td>125 Belvidere</td>
<td>08/08/12</td>
<td>Distributed: 25 flyers left on brochure table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library - Irving Schwartz</td>
<td>1865 Dean Martin</td>
<td>10/21/12</td>
<td>Distributed: 25 flyers left on brochure table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library - Esperanza Acosta Moreno</td>
<td>12480 Pebble Hills</td>
<td>11/19/12</td>
<td>Distributed: 25 flyers left on brochure table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library - Jose Cisneros Cielo Vista</td>
<td>1300 Hawkins</td>
<td>11/19/12</td>
<td>Distributed: 25 flyers left on brochure table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library - Ysleta</td>
<td>9321 Alameda</td>
<td>11/21/12</td>
<td>Distributed: 25 flyers left on brochure table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Aids Empowerment</td>
<td>800 Montana Ave.</td>
<td>08/14/12</td>
<td>Distributed: 25 flyers left on reception table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Pius X Church</td>
<td>1050 N. Clark</td>
<td>09/10/12</td>
<td>Distributed: 75 flyers given to council members to distribute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor at EPCC - Transmountain</td>
<td>9570 Gateway Blvd. North</td>
<td>09/07/12 to 09/14/12</td>
<td>Distributed: Flyers given by professor to 5 Introduction to Biology classes (Maximum students in all classes = 112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardovino’s Dessert Crossing Farmer’s Market &amp; 3rd Annual Brunch &amp; Barks</td>
<td>1 Ardovinos Dr.</td>
<td>10/06/12</td>
<td>Distributed: 44 flyers handed out from 9am-11:30am. 17 on-site sign-ups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardovino’s Dessert Crossing Farmer’s Market</td>
<td>1 Ardovinos Dr.</td>
<td>10/13/12</td>
<td>Distributed: 24 flyers handed out from 9:30am-10:30am. 14 on-site sign-ups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalk The Block Arts Festival</td>
<td>Arts Festival Plaza, San Jacinto Plaza and Cleveland Square Park</td>
<td>10/13/12</td>
<td>Distributed: 10 flyers handed out from 8pm-9pm. 13 on-site sign-ups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinleys Coffee House</td>
<td>2231 N. Mesa</td>
<td>09/07/12</td>
<td>Distributed &amp; Posted: 24 flyers left on brochure table &amp; 1 flyer posted under counter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA - Westside Family</td>
<td>7145 N. Mesa</td>
<td>08/08/12</td>
<td>Posted: 1 flyer posted in community room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA - Loya Family</td>
<td>2044 Trawood</td>
<td>11/21/12</td>
<td>Posted: 1 flyer posted in community room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity-First United Methodist Church</td>
<td>801 N. Mesa</td>
<td>08/08/12</td>
<td>Email: Flyer in weekly online newsletter emailed to members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Horak, professor at UTEP</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>08/10/12</td>
<td>Email: Flyer emailed to distribution list of friends, family, &amp; co-workers who live in Kern, Rim, Mission Hills neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Researcher</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>11/02/12</td>
<td>Email: Emailed flyer to Psychology Faculty, Graduate Students, Undergraduate lab members, and friends to email flyer to their family and friends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18

*UTEP Campus Recruitment Information*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Recruitment</th>
<th>Recruitment Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/15/12 to 11/20/12</td>
<td>Posted: 102 flyers posted in 29 campus buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/31/13 to 2/6/13</td>
<td>Posted: 111 flyers reposted in 28 campus buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/12 &amp; 12/10/12</td>
<td>Distributed: 150 flyers handed out at the Library, Union and Business Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/31/13, 2/1/13 &amp; 2/5/13</td>
<td>Distributed: 50 flyers handed out at Union and Liberal Arts building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 19

