

Exploring Humiliation as a Possible Psychological Cause of Major Human Conflict.

William A. McConochie, Ph.D., Principal Investigator

David Leung, M.A., Investigator.

7/22/10 update.

Political Psychology Research, Inc.

Eugene, Or. 97401

1-541-686-9934

Bill@Politicalpsychologyresearch.com

Abstract. This study provides two measures of humiliation as a psychological trait and one measure of its conceptual opposite, dignity. It also provides measures of about 38 other traits. A sample of 99 college students provides initial correlations between these measures and measures of other traits, including mental illness, humiliation handling skills, religious beliefs, political attitudes, violence proneness, warmongering endorsement and Big Five personality traits. Humiliation in the childhood home seems to be projected out into one's worldviews, increasing one's tendency to feel humiliated by peers, teachers, police and even governments. It is mildly related to violence proneness. However, humiliation did not strongly or directly correlate with severe antisocial traits, such as attitudes about endorsing war or terrorism, or to major pro-social traits, such as human rights endorsement. The converse holds for dignity; being treated as children with dignity does not strongly relate to endorsement of either major pro-social or anti-social political attitudes. Implications are discussed.

Introduction and literature review. This study was inspired by an invitation to a conference in New York City in December, 2007 from the Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies organization. A specific Internet call had been made for expertise in measuring humiliation. The principle author participated in the conference to offer his measuring expertise. This study was designed with input from HDHS members. In the presentation below, the term “author” refers to the principal investigator.

The study was designed to measure humiliation as experienced by people as individuals and to measure several related traits to test hypotheses implicit in theory propounded especially by Dr. Evelin Gerda Lindner, the founder of the HDHS

organization (Lindner, 2007).

Specifically, in the referenced article Lindner makes several statements that imply her belief in causal relationships between experienced humiliation and various social ills:

“...the many observable rifts among people stem from ... humiliation ...the strongest force that creates rifts....” (p.2)

She suggests that Bin Laden might have been motivated by humiliation (p. 4).

“Feelings of humiliation may lead to violent acts of humiliation....(p.4).

She quotes another writer with whom she presumably agrees: “Today, militancy in the Middle East is fueled ...by a pervasive sense of humiliation and helplessness....”

However, she does seem to acknowledge that persons' feelings of humiliation may be solely a function of their perceptions, irrespective of objective events:

“...feelings of humiliation when respect is perceived to be lacking (whether the factual backgrounds feeding these feelings are real or imagined).” (p.5).

She says: “I began to ask what the most significant obstacle to peace and social cohesion was. My hunch was that dynamics of humiliation could be central.” (p. 5) She goes on to cite presumed German humiliation at the Versailles Treaty as a social condition that Hitler exploited to start WW II.

She differentiates humiliation as a feeling, an act and a “process” (p. 5). She posits that some persons react to humiliation as an act by violence, rage, depression or apathy (p. 5). She quotes political philosopher Max Scheler as a source for the notion that when people are not “recognized” and are thus humiliated they may resort to violence. (p.7).

She describes her interest in humiliation as originating in her own childhood as a member of a displaced family (p. 2). In a personal conversation with the author, she explained that her family had been driven from one European country by war to Germany as refugees.

She cites a study Linda Hartling and Tracy Luchetta (1999) as the only research involving an empirical measure of humiliation. Linda was a leader in the HDHS movement in December, 2007. She provided the author a copy of her dissertation.

This dissertation measure consists of 32 items in Likert Scale format that ask whether a person has been "harmed by" being teased, scorned, criticized,

embarrassed, etc. It then asks if the person currently feels "fear of being" scorned, harassed, excluded, etc. It then asks if the person is "concerned about" being...teased, made to feel small or insignificant, etc. The final two items ask if the person is "worried about being" ...viewed by others as incompetent, etc. The scale was termed the Humiliation Inventory and had a Cronbach alpha reliability of .96.

However, the questionnaire does not define the term "humiliation" for the respondent and does not use the term "humiliation" in any questionnaire items. It seems to measure exposure to unpleasant experiences, fear, concern and worry. As such, it seems to measure anxiety and depression symptoms. Therefore, it is difficult to see how this questionnaire can be considered a measure of humiliation as a psychological experience.

A researcher using the instrument might argue that this scale measures humiliation because the researcher defines humiliation as feeling harmed by being teased, or being afraid of being scorned, or being concerned or worried about other unpleasant experiences. However, another researcher might define humiliation differently, as might persons completing the instrument.

This scale seems to be a measure of experienced unpleasant events that have aroused feelings of fear, harm, concern and worry. These are symptoms typically associated in clinical psychology with anxiety and depression disorders when they reach troubling levels.

Seven items from the Hartling and Luchetta scale were used in a study of Latino adolescents (Smokowski, Buchanan and Bacallao, 2009). The items formed a reliable scale (alpha .90) and correlated with several other traits in a manner consistent with interpreting the scale as a measure of clinically significant emotional stress (-.25** with self-esteem, .16** with hopelessness, .42** with social problems, .25** with aggression and .37** with anxiety). These symptoms are suggestive specifically of those associated with clinical anxiety, depression and personality disorders.

A literature search yielded another more recent study that purports to measure humiliation. However, upon close examination, it does not appear to, for reasons similar to those raised above regarding the Harling and Luchetta instrument.

This study by Giacaman, Abu-Rmeileh, Husseini, Sabb and Boyce (2007) involves a 27-item scale that asks subjects how often they witnessed traumatic events in Palestine during the prior year. This scale is referred to variously as the EtT (exposure to trauma) scale and as a measure of humiliation. The authors define humiliation as “feelings of debasement and injustice” by observing mistreatment of others (p.565). And “feelings of debasement associated with the loss of dignity and honour.” (Giacaman, et al, 2007).

However, their questionnaire does not ask for reports of feelings, but only for reports of experienced or observed events that are assumed by the researchers to be traumatic, e.g. House searched, House bombed or shelled, Body searched, Shot at or hit. Four of the 27 questionnaire items *do* specifically include the term “humiliation” but none of them involve *feelings* of humiliation, only observations of other persons being humiliated: Saw friend/ neighbor killed humiliated, Saw stranger being humiliated, Saw family member humiliated, and Saw friend/neighbor humiliated.

Thus, this instrument does not measure the respondents' personal feelings of humiliation but only experienced events presumed to be psychologically disturbing or traumatic.

The basic finding of the study was that experiencing these unpleasant events is associated with increased reporting of subjective health complaints in high school students.

This study is reviewed and critiqued by Neria and Neugebauer (2007), who reference 62 prior studies that they consider to have involved humiliation. However, they report that all of these studies conceptualize humiliation as an *event* not as a *subjective experience*, such as a feeling. Presumably all such events are external of the person experiencing them, e.g. witnessing someone being beaten or ridiculed.

Studies of events would appear to be the subject of history, political science or government rather than the subject of psychology. As such, events can be viewed very differently depending on the personal or professional biases or orientations of the persons viewing, reading about or studying the events.

For example, the Nazi persecution of Jews in the holocaust (a humiliating series of *events*, or a *process*) could have been viewed by Nazis as a noble and

victorious activity, while Jews and most others in the world have viewed this as genocide. Political "Hawks" in the United States can view the Invasion of Iraq after 9/11 as a noble and necessary military response to terrorism, while "Doves" view it as an unjustified, illegal invasion of a sovereign nation. The Hawks can consider any resulting humiliation of Iraqis as deserved, while Doves consider such humiliation as a violation of human rights. Skinhead activists might side with the Nazi position. Peace-advocating social activists could be expected to side with political Doves.

Therefore, studies of humiliation as events would seem to be severely complicated by accounting for possible biases in the persons doing the studies. The advantage of a scientific study is the application of measures and techniques that help one minimize the impact of bias and the uncertainty stemming from possible differences in definitions of terms.

Psychology is the scientific study not of "events", but of the human individual or groups of individuals particularly as understandable in terms of mental or emotional processes, such as *feelings* of humiliation when being ridiculed or observing someone else being mistreated. To study humiliation as a psychological phenomenon therefore requires measures of personal responses, such as feelings or perceptions. These would be reflected in statements such as "I felt humiliated", or "I was humiliated".

To minimize observer (e.g. scientist, researcher) bias, one can design psychological studies of humiliation that permit clarification of relationships between humiliation as measured and other traits, both those expected by the researcher and those not expected. These can include both pro-social and antisocial traits, such as endorsement of human rights, measures of mental health or illness, physical health, measures of religious beliefs, authoritarianism, warmongering endorsement, positive foreign policy endorsement and endorsement of different types of governments, e.g. types of democracy, anarchy, and military dictatorships. By including both pro-social and antisocial traits in the study, one remains open to discovering relationships contrary to one's initial hypotheses.

Another purported measure of humiliation (Foo and Margolin, 1995) is described by researchers who have used it as including descriptions of experiences such as "your girl/boyfriend makes you look like a fool in front of your friends", and "you learn that your boy/girlfriend is having an affair" (Kinsfogel and Grych, 2004). Each of these items is then to be rated on a scale from 1 (unjustifiable) to 7

(justifiable). This scale, called the Humiliation subscale, had an alpha reliability of .91 in the study by Kinsfogel and Grych. However, as described, it is difficult to see how this scale can be considered a measure of humiliation per se. It seems to be a measure of attitudes about offensive social behaviors, with high scores appearing to reflect social callousness and low scores reflecting something like indignation over socially insensitive behaviors.