**Recruitment Type Frequencies and Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UTEP Intro Students</th>
<th>Off-Campus Site</th>
<th>Snowball</th>
<th>UTEP Psych Dept. Email</th>
<th>UTEP Campus</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Not Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Participants</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age</td>
<td>20.25</td>
<td>38.35</td>
<td>27.62</td>
<td>35.75</td>
<td>24.75</td>
<td>23.85</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average numbers of years lived in Juarez</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average % of Family &amp; Friends in Juarez</td>
<td>19.85</td>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>22.74</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.62</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average % of Family in Juarez</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average % of Friends in Juarez</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency %</th>
<th>Frequency %</th>
<th>Frequency %</th>
<th>Frequency %</th>
<th>Frequency %</th>
<th>Frequency %</th>
<th>Frequency %</th>
<th>Frequency %</th>
<th>Frequency %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juarez</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both El Paso &amp; Juarez</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived in Juarez Before</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UTEP Intro Students</td>
<td>UTEP Off-Campus Site</td>
<td>UTEP Snowball</td>
<td>UTEP Psych Dept. Email</td>
<td>UTEP Campus</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Not Provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency %</td>
<td>Frequency %</td>
<td>Frequency %</td>
<td>Frequency %</td>
<td>Frequency %</td>
<td>Frequency %</td>
<td>Frequency %</td>
<td>Frequency %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of days in Juarez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 days</td>
<td>321 82.5</td>
<td>34 91.9</td>
<td>44 95.7</td>
<td>13 81.3</td>
<td>66 90.4</td>
<td>22 81.5</td>
<td>3 75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>24 6.2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>3 18.8</td>
<td>2 2.7</td>
<td>3 11.1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>17 4.4</td>
<td>1 2.7</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>2 2.7</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>7 1.8</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 2.2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 1.4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>2 0.5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 2.2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 1.4</td>
<td>1 3.7</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>6 1.5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 1.4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 days</td>
<td>2 0.5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>4 1 1</td>
<td>1 2.7</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 3.7</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education - Some college or higher degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>281 72.2</td>
<td>33 89.2</td>
<td>40 86.9</td>
<td>16 100</td>
<td>70 95.9</td>
<td>27 100</td>
<td>3 75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Employee</td>
<td>16 4.1</td>
<td>3 8.1</td>
<td>2 4.3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>7 9.6</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government Employee</td>
<td>10 2.5</td>
<td>1 2.7</td>
<td>4 8.7</td>
<td>3 18.8</td>
<td>3 4.1</td>
<td>1 3.7</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government Employee</td>
<td>11 0.2</td>
<td>1 2.7</td>
<td>4 8.7</td>
<td>1 6.3</td>
<td>4 5.5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Affiliations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>155 39.8</td>
<td>23 62.1</td>
<td>21 45.6</td>
<td>6 37.5</td>
<td>39 53.4</td>
<td>14 51.9</td>
<td>3 75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>56 14.3</td>
<td>4 10.8</td>
<td>5 10.9</td>
<td>3 18.8</td>
<td>11 15.1</td>
<td>1 3.7</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>56 14.3</td>
<td>9 24.3</td>
<td>3 6.5</td>
<td>4 25</td>
<td>9 56.3</td>
<td>7 25.9</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9 2.3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>2 4.3</td>
<td>2 12.5</td>
<td>3 4.1</td>
<td>1 3.7</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>75 19.3</td>
<td>10 27</td>
<td>5 10.9</td>
<td>3 18.8</td>
<td>15 20.5</td>
<td>11 40.7</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>181 46.5</td>
<td>8 21.6</td>
<td>20 43.4</td>
<td>8 50</td>
<td>26 35.6</td>
<td>7 25.9</td>
<td>2 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>129 33.2</td>
<td>18 48.6</td>
<td>21 45.7</td>
<td>5 31.3</td>
<td>32 43.8</td>
<td>9 33.3</td>
<td>1 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>192 49.4</td>
<td>15 40.5</td>
<td>26 56.5</td>
<td>5 31.3</td>
<td>28 38.4</td>
<td>13 48.1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G

Off-Campus Site Recruitment Permission Letter

I give permission to Linsa Nishad Jabeen who is a graduate student at the University of Texas El Paso and her research assistants to recruit participants for her dissertation study at the location stated below. I understand flyers for the study to recruit participants will be distributed to people at the location stated below. I understand that the study is examining how cartel violence and terrorism affect the local communities’ trust in authority figures. I understand that community participants will receive a $10 gift card if they choose to participate in the study. I have also received a copy of this letter to keep for my records.

Recruitment Site: _________________________________

Address: __________________________________________

Phone Number: ______________________

Authorized by: ______________________________________

Position Title ______________________________________

Printed Name ______________________________________

Signature ___________________________ Date

Linsa Jabeen’s Contact Information:
Email: njabeen@utep.edu
Office Phone: 915-7474-5330
Cell Phone: 601-699-2024
Appendix H

UTEP RESEARCH STUDY

Are you interested in helping with a University of Texas at El Paso research study about issues that affect your community?

If so, you can participate in this study and receive a $10 Walmart gift card for 30-40 min of your time.

This study can be completed online using a computer or in paper and pencil format.

You will be asked to answer questions about yourself and several other questions about your thoughts and reactions to an issue that affects your community.

To participate in this study you:
MUST BE FLUENT IN READING AND WRITING ENGLISH & MUST BE 18 YEARS OR OLDER

Please contact Linsa Jabeen by email or phone within 2-3 days if you would like to participate in this study.

Email: njabeen@miners.utep.edu  Phone: 915-747-6560

If you complete the study online, you will be asked to provide your address so the gift card can be mailed to you. After receiving the gift card, you will be provided with an online link to confirm that you have received your gift card.

If you prefer to complete the study in paper and pencil format or do not have access to a computer to complete the study online, you can make an appointment to come to the UTEP Psychology Department to complete the study in person.
Appendix I

UTEP PSYCHOLOGY RESEARCH STUDY

Participate in this ONLINE research study
and receive a
$10 Walmart Gift Card

To participate in this study you:
MUST BE FLUENT IN READING AND WRITING ENGLISH &
MUST BE 18 YEARS OR OLDER

You CANNOT participate if you have already completed the
Authority Judgments study as an Introduction to Psychology student.

The study will take 30-40 min to complete.
You will be asked to answer questions about yourself and
several other questions about your thoughts and reactions
to an issue that affects your community.

After you complete the study, you will be asked to provide
your address so the gift card can be mailed to you.

Please email Linsa Jabeen within 2-3 days
if you would like to participate in this study.
Email: njabeen@miners.utep.edu  Phone: 915-747-6560
Appendix J

UTEP PSYCHOLOGY RESEARCH STUDY

Participate in this ONLINE research study and receive a $10 Walmart Gift Card

To participate in this study you:
MUST BE FLUENT IN READING AND WRITING ENGLISH & MUST BE 18 YEARS OR OLDER

You CANNOT participate if you have already completed the Authority Judgments study as an Introduction to Psychology student.