A study of Palestinians by Ginges and Atran published in 2008, after the present study was designed, *did* entail a measure of humiliation as feelings (Ginges and Atran, 2008). This questionnaire measure presents a list of emotions: sadness, dignity, humiliation, pride, oppression, justice, insult, fear, joy, anger, freedom, revenge, powerful, frustration, and powerless (p. 285). The respondent is then asked: "Which of the following feelings/emotions come to mind when thinking about..." Then the questionnaire presents a list of seven circumstances (events): people stand in line at checkpoints, the number of settlers increases all the time, Palestinian farmers are unable to reach their land, The wall encircles Palestinian land, Unemployment increases due to Israeli closures, Assassination of Palestinian activists, Demolition of Palestinian homes. If the word "humiliation" is chosen as the first response to an event it is scored 2, if chosen as the second response it is scored 1. The resulting humiliation measure had a mean of 2.5 and SD of 1.9. No alpha reliability coefficient was reported. Humiliation as measured was found in three studies to be *negatively* related to endorsement of violent retaliation, e.g. in the form of suicide attacks.

The investigators comment on this issue:

"It is interesting to juxtapose these empirical findings with reports of Palestinian and Islamic militants who frequently attribute their own actions to identity based experiences of humiliation. As is common in other domains where people do a poor job of understanding the cause of their own actions (Nisbett and Wilson, 1977), it appears that these self-attributions may be inaccurate."

This emphasizes the importance of not basing one's understanding of social, political or historical phenomena simply on the verbal statements or explanations of persons participating in or observing those phenomena. Hypotheses based on such information must be tested by empirical measurement and study before conclusions can be drawn with confidence.

While the measure of humiliation used in this study refers to feelings and emotions, including humiliation, it does not necessarily reflect feelings of

humiliation experienced by questionnaire respondents. It merely asks which feelings "come to mind" when considering various possible experiences of people, e.g. waiting in line at checkpoints manned by foreigners.

A person who had never lived in Palestine could complete this questionnaire in good faith, giving answers reflecting simply empathy with persons who have had to stand in such lines. A person reading a good novel also has feelings "come to mind", empathizing with the characters in the novel. Thus, scores on this questionnaire do not necessarily reflect actual feelings of humiliation of persons having experienced stressful experiences in their personal lives. The scores may simply reflect empathy.

The present examiner was particularly interested in helping the HDHS organization to measure and study humiliation in part because he had conducted a study of similar concepts, "felt oppression" and "perceived oppression", using a scale designed originally by psychiatrist Jeff Victoroff (McConochie, 2006a). Jeff had data on a group of Gaza Strip teenagers that he kindly made available to the author. The author gathered data for Eugene, Oregon adult churchgoers. Surprisingly, the two groups did not differ on their felt or perceived oppression, in spite of the fact that the Gaza Strip subjects were presumably under much greater social stress.

And, the Eugene subjects who *did* feel oppressed tended to report that they had been treated "differently and unpleasantly" in their childhood families. This implied that felt and perceived oppression is to some extent conditioned by early family experiences. Gaza Strip children might show a similar relationship between childhood family experiences and their perceptions of their external communities: those who felt loved, accepted and respected might tend not to see their communities as "oppressive", even when traumatic events are present. Those who felt mistreated in their families might tend to displace this out into their communities, seeing them as oppressive.

The Victoroff study also yielded significant correlations between the felt oppression and perceived oppression scales and several measures of antisocial dispositions, e.g. with warmongering endorsement (.46**, .40*), terrorism endorsement (.37*, .41*), Social Disenfranchisement (.74**, .71**), the Big Five personality trait of Emotional Stability (-.36*, -.43*), and "Authority Paranoia", a measure of having felt differently and unpleasantly treated by parents, teachers, police, governments, etc. (.51**, .48**).

This result might run counter to some theories about felt and perceived oppression. Social activists who advocate human rights, for example, might assume (theorize) that persons who feel oppressed by war in their communities or by their local police or by their governments are simply responding reasonably to the evil inherent in war, police or unjust governments. The Victoroff study suggests that perceptions of oppression in one's community, both local and global, are partially a function of worldviews shaped in early negative childhood family experiences rather than simply reasonable reactions to objectively assessed events.

The author suspected that humiliation might follow the same pattern, with perceptions of one's community as causing feelings of humiliation significantly colored by perceptions of mistreatment by one's childhood family. While correlations don't indicate cause, it seemed more reasonable to interpret the findings from the Victoroff study as meaning that childhood experiences cause adult perceptions rather than the other way around, that harsh community events in adulthood cause one to remember childhood as abusive when it wasn't, or that some other factor causes some persons to view both childhood and adult experiences as abusive, even if they were not.

To Dr. Lindner's great credit, she welcomed the author's offer to assist with measures of humiliation.

The hypotheses implicit in the design of the present study on humiliation include the following:

1. Humiliation can be reliably measured as a subjective psychological experience with brief questionnaires in Likert scale format.
2. Humiliation as measured will correlate with other traits in a manner that lends validity to the measures of humiliation. For example, two different types of measures of humiliation will correlate highly and positively with each other and such measures will correlate substantially and *negatively* with measures of dignity, the theoretical opposite of humiliation according to HDHS theory.
3. Humiliation, like felt oppression, will be shaped to an important degree by early childhood family experiences. Persons who felt humiliated in their childhood homes will be more likely to perceive their broader communities as humiliating.

4. Traits that reflect tendencies toward severely antisocial behaviors, such as war and terrorism, can be reliably measured with brief questionnaires measuring warmongering endorsement and terrorism endorsement. The present author has developed such measures in several prior studies. It was expected that such measures would be reliable in the present study and thus provide a basis for exploring the relationship between humiliation and these other important human tendencies.

5. Humiliation will be only one of many traits that correlate significantly with endorsement of terrorism and endorsement of warmongering and may not be more important than many other traits. Specifically, it was expected that measures of humiliation will correlate less strongly with warmongering endorsement and terrorism endorsement than other traits do, and will correlate with these traits such as endorsement of terrorism and endorsement of warmongering about as strongly as felt oppression does.

Method.

An initial draft questionnaire of several hundred items was written in the spring of 2009 and reduced to 292 items in response to excessive length concerns raised by HDHS research committee members with whom it was shared. The final instrument includes scales measuring humiliation in two different ways and dignity, its theoretical opposite, in one way. In addition, about 35 other traits are measured to permit exploration of the relationships between the traits. Of special interest were the possible relationships between humiliation and antisocial traits such as violence-proneness and warmongering endorsement to permit exploration of Lindner's many implicit hypotheses about the causal relationship between humiliation and such human behaviors ("rifts"), and the author's hypotheses that humiliation, like felt and perceived oppression, would be related to such traits, as they were in the Victoroff study.

Many of the scales were created specifically for this study, including the measures of humiliation and dignity. Other items were taken from previously developed scales, many by the principle investigator and some from other researchers, including Bob Altemeyer's RWA (Right Wing Authoritarianism) scale and Victoroff's Felt Oppression scale. They were all presented in Likert scale format with options generally running from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). The Big Five personality traits had 7 options. The questionnaire is available

from the principal investigator and can also be observed on the author's web site under Help Do Research, Politicalpsychologyresearch.com.

The questionnaire was loaded onto the principal investigator's non-profit corporation web site, Politicalpsychologyresearch.com by Botworks.com, the site manager. The site service was prepared so that participants who completed questionnaires could immediately print out a report of their scores on many of the traits measured. The scores were saved to file, downloaded by the principal investigator and analyzed via SPSS software.

HDHS published the availability of the study on their web site, but no one had responded after several months, so arrangements were made with 99 community college students to participate, about a dozen from an East Coast school and more than 80 from a school in Eugene, Or. The Eugene students were in psychology classes taught by Professor Leung, the secondary author. The data was collected in 2009. The subjects ranged in age from 16 to 69, and in education from 9 to 21 years. 73 percent were females. The mean age was 30, standard deviation 13.5. For education the mean was 14 years, standard deviation 2.3 years. These students also completed a separate study questionnaire measuring traits related to social and political activism.

Results. Scales were created from the questionnaire items after checking item clusters via item analysis in the case of new scales and simply by computing scores by formula for previously designed scales. The basic data for the scales is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Basic scale data.

Trait #	Trait name.	No. of items	Scale items	Range of mean item scores (MIS)	Mean	MIS => 3.5 (in %)	Standard Deviation	Cronbach alpha reliability
1	Humiliation A	14	1 to 14	1 – 4.1	2.23	3	0.71	.87
1.5	HFam3	3	1 to 3	1 – 5.0	3	13	1.09	.80
2	Humiliation B	13	15 to 23,30 to 34	1 – 5.0	2.24	8	0.94	.92
3	Local humiliation	5	23 to 27	1 – 4.4	2.13	8	0.84	.77
4	Wider humiliation	2	28 to 29	1 – 5.0	1.87	9	0.9	.65

5	Dignity	4	35 to 38	1 – 5.0	3.33	54	0.89	.91
5.5	Bad hum. Habits	9	39-47	1.22-3.67	2.31	5	0.62	.78
6	Hit and tease	4	44 to 47	1 – 4.0	2.11	10	0.8	.76
7	Reject others	3	40 to 42	1 – 3.7	1.98	1	0.75	.74
8	Avoid others	1	39	1 – 5	3.28	48	1.13	High?
9	Mental illness	11	48-58	1.09-4.91	2.8	25	0.9	.93
10	Hum. & dominate others	3	60-62	1 to 3.33	1.34	0	0.55	.65
11	Dominate children	3	59,63,64	1 to 4.67	2.09	8	0.88	.61
12	Abused as child	8	75-82	1 to 4.50	1.59	3	0.8	.85
13	Good anger communication skills	11	84-94	1.09 to 5.00	3.1	35	0.9	.91
14	Outside love	3	95-97	1.67 to 5.00	3.92	72	0.88	.74
15	Hum. Enduring	4	107,109-111	1 to 4.50	2.44	14	0.81	.70
16	Hum. Fight back	2	105, 106	1 to 5	2.42	22	1.09	.80
17	Hum. Seek support	2	101, 104	1.5 to 5	3.56	65	0.87	.51
18	Hum. Spiritual help	2	102, 103	1 to 5	3.17	40	0.99	.45
19	Hum. Joke	2	98, 99	1 to 5	2.8	32	0.92	.54
20	Social disenfranchisement.	10	112-121	1 to 5	2.26	12	1.03	.96
21	Authoritarianism (McC)	30	122-151	1.13 to 4.17	2.56	4	0.55	.90
22	RWA	15	152-166	1 to 4.53	2.57	6	0.66	.87
23	Religious Fundamentalism (McC)	19	See discussion	1.47 to 4.16	2.59	10	0.68	.88
24	Kindly religious Beliefs	16	“ “	2 to 5	4.07	90	0.51	.85
25	Human rights endorsement	19	201-219	1 to 5	4.3	92	0.65	.96