The study will take 30-40 min to complete.
You will be asked to answer questions about yourself and several other questions about your thoughts and reactions to an issue that affects your community.

After you complete the study, you will be asked to provide your address so the gift card can be mailed to you.

Please email Linsa Jabeen within 2-3 days if you would like to participate in this study.
Email: njabeen@miners.utep.edu Phone: 915-747-6560
Appendix K

Language History Questionnaire

This questionnaire is designed to give us a better understanding of your experience with the English language. We ask that you be as accurate and as thorough as possible when answering the following questions.

1. Native Country (not necessarily where you are a citizen, just where you think you are “from”). If you consider both the United States and Mexico your native country, please select the country that you identify with more.
   - United States
   - Mexico
   - Other ___________________

2. What language(s) do you consider your native language(s)?

__________________________________________________

3. What Language(s) are spoken at home? (Please check all that apply).
   - English
   - Spanish
   Other [Please explain]:

__________________________________________________

4. What Language did you learn first?
   - English
   - Spanish
   - Both at the same time
   - Other [Please explain]
   - ____________________

5. Estimate how often you communicate in English:
   - daily
   - several days a week
   - weekly
   - bi-weekly
   - monthly
   - every few months
   - once or twice a year
   - less than once or twice a year
6. In what contexts did you learn English? (check all that apply)
   - Home/family
   - Work
   - School
   - Media (TV, radio, internet, newspaper)

7. In what contexts do you communicate in English? (check all that apply)
   - Home/family
   - Work
   - School
   - Friends
   - Media (TV, radio, internet, newspaper)

8. At what age did you start learning English?
   - ___ Before 5 years of age
   - ___ Between 5-10 years of age
   - ___ Between 11-14 years of age
   - ___ After 14 years of age

9. Please rate how much you agree with each statement
   
a. English reading proficiency.
      I can read very well in English (1 = don’t agree and 10 = completely agree)
      1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   
b. English writing proficiency.
      I can write very well in English (1 = don’t agree and 10 = completely agree)
      1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   
c. English speaking ability.
      I can speak very well in English (1 = don’t agree and 10 = completely agree)
      1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   
d. English speech comprehension ability
      I can perfectly understand conversations in English (1 = don’t agree and 10 = completely agree)
      1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

10. In your opinion, how much of a foreign accent do you think you have when speaking English? (1 = not at all; 10 = very strong)
    1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
11. Please rate how frequently others identify you as a NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKER based on your accent? (1 = never; 10 = always)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

12. What percent of the time do you speak/interact in English? (0-100%) ________
Appendix L

Your government Question

Which country’s government do you consider to be “your” government? If you consider both the United States and Mexican government as “your” government, please select the country that you identify with more.

_____ United States government

_____ Mexican government
Appendix M

Baseline Attitude and Trust Question (Randomized)

The following questions ask you about your perceptions of federal and local authorities in the United States.

Examples of FEDERAL AUTHORITIES in the United States are: the President, the Vice President, Senators, Congressmen and Congresswomen, federal Judges, federal Police, the Military, Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, Border Patrol, Federal Bureau of Investigation, etc.

Examples of LOCAL AUTHORITIES in the United States are: Governor, Lieutenant Governor, state Senators, state House of Representatives, Mayor, members of the City Council, county Judges, local Police, state Police, Highway Patrol, Deputy Sheriffs, Firefighters, State Bureau of Investigation, etc.

1. To what extent is your attitude towards the United States’ FEDERAL AUTHORITIES negative/positive?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. To what extent is your attitude towards El Paso’s LOCAL AUTHORITIES negative/positive?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. An external threat is a natural or man-made occurrence that can cause potential harm to people’s lives such as natural disasters, terrorism, and criminal violence. Keep this definition in mind when answering the following question.

How much TRUST do you have in the United States’ FEDERAL AUTHORITIES to protect your community against an external threat?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distrust</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. An external threat is a natural or man-made occurrence that can cause potential harm to people’s lives such as natural disasters, terrorism, and criminal violence. Keep this definition in mind when answering the following question.

How much TRUST do you have in El Paso’s LOCAL AUTHORITIES to protect your community against an external threat?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distrust</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix N

Political Sophistication Measure

Please identify the positions held by the following people in the United States government.

1) What position does Joe Biden currently hold?

_______________________________________________________________________________  ____ don’t know

2) What position does Hillary Clinton currently hold?

_______________________________________________________________________________  ____ don’t know

3) What position does John G. Roberts, Jr. currently hold?

_______________________________________________________________________________  ____ don’t know

4) What position does Kay Bailey Hutchison currently hold?

_______________________________________________________________________________  ____ don’t know

5) What position does David Dewhurst currently hold?

_______________________________________________________________________________  ____ don’t know

6) What position does Greg Abbott currently hold?

_______________________________________________________________________________  ____ don’t know

7) Which party currently has the most members in the U.S. House of Representatives in Washington?

_______________________________________________________________________________  ____ don’t know

8) Which party currently has the most members in the Texas House of Representatives?

_______________________________________________________________________________  ____ don’t know
### Political Behavior Measure (Randomized)

This questionnaire is about political behaviors that people engage in. We are interested in political behaviors you are likely to do in the future.