26	Environmental-ism	6	209,13,14,16,17,18	1 to 5	4.31	89	0.73	.94
27	Public democracy govt	5	220-224	2 to 5	4.21	84	0.72	.78
28	Positive, helpful foreign policy	12	225-236	2.42-5.00	4.02	84	0.59	.86
29	Sustainability endorsement	10	237-246	1.80-4.50	3.59	59	0.6	.90
30	Violence-prone	12	254-265	1.00 to 2.83	1.38	0	0.4	.71
31	Warmongering	10	266-275	1 to 3.60	1.9	2	0.71	.90
32	Terrorism endorsement	12	276-287	1 to 4.08	1.69	2	0.44	.93
33	Felt oppression	5	288-292	1 to 5	2.11	17	1.18	.97
34	Big Five Extro	1	249	1 to 7	4.9		1.63	High?
35	Big Five Agree	1	250	1 to 7	5.2		1.29	High?
36	Big Five Consc.	1	251	1 to 7	4.85		1.54	High?
37	Big Five Stability	1	252	1 to 7	4.25		1.59	High?
38	Big Five Open.	1	253	1 to 7	5.2		1.64	High?

Most of the scales have adequate to excellent reliability, in many cases .90 or better. The reliabilities for the single-item measures of the Big Five traits are assumed to be high, given their substantial standard deviations.

The several measures are considered to have content validity based on the content of the items themselves, which the reader can confirm by examining the items in the addendum copy of the questionnaire.

The relationships between the variables are many, given the high number of variables. Many were statistically insignificant. The more interesting findings are presented. Those significant at the .05 level are indicated with a single asterisk, those at the .01 level with a double asterisk.

Humiliation:

The questionnaire begins by presenting the subject with a definition:
 “Feeling 'humiliated' means feeling one or more of these feelings: ashamed,

foolish, belittled, ridiculed, disrespected or dis-empowered”. Then 16 statements are presented, using this term, e.g. “1. I often felt humiliated in my childhood family.” The subject indicates his degree of agreement or disagreement on a 5-point scale. This is scale 1 in Table 1. A second measure of humiliation (scale 3) uses statements such as “My mother often caused me to feel ashamed.” These statements use the terms used to define humiliation in the first scale.

Humiliation and its opposite, dignity (scale 5), are related to each other as expected. The two major humiliation measures (scales 1 and 2) correlate $.70^{**}$ with each other and negatively with dignity ($-.51^{**}$ and $-.49^{**}$ respectively). Age, gender and years of education did not correlate significantly with any of these three variables except for a correlation of $.29^{**}$ between the second measure of humiliation (scale 2) and age. Older persons report slightly more humiliation in childhood by this measure.

Two of the humiliation scales measure humiliating experiences and treatment specifically within one's childhood family, Scales 1.5 and 2, which correlate $.85^{**}$ with each other.

Feeling humiliated in one's family is substantially related to feeling humiliated outside one's family, locally and in one's more distant community. Specifically, the correlations between scales 1.5 and 2 and several other scale items are informative. The correlations are: Item 4. “As a child I often felt humiliated by children in my neighborhood or school. ($.48^{**}$, $.45^{**}$), Item 5. “I often felt humiliated by teachers as a child.” ($.35^{**}$, $.36^{**}$), Item 6. “I have often felt humiliated in work situations, either at home when doing chores or on the job for an employer. ($.28^{**}$, $.35^{**}$), Item 7. “I have often felt humiliated by police persons.” ($.24^{*}$, $.26^{**}$), Item 8. “I have often felt humiliated by one or more religious leaders.” ($.12$, $.18$), Item 9. “I have often felt humiliated by my local city or state government.” ($.29^{**}$, $.34^{**}$), Item 10. “I have often felt humiliated by my national government.” ($.32^{**}$, $.38^{**}$), Item 11. “I have often felt humiliated by other nations.” ($.14$, $.32^{**}$), Item 12. “I have often felt humiliated by persons of a social or economic class different from my own.” ($.33^{**}$, $.37^{**}$), Item 13. “I have often felt humiliated by persons of ethnic background different from my own.” ($.26^{**}$, $.35^{**}$), and item 14. “I have often felt humiliated by persons of different religions from my own.” ($.19$, $.34^{**}$).