1. How likely is it for you to vote in a public election?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No chance</th>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Moderate chance</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Definitely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How likely is it for you to persuade others to vote for a candidate or party?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No chance</th>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Moderate chance</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Definitely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How likely is it that you would wear a button or display a bumper sticker on your car, or place a sign in front of your house to show support for a candidate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No chance</th>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Moderate chance</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Definitely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How likely is it for you to volunteer in a political campaign?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No chance</th>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Moderate chance</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Definitely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How likely is it for you to contribute money to a candidate, a political party or any organization that supported candidates?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No chance</th>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Moderate chance</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Definitely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. How likely is it for you to contact a government or public official or agency to ask for assistance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No chance</th>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Moderate chance</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Definitely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. How likely is it for you to join a club or organization that deals with government and politics?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No chance</th>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Moderate chance</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Definitely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How likely is it for you to participate in a march or demonstration for a political cause?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No chance</th>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Moderate chance</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Definitely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. How likely is it for you to sign a paper or email petition about a social or political cause?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No chance</th>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Moderate chance</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Definitely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix P

Cartel Violence Article

Please read the following news article about an external threat.

Please read it VERY CAREFULLY and even MORE THAN ONCE if you need to because you will be asked several questions about the article in the rest of the survey.

The city of Ciudad Juárez is one of the most violent cities in the world as a result of the cartel drug war. Mexico has had 45,000 cartel related homicides since 2005. Since 2007, kidnappings have increased by 188%, armed robbery by 47%, and extortion by 101%. The violence has particularly affected the city of Juarez compared to other Mexican cities, with a record of 9,400 victims since 2008. One of the bloodiest years in the war was 2011 with an estimated 3,400 people killed in Juárez.

There has also been a sharp increase in drug-related violence in several US cities as the war against the Mexican drug cartels reaches catastrophic levels of violence across the border. “Violence from Mexican drug cartels has spilled over into El Paso and other parts of Texas”, said the Texas Homeland Security Director Steve McCraw on Monday. “Yes, I’m absolutely certain that it has occurred; there’s no question about it” McCraw said.

Many El Paso residents have family and business ties in Juárez and often commute back and forth between the two cities. The University of Texas-El Paso sits only a few hundred yards away from the line that straddles the neighboring countries. During the 2010-2011 school year, 1,400 Mexican nationals were enrolled, many crossing the border everyday.

Many El Paso residents and students are already experiencing the negative effects of the violence such as having their loved ones kidnapped or killed. However, just recently the drug cartel threatened to demonstrate their power by extorting El Paso businesses and kidnapping El Paso residents for ransom. If this were to occur, it would increase the number of drug-related homicides and crimes and negatively affect many more people in the border area. The drug cartel violence has affected thousands of people and continues to pose a threat to El Paso and the nation.
Appendix Q

Cartel Article Check Questions

The following questions are about the article you just read.

1. One of the bloodiest years in Ciudad Juárez was:
   ___ 2005
   ___ 2007
   ___ 2009
   ___ 2011

2. Did the article state that the violence has spilled over to El Paso and other parts of Texas?
   ___ Yes
   ___ No

3. As stated in the article, which negative effects have people experienced due to the violence?
   ___ Suicidal thoughts
   ___ Depression
   ___ People have had loved ones kidnapped or killed
   ___ Economic hardship

4. As stated in the article, which threat has the drug cartel made to demonstrate their power?
   ___ Kill the president of Mexico
   ___ Kidnap more people in Ciudad Juárez
   ___ Extort El Paso businesses and kidnap El Paso residents for ransom
   ___ Sell drugs to El Paso residents

5. Did the article state that the drug cartel violence continues to be a threat to El Paso and the nation?
   ___ Yes
   ___ No
Appendix R

Terrorism Article

Please read the following news article about an external threat.

Please read it VERY CAREFULLY and even MORE THAN ONCE if you need to because you will be asked several questions about the article in the rest of the survey.

The September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in the U.S. resulted in extensive death and destruction. Over 3,000 people were killed during the attacks in New York City and Washington, D.C. Since 9/11 there have been at least 45 known terrorist attacks plotted against Americans. “Even though the plots were unsuccessful the threat is definitely not gone,” said Professor Erik Dahl of the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey. The latest plot was by the branch of Al Qaeda in Yemen to smuggle an experimental bomb aboard an airliner bound for the U.S. in April 2012.

The plots have also changed from civilian-targeted terror threats to military targets such as the shooting spree at Fort Hood by Army Maj. Nidal Malik Hassan in 2009. The gunman killed 13 people and wounded 29 others, which was the worst shooting ever to take place on an American military base.

After 9/11, Fort Bliss was at a heightened state of security because it is the home of the United States Army Air Defense Artillery Center. It has served as one of the major deployment centers for troops bound for Iraq and Afghanistan making the base critical in the war on terror and very susceptible to a terrorist attack.

The security at Fort Bliss was also increased after the announcement of bin Laden’s death on May 2, 2011. “Threats to the security at Fort Bliss is certainly a possibility,” Major General Dana J.H. Pittard said. The new al Qaeda chief Ayman al-Zawahiri pledged to avenge bin Laden’s death and plots to attack America again, specifically targeting military bases. If a terrorist attack were to occur at Fort Bliss, it would increase the number of terrorism related deaths and negatively affect more people in the border area. Terrorism has affected thousands of people and continues to pose a threat to El Paso and the nation.
Appendix S

Terrorism Article Check Questions

The following questions are about the article you just read.