The correlations in the paragraph above are not significant for humiliation by religious leaders (Item 8), or consistently for “Other nations” (Item 11), or

humiliation by persons from ethnic backgrounds different from one's own (Item 13), or from different religions (item 14). However, the correlations are consistently significant for all of the other items listed, suggesting a rather robust tendency for humiliation in the childhood family to be displaced out onto one's community worldviews. Humiliation in one's childhood family appears to predispose one to feel humiliated outside the family.

This phenomenon is also reflected in correlations between scales 1.5 and 2 and scales based on clusters of items for local and wider community humiliation, Scales 3 and 4. The correlations are: scale 3, Local humiliation (peers, teachers, police, city and state government) (.45** and .56** respectively) and scale 4, Wider community humiliation (national government, “unfair fate”) (.40** and .48**). Feeling humiliated by the *local* community correlates .62** with feeling humiliated by one's *wider* community.

This data seems to confirm the author's hypothesis that humiliation, like felt and perceived oppression, for some persons can originate in childhood family experiences and then be displaced out onto their community worldviews.

Being treated with dignity in one's childhood family appears to have the opposite effect on our local and wider community worldviews. Dignity is measured with Scale 5. As expected, it correlates negatively with the measures of family humiliation, as mentioned above (scales 1.5 and 2 (-.51** and -.49** respectively). Dignity correlates negatively also with feeling humiliated in one's community. The correlations with Local and Wider community humiliation (scales 3 and 4) are -.31** and -.32**. The implication is that those of us who were treated with dignity in childhood tend to view our social environments more positively.

How do people who have been humiliated in childhood tend to respond to other people, even those who want to befriend them? Habits for relating to other people are measured with the nine items of scale 5.5, e.g. “I have often rejected persons who seemed to want my protection or friendship”, and “I have often hit other people in anger.” The correlations between scales 1.5 and 2 and scale 5.5 are .47** and .41**.

Scale 5.5 can be broken down into specific types of social relationships, as reflected in scales 6 (Hitting others), 7 (Rejecting others) and 8 (Avoiding others). A single item, item 43, reads “I have often been critical of other people.” Scales 1.5 and 2 correlate with Hitting .39** and .32**, with Rejecting .38** and .34**, with

Avoiding .12 and .09, and with Critical .33** and .32**. Thus, while persons humiliated in childhood don't necessarily avoid other people altogether, they do report tendencies to hit, reject and criticize people with whom they do interact. This data suggests that humiliation in childhood tends to handicap persons in their adult social skills.

Common symptoms of mental illness (anxiety, depression, worry, etc.) are very reliably measured with scale 9 (Cronbach alpha of .93). Does humiliation cause mental illness? If it does, we would expect a significant positive correlation between humiliation measures and scale 9. But the correlations between the two general humiliation measures (scales 1 and 2) and scale 9 are only .31* and .16. And the correlation between being treated with dignity, scale 5, and mental health is only -.14. Thus, humiliation and dignity do not appear to be strongly related to mental illness or mental health per se.

Being humiliated does not necessarily cause one to directly dominate or humiliate others in turn, as the correlations between scales 1 and 2 and scales 10 and 11 are insignificant.

Does humiliation equate with childhood abuse? Apparently it does. People who report being humiliated (Scales 1 and 2) also tend to report being abused (scale 12), .49** and .72**. Those treated with dignity tend not to report abuse (-.35**).

Does being humiliated correspond with poor anger management skills? Scale 13 measures communication skills related to handling anger and other problems, including talking things through, apologizing, forgiving, listening, etc. The correlations between the two humiliation measures (scales 1 and 2) and scale 13 are substantial and negative (-.44**, -.65**), suggesting that families that humiliate fail to model and teach good emotional communication and problem resolution skills.

What if one had friends, relatives and teachers by whom one felt loved? Having this love (scale 14) is associated with having good emotional communication skills (scale 13) (.34**). It is also associated with having been in a childhood family that fostered feelings of dignity (.36**). However, feeling loved by relatives and teachers tends to be negatively related to having been humiliated (-.21, -.35**), for unclear reasons. Perhaps humiliating families involve unloving relatives. Or perhaps being humiliated in one's family tends to make one indifferent to love from relatives and teachers.

What strategies do people use for handling humiliation? The correlations between the two humiliation measures (scales 1 and 2) and other scales provide some hints. Just enduring it (scale 15) correlates with these two scales slightly (.30*, .17). So does fighting back (scale 16), but not significantly (.09, .16). Seeking outside support and understanding (scale 17) does not tend to be likely (-.16, -.27**). Weak correlations with seeking spiritual help (scale 18) (.18, .09) and joking one's way out of humiliation (scale 19) (-.14, -.12) suggest that these are unlikely strategies.

Being humiliated seems unrelated to basic religious beliefs or endorsement of authoritarianism. Humiliation as measured in scale 1 does not correlate significantly with (scales 21-24): Religious Fundamentalism (-.02), Kindly Religious Beliefs (-.04), Authoritarianism (McC) (-.02), or Right Wing Authoritarianism (Altemeyer) (-.21). Humiliation measured by scale 2 is similar in this respect, with insignificant correlations: Religious fundamentalism (-.00), Kindly Religious Beliefs (-.11), Authoritarianism (McC) (-.07), and RWA (-.10).