1. How many known terrorist attacks have been plotted against Americans since 9/11?
   ___ At least 15
   ___ At least 25
   ___ At least 35
   ___ At least 45

2. Did the article state that the plots have changed from civilian-targeted terror threats to military targets?
   ___ Yes
   ___ No

3. As stated in the article, why is Fort Bliss susceptible to a terrorist attack?
   ___ The president of American visits the base often
   ___ The base has nuclear bombs
   ___ The base is one of the major deployment centers for troops and is critical in the war
   ___ The base is a secret training center for Al Qaeda

4. As stated in the article, why does al Qaeda chief Ayman al-Zawahiri want to plot to attack America again, specifically targeting military bases?
   ___ To kill the president of America
   ___ To demonstrate al Qaeda’s power
   ___ To avenge bin Laden’s death
   ___ To achieve greater honor in his family

5. Did the article state that the terrorism continues to be a threat to El Paso and the nation?
   ___ Yes
   ___ No
Appendix T

Severity of Threat Questions (Randomized)

The following questions ask about how severe you think some types of external threats are in El Paso.

1. How severe do you think the threat of cartel violence is in El Paso?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all severe</th>
<th>Moderately severe</th>
<th>Very severe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How severe do you think the threat of a terrorist attack is in El Paso?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all severe</th>
<th>Moderately severe</th>
<th>Very severe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How severe do you think the threat of a natural disaster is in El Paso?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all severe</th>
<th>Moderately severe</th>
<th>Very severe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix U

Likelihood to Comply Measure

The following questions are about the cartel violence threat/terrorism threat you read about in the news article.

Specifically, we are interested in your decisions to follow the United States’ federal and local authority recommendations if the drug cartels planned to carry out their threat of extorting El Paso businesses and kidnapping El Paso residents for ransom.

The following questions are about the FEDERAL AUTHORITIES in the United States.

As a reminder, below are some examples of the FEDERAL AUTHORITIES in the United States.

Examples of FEDERAL AUTHORITIES in the United States are: the President, the Vice President, Senators, Congressmen and Congresswomen, federal Judges, federal Police, the Military, Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, Border Patrol, Federal Bureau of Investigation, etc.

1. What is the likelihood that you would follow the United State’s FEDERAL AUTHORITY recommendations to RELOCATE if the threatening event were to occur?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No chance</th>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Moderate chance</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Definitely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What is the likelihood that you would follow the United State’s FEDERAL AUTHORITY recommendations to SECURE YOUR HOME if the threatening event were to occur?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No chance</th>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Moderate chance</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Definitely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What is the likelihood that you would follow the United State’s FEDERAL AUTHORITY recommendations to CHANGE YOUR DAILY ACTIVITIES if the threatening event were to occur?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No chance</th>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Moderate chance</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Definitely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following questions are about El Paso’s LOCAL AUTHORITIES.

As a reminder, below are some examples of the United State’s LOCAL AUTHORITIES.

Examples of LOCAL AUTHORITIES in the United States are: Governor, Lieutenant Governor, state Senators, state House of Representatives, Mayor, members of the City Council, county Judges, local Police, state Police, Highway Patrol, Deputy Sheriffs, Firefighters, State Bureau of Investigation, etc.

4. What is the likelihood that you would follow El Paso’s LOCAL AUTHORITY recommendations to RELOCATE if the threatening event were to occur?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No chance</th>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Moderate chance</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Definitely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What is the likelihood that you would follow El Paso’s LOCAL AUTHORITY recommendations to SECURE YOUR HOME if the threatening event were to occur?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No chance</th>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Moderate chance</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Definitely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What is the likelihood that you would follow El Paso’s LOCAL AUTHORITY recommendations to CHANGE YOUR DAILY ACTIVITIES if the threatening event were to occur?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No chance</th>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Moderate chance</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Definitely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix V

Attitudes Toward Authorities Scale (Counterbalanced with TIAS)

The following questions ask about your attitudes toward the United States’ FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

Examples of people who are a part of the FEDERAL GOVERNMENT in the United States are: the President, the Vice President, Senators, Congressmen and Congresswomen, federal Judges, etc.

1. To what extent is your attitude towards the United States’ FEDERAL GOVERNMENT negative/positive?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. To what extent do you dislike/like the United States’ FEDERAL GOVERNMENT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dislike</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Like</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. To what extent is your attitude towards the United States’ FEDERAL GOVERNMENT bad/good?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following questions ask about your attitudes toward El Paso’s LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

Examples of people who are a part of the LOCAL GOVERNMENT in the United States are: Governor, Lieutenant Governor, state Senators, state House of Representatives, Mayor, members of the City Council, county Judges, etc.

4. To what extent is your attitude towards El Paso’s LOCAL GOVERNMENT negative/positive?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. To what extent do you dislike/like El Paso’s LOCAL GOVERNMENT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dislike</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Like</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. To what extent is your attitude towards El Paso’s LOCAL GOVERNMENT bad/good?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following questions ask about your attitudes toward the United States’ FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT.

Examples of people who are a part of the FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT in the United States are: federal Police, the Military, Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, Border Patrol, Federal Bureau of Investigation, etc.

7. To what extent is your attitude toward the United States’ FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT negative/positive?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. To what extent do you dislike/like the United States’ FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dislike</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Like</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. To what extent is your attitude toward the United States’ FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT bad/good?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following questions ask about your attitudes toward El Paso’s LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT.

Examples of people who are a part of the LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT in the United States are: local Police, state Police, Highway Patrol, Deputy Sheriffs, Firefighters, State Bureau of Investigation, etc.

10. To what extent is your attitude toward El Paso’s LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT negative/positive?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. To what extent do you dislike/like El Paso’s LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dislike</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Like</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. To what extent is your attitude toward El Paso’s LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT bad/good?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bad</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix W

**Trust in Authorities Scale (Counterbalanced with ATAS)**

The following questions are about the cartel violence threat/terrorism that you read about in the news article.

The following questions ask about your perceptions toward the United States’ FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

Examples of people who are a part of the FEDERAL GOVERNMENT in the United States are: the President, the Vice President, Senators, Congressmen and Congresswomen, federal Judges, etc.

1. How much **TRUST** do you have in the United States’ FEDERAL GOVERNMENT to protect your community against the threat of cartel violence/terrorism?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distrust</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How **COMPETENT** do you think the United States’ FEDERAL GOVERNMENT is to protect your community against the threat of cartel violence/terrorism?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incompetent</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Competent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How **HONEST** do you think the United States’ FEDERAL GOVERNMENT is to your community when handling the threat of cartel violence/terrorism?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dishonest</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Honest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How **SUPPORTIVE** of your community is the United States’ FEDERAL GOVERNMENT during the threat of cartel violence/terrorism?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsupportive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Supportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following questions ask about your perceptions toward El Paso’s LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

Examples of people who are a part of the LOCAL GOVERNMENT in the United States are: Governor, Lieutenant Governor, state Senators, state House of Representatives, Mayor, members of the City Council, county Judges, etc.

5. How much TRUST do you have in El Paso’s LOCAL GOVERNMENT to protect your community against the threat of cartel violence/terrorism?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distrust</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. How COMPETENT do you think El Paso’s LOCAL GOVERNMENT is to protect your community against the threat of cartel violence/terrorism?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incompetent</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Competent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How HONEST do you think El Paso’s LOCAL GOVERNMENT is to your community when handling the threat of cartel violence/terrorism?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dishonest</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Honest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How SUPPORTIVE of your community is El Paso’s LOCAL GOVERNMENT during the threat of cartel violence?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsupportive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Supportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following questions ask about your perceptions toward the United States’ FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT.

Examples of people who are a part of the FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT in the United States are: federal Police, the Military, Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, Border Patrol, Federal Bureau of Investigation, etc.

9. How much TRUST do you have in the United States’ FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT to protect your community against the threat of cartel violence/terrorism?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distrust</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. How COMPETENT do you think the United States’ FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT is to protect your community against the threat of cartel violence/terrorism?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incompetent</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Competent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How HONEST do you think the United States’ FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT is to your community when handling the threat of cartel violence/terrorism?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dishonest</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Honest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. How SUPPORTIVE of your community is the United States’ FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT during the threat of cartel violence/terrorism?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsupportive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Supportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following questions ask about your perceptions toward the El Paso’s LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT.

Examples of people who are a part of the LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT in the United States are: local Police, state Police, Highway Patrol, Deputy Sheriffs, Firefighters, State Bureau of Investigation, etc.

13. How much TRUST do you have in El Paso’s LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT to protect your community against the threat of cartel violence/terrorism?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distrust</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. How COMPETENT do you think El Paso’s LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT is to protect your community against the threat of cartel violence/terrorism?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incompetent</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Competent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. How HONEST do you think El Paso’s LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT is to your community when handling the threat of cartel violence/terrorism?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dishonest</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Honest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. How SUPPORTIVE of your community is El Paso’s LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT during the threat of cartel violence/terrorism?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsupportive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Supportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix X

Emotion Self-Report (Randomized)

The following questions are about the cartel violence/terrorism threat that you read about in the news article.

When responding to the questions, think back to how you actually felt while you were reading the article. Indicate the number on the scale that best describes the greatest amount of each emotion you felt at any time while reading the article.

1. How ANGRY did you feel?
   - Not at all
   - Moderately
   - Extremely
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. How MAD did you feel?
   - Not at all
   - Moderately
   - Extremely
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. How FURIOUS did you feel?
   - Not at all
   - Moderately
   - Extremely
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. How IRRITATED did you feel?
   - Not at all
   - Moderately
   - Extremely
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. How FRUSTRATED did you feel?
   - Not at all
   - Moderately
   - Extremely
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. How DISGUSTED did you feel?
   - Not at all
   - Moderately
   - Extremely
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. How REPULSED did you feel?
   - Not at all
   - Moderately
   - Extremely
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. How GROSSED OUT did you feel?
   - Not at all
   - Moderately
   - Extremely
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. How SAD did you feel?
   - Not at all
   - Moderately
   - Extremely
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10. How UPSET did you feel?
   Not at all  1  2  3  Moderately  4  5  6  Extremely  7