Humiliation measured by scales 1, 1.5 and 2 correlates positively with Social Disenfranchisement (scale 20) (.52**, .34** and .34**), Felt Oppression (scale 33) (.37**, .21* and .17) and Violence Proneness (scale 30)(.39**, .28** and .20*). Humiliation measured by scales 1, 1.5 and 2 does not correlate substantially with Warmongering Endorsement (-.20*, -.13, and -.15) or with Terrorism Endorsement (.14, .06 and .08). However, Social Disenfranchisement correlates positively and substantially with Felt Oppression (.82**), and Felt Oppression correlates positively with Terrorism endorsement (.28*).

Feeling humiliated in one's local community (scale 3) correlates with being At Risk for Violence (scale 30) .40** and with Terrorism Endorsement (scale 32) .23*, but negatively with Warmongering Endorsement (scale 31) -.20*. Feeling humiliated in one's wider community (scale 4) correlates with At Risk for Violence .30** but not significantly with Terrorism Endorsement (.09) or Warmongering endorsement (-.07). Thus, these other forms of humiliation also do not correlate strongly and consistently with major forms of antisocial behavior.

Thus, humiliation is, in some respects, like felt oppression. Both appear to have origins in childhood families. Both are related to feeling socially disenfranchised. Persons who feel socially disenfranchised tend to be prone to violence. Those who are prone to violence tend to endorse terrorism and warmongering (documented especially in other studies by the author).

Feeling humiliated in one's local and wider communities is moderately related to violence-proneness but not consistently or directly with more serious antisocial traits such as endorsement of terrorism or warmongering.

Thus, while humiliation is not strongly and directly related to endorsement of terrorism or warmongering, humiliation apparently can contribute through chains of experiences to these severely antisocial attitudes.

What is the relationship between humiliation and pro-social attitudes: endorsement of Human Rights, Environmentalism, Public Democracy, Positive Foreign Policy and Sustainable Policies and Programs? None of the three measures of humiliation, or its mirror trait, dignity (scale 5), correlated significantly with any the measures of these pro-social traits. Thus, humiliation and dignity do not seem strongly related to either supporting or undermining constructive social attitudes.

Thus, in terms of wider social issues, while there may be some indirect effects, there is little support in the above data for the notions that reducing humiliation or fostering dignity can be expected to significantly and directly impact human behavior or attitudes about major social issues such as human rights, war or terrorism.

The three humiliation measures all correlated negatively with all of the Big Five personality traits, but very mildly. The mean correlation was $-.13$. The opposite tended to be true for the measure of dignity, scale 3, which correlated positively with two of the Big Five measures Agreeableness ($.22^*$) and Emotional Stability ($.23^*$) but not significantly with the other three. Thus, the interaction between either humiliation or dignity and personality does not appear to be strong.

Environmentalism, Terrorism and Warmongering Correlates.

As there are over 38 scales in the present study, one can explore the correlates of a given trait, such as social disenfranchisement, religious fundamentalism, human rights endorsement, environmental protection or warmongering endorsement. Significant correlations help flesh out the validity or broader meanings of traits as measured. Correlation data for three traits are presented as examples. While the correlations are not all very high, they are all statistically significant, each providing some worthwhile information.

Environmental protection endorsement correlates positively with several scales, as follow:

- .93** 25. Human rights endorsement
- .68** 29. Sustainable policies and programs
- .62** 24. Kindly Religious Beliefs
- .60** 28. Positive foreign policy
- .32** 17. Seeking help to handle humiliation
- .25* 27. Public democracy endorsement
- .20* 34. Extroversion
- .26** 38. Openness

Thus, persons who endorse protecting the environment tend to endorse human rights, sustainable policies and programs, kindly religious beliefs, a positive and helpful foreign policy, seeking help to handle humiliation and public democracy, government serving the common good. They tend to be higher on extroversion and openness.

Environmental protection endorsement correlates negatively with other scales as follows:

- .61** 31. Warmongering
- .48** 10. Dominating others
- .47** 32. Terrorism endorsement
- .31** 22. Right Wing Authoritarianism
- .30** 21. Authoritarianism
- .29** 23. Religious Fundamentalism
- .26* 30. At Risk for Violence

Persons who endorse environmental protection tend *not* to endorse warmongering, dominating other people, terrorism, authoritarianism or religious fundamentalism. They tend not to be at risk for violence.

Endorsement of Warmongering and Terrorism are also scales of importance, especially considering present international conflicts. In column 7 of Table 1, are frequency data, expressed as percentage of persons who had a mean item score of 3.5 or higher on a scale. Two percent of the current sample of 99 college students had mean item scores of 3.5 or higher on each of the scales that measure these two traits quite reliably (alphas of .90 and .95 on scales 31 and 32).