11. How DOWNHEARTED did you feel?
   Not at all  1  2  3  Moderately  4  5  6  Extremely  7

12. How FEARFUL did you feel?
   Not at all  1  2  3  Moderately  4  5  6  Extremely  7

13. How NERVOUS did you feel?
   Not at all  1  2  3  Moderately  4  5  6  Extremely  7

14. How ANXIOUS did you feel?
   Not at all  1  2  3  Moderately  4  5  6  Extremely  7

15. How ENGAGED did you feel?
   Not at all  1  2  3  Moderately  4  5  6  Extremely  7

16. How INTERESTED did you feel?
   Not at all  1  2  3  Moderately  4  5  6  Extremely  7

17. How AMUSED did you feel?
   Not at all  1  2  3  Moderately  4  5  6  Extremely  7

18. How DETERMINED did you feel?
   Not at all  1  2  3  Moderately  4  5  6  Extremely  7

19. How PROUD did you feel?
   Not at all  1  2  3  Moderately  4  5  6  Extremely  7

20. How INSPIRED did you feel?
   Not at all  1  2  3  Moderately  4  5  6  Extremely  7
The following questions are about the cartel violence/terrorism threat that you read about in the news article.

When responding to the questions, think back to how you actually felt while you were reading the article. Indicate the appropriate response on the number on the scale.

1. How DIFFICULT was it for you to read the article?
   - Not at all
   - Moderately
   - Extremely
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. How UNPLEASANT was it for you to read the article?
   - Not at all
   - Moderately
   - Extremely
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. How INTENSE was it for you to read the article?
   - Not at all
   - Moderately
   - Extremely
   
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Appendix Y

Cartel Condition - Attribution of Responsibility Questionnaire

The following questions are about the cartel violence/terrorism threat that you read about in the news article.

As a reminder,
Examples of people who are a part of the FEDERAL GOVERNMENT in the United States are: the President, the Vice President, Senators, Congressmen and Congresswomen, federal Judges, etc.

Examples of people who are a part of the LOCAL GOVERNMENT in the United States are: Governor, Lieutenant Governor, state Senators, state House of Representatives, Mayor, members of the City Council, county Judges, etc.

Examples of people who are a part of the FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT in the United States are: federal Police, the Military, Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, Border Patrol, Federal Bureau of Investigation, etc.

Examples of people who are a part of the LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT in the United States are: local Police, state Police, Highway Patrol, Deputy Sheriffs, Firefighters, State Bureau of Investigation, etc.

1. First, think about the time period BEFORE the cartel violence/terrorist attack occurs. Who should take the lead in dealing with problems during this time period? (Please select only one authority type)
   _____ United States’ Federal Government
   _____ El Paso’s Local Government
   _____ United State’s Federal Law Enforcement
   _____ El Paso’s Local Law Enforcement

2. How about the time period when the cartel violence/terrorist attack is OCCURRING? Who should take the lead in dealing with problems during this time period? (Please select only one authority type)
   _____ United States’ Federal Government
   _____ El Paso’s Local Government
   _____ United State’s Federal Law Enforcement
   _____ El Paso’s Local Law Enforcement

3. Finally, how about the time period IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING the cartel violence/terrorist attack? Who should take the lead in dealing with problems during this period? (Please select only one authority type)
   _____ United States’ Federal Government
   _____ El Paso’s Local Government
   _____ United State’s Federal Law Enforcement
   _____ El Paso’s Local Law Enforcement
The following questions are about the cartel violence/terrorism threat you read about in the news article.

Cartel Condition: If the drug cartels were successful at extorting El Paso businesses and kidnapping El Paso residents for ransom, we are interested in how much you think each authority figure would be responsible for failing to prevent the event.

Terrorism Condition: If al Qaeda was successful at attacking Fort Bliss, we are interested in how much you think each authority figure would be responsible for failing to prevent the event.

As a reminder,

Examples of people who are a part of the FEDERAL GOVERNMENT in the United States are: the President, the Vice President, Senators, Congressmen and Congresswomen, federal Judges, etc.

Examples of people who are a part of the LOCAL GOVERNMENT in the United States are: Governor, Lieutenant Governor, state Senators, state House of Representatives, Mayor, members of the City Council, county Judges, etc.

Examples of people who are a part of the FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT in the United States are: federal Police, the Military, Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, Border Patrol, Federal Bureau of Investigation, etc.

Examples of people who are a part of the LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT in the United States are: local Police, state Police, Highway Patrol, Deputy Sheriffs, Firefighters, State Bureau of Investigation, etc.

4. If the event were to occur, how responsible is the United States’ FEDERAL GOVERNMENT for failing to prevent the event?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all responsible</th>
<th>Moderately responsible</th>
<th>Very responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. If the event were to occur, how responsible is El Paso’s LOCAL GOVERNMENT for failing to prevent the event?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all responsible</th>
<th>Moderately responsible</th>
<th>Very responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. If the event were to occur, how responsible is the United States’ FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT for failing to prevent the event?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all responsible</th>
<th>Moderately responsible</th>
<th>Very responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. If the event were to occur, how responsible is El Paso’s LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT for failing to prevent the event?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all responsible</th>
<th>Moderately responsible</th>
<th>Very responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Z

Threat Experience Measure (Randomized)

The following questions ask about your experience with drug cartel violence/terrorism.

1. To what extent has the drug cartel violence/terrorism affected you personally?

   Not at all  1  2  3  Moderately  4  5  6  Very Much  7

2. To what extent has the drug cartel violence/terrorism affected your family?

   Not at all  1  2  3  Moderately  4  5  6  Very Much  7

3. To what extent has the drug cartel violence/terrorism affected your friends?

   Not at all  1  2  3  Moderately  4  5  6  Very Much  7

4. How negative has your experience been with the threat of drug cartel violence/terrorism?

   Not at all negative  1  2  3  Moderately negative  4  5  6  Very negative  7
Appendix AA

Demographics Questionnaire

The following are some demographic questions. Please indicate the appropriate response.

1) What is your gender?
   ___ Male
   ___ Female

2) What is your age? _______

3) Would you describe yourself as:
   ___ American Indian / Native American
   ___ Asian
   ___ Black / African American
   ___ Hispanic / Latino
   ___ White / Caucasian
   ___ Pacific Islander
   ___ Other
   Please specify: ____________

4) If Hispanic or Latino, are you a
   ___ Mexican National
   ___ Mexican American
   ___ Not Hispanic or Latino
   ___ Other
   Please specify: ____________

5) Where were you born?
   ___ El Paso, Texas
   ___ Ciudad Juárez, Mexico
   ___ Other
   Please specify: ______________

6) In what city do you currently live in?
   ___ El Paso, Texas
   ___ Ciudad Juárez, Mexico
   ___ Both El Paso, Texas and Ciudad Juárez, Mexico
   ___ Other
   Please specify: ______________
7) If you live in El Paso, which area do you live in?
   ___ Central El Paso (Downtown El Paso, Sunset Heights)
   ___ East El Paso (Ysleta)
   ___ Far East El Paso-Montana Vista
   ___ Mission Valley El Paso (Lower Valley and Ysleta, Texas)
   ___ Northwest El Paso (West El Paso or Upper Valley)
   ___ Northeast El Paso
   ___ West Central El Paso
   ___ Do not live in El Paso
   ___ Other:
      Please specify: __________________

7) How many years have you lived in the city you currently reside in? ______

8) If you currently do not live in Ciudad Juárez, Mexico, have you ever lived there before?
   ___ Yes
   ___ No
   ___ Currently live in Ciudad Juárez, Mexico

9) If you have ever lived in Ciudad Juárez, Mexico before, how many years did you live there for? If you have NEVER lived in Ciudad Juárez, Mexico, write 0 as your response.

   __________

10) How many days per week, on average are you in Ciudad Juárez?
    ___ 0 days
    ___ 1 day
    ___ 2 days
    ___ 3 days
    ___ 4 days
    ___ 5 days
    ___ 6 days
    ___ 7 days

11) What percentage of your family (approximately) lives in Ciudad Juárez? ______ %

12) What percentage of your friends (approximately) lives in Ciudad Juárez? ______ %

13) What is your marital status?
    ___ Single (never married)
    ___ Married
    ___ Separated
    ___ Widowed
    ___ Divorced
14) How many children do you have?
___ 0
___ 1
___ 2
___ 3
___ 4
___ More than 4

15) What is the highest level of education you completed?
___ No schooling completed
___ Elementary school only
___ Some high school, no diploma
___ High school graduate, diploma or the equivalent (for example: GED)
___ Some college credit, no degree
___ Associate degree
___ Bachelor’s degree
___ Some graduate work
___ Master’s degree
___ Professional degree
___ Ph.D

16) How would you describe your current employment status? (Check all that apply)
___ Employed full time
___ Employed part time
___ Unemployed / Looking for work
___ Student
___ Homemaker
___ Retired
___ Unable to work

17) Please describe your work. (Check all that apply)
___ Employee of a for-profit company or business or of an individual, for wages, salary, or commissions
___ Employee of a not-for-profit, tax-exempt, or charitable organization
___ Local government employee (city, county, etc.)
___ State government employee
___ Federal government employee
___ Self-employed in own not-incorporated business, professional practice, or farm
___ Self-employed in own incorporated business, professional practice, or farm
___ Working without pay in family business or farm
___ Not applicable (unemployed, student, homemaker, retired, or unable to work)
18) What is your total household income?
___ Less than $10,000
___ $10,000 to $19,999
___ $20,000 to $29,999
___ $30,000 to $39,999
___ $40,000 to $49,999
___ $50,000 to $59,999
___ $60,000 to $69,999
___ $70,000 to $79,999
___ $80,000 to $89,999
___ $90,000 to $99,999
___ $100,000 to $149,999
___ $150,000 or more

19) Generally speaking, how comfortable do you feel using a computer?
___ Very comfortable
___ Somewhat comfortable
___ Not very comfortable
___ Not at all comfortable

20) How often do you use the Internet?
___ Once or more a day
___ A few times a week
___ A few times a month
___ Hardly ever
___ Never

21) Generally speaking, do you consider yourself to be a(n):
___ Strong Democrat
___ Not so strong Democrat
___ Independent leaning Democrat
___ Independent
___ Independent leaning Republican
___ Not so strong Republican
___ Strong Republican
___ Don’t Know
___ Other
   Please specify: ________________

22) How would you describe your political views?
___ Very conservative
___ Conservative
___ Moderate
___ Liberal
___ Very liberal
23) What is your religious affiliation?
   ___ Roman Catholic
   ___ Protestant Christian
   ___ Evangelical Christian
   ___ No preference / No religious affiliation
   ___ Prefer not to say
   ___ Other: ___________
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