Terrorism endorsement correlates positively with other scales as follows:

- .47** 10. Humiliating others
- .43** 30. At Risk for Violence
- .34** 31. Warmongering
- .27** 33. Felt oppression
- .23* 3. Local humiliation
- .21* 12. Abusive childhood

Thus, persons who endorse terrorism tend to endorse humiliating other persons, tend to be at risk for violence, endorse warmongering, feel oppressed and humiliated in their local communities and tend to report abuse in childhood.

Terrorism endorsement correlates negatively with other traits as follows:

- .55** 25. Human rights endorsement
- .47** 26. Environmentalism
- .34** 24. Kindly religious beliefs
- .25* 27. Public democracy endorsement
- .24* 14. Felt loved in childhood
- .23* 34. Extroversion

Thus, persons who endorse terrorism tend *not* to endorse human rights, environmental protection, kindly religious beliefs, or public democracy. They tend not to have felt loved in childhood and tend to be introverted.

Warmongering endorsement correlates positively with traits as follows:

- .72** 21. Authoritarianism
- .66** 22. Right Wing Authoritarianism
- .49** 23. Religious Fundamentalism
- .45** 10. Humiliating others
- .34** 32. Terrorism endorsement
- .22* 11. Humiliating children

Thus, persons who endorse warmongering tend also to endorse authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, humiliating others, including children, and terrorism.

Warmongering correlates negatively with endorsement of many other traits as follows:

- .70** 28. Positive foreign policy endorsement
- .68** 29. Sustainable policies and programs endorsement

- 0.64** 25. Human rights endorsement
- 0.62** 26. Environment protection
- 0.43** 24. Kindly religious beliefs
- 0.37** 27. Public democracy endorsement
- 0.25* 38. Openness
- 0.21* 9. Mental illness
- 0.20* 1. Childhood humiliation
- 0.20* 3. Local community humiliation

Thus, persons who endorse warmongering tend *not* to endorse a positive and helpful foreign policy, sustainable policies and programs, human rights, environmental protection, kindly religious beliefs, or public democracy. They tend not to be open-minded. They tend *not* to be mentally ill. They tend *not* to report humiliation in childhood.

Religious Fundamentalism and Kindly Religious Beliefs scales were explored in extra detail in this study. Religious fundamentalism has been studied and measured repeatedly in different scales, for example by Spilka, et al (Spilka, Hood, Hunsberger, & Gorsuch, 2003), Shuon(1953) and Saucier (2000, 2006).

The present author has identified Fundamentalism and Kindly belief factors in prior studies by the author (McConochie, 2006c). In the present study two new items were included on the hunch that they might load on these two scales. The items were these:

193. Church and state should not be separated; religion should strongly guide political behavior and government legislation.

194. Politicians and elected government persons should keep their personal religious beliefs to themselves and not use them in campaign speeches or promises to voters.

These two items load heavily on the Religious Fundamentalism scale: .70** and -.62** respectively. They do not load significantly on the Kindly Beliefs scale (.08 and -.02).

Brief scales, especially all pro-trait item scales that do not included reverse-scored items, are convenient in conducting research studies that include many scales, as did the present study. Factor analysis of the data in the present study of the religious beliefs items yielded scales of this nature, including a six-item scale for Fundamentalism with a Cronbach alpha reliability of .90. The items were these:

169. There is only one true god (or God) that all people of the world should

worship.

170. All religions that do not ascribe to this belief (item immediately above) are wrong.

183. One should submit to the will of god (or God).

184. One should submit to the will of religious or political leaders who say they know what god (or God) wants.

193. Church and state should not be separated; religion should strongly guide political behavior and government legislation.

197. God is the creator of the universe and everything in it, including people.

An 8-item scale emerged for the Kindly Beliefs measure with an alpha of .86:

171. Violence toward one's fellow humans is not appropriate.

172. Stealing from one's fellow humans is not appropriate.

173. Lying, slander and tattling are not appropriate.

178. One should love his neighbor as himself and treat others as he would like to be treated.

180. Using a god's name as an excuse for or justification of evil against one's fellow man is inappropriate.

182. One should help others who are less fortunate or are suffering.

191. Honoring and respecting elders is appropriate.

196. God is kind and forgiving of wrong-doers.

The demographic data gathered at the beginning of the study includes religious affiliation. Ten of the 99 subjects in the present study identified themselves as evangelical protestants. This identification correlated .46** with scale 23, the 19-item measure of Religious Fundamentalism, meaning that their mean item score mean of 3.5 was significantly higher than the scores for the other religious groups, such as the group of 37 students who listed their religion as “none” (mean 2.13).

The Evangelical Protestants were also slightly higher than other groups on the Kindly Religious Beliefs scale (4.41 versus 4.23 for mainstream protestants, 3.71 for Catholics, and 4.04 for “none, no religion”).

A factor analysis of the major traits in this study was conducted. Six factors had eigen values greater than 1. When asking for a single factor, one emerges that accounts for 27 percent of the variance. The single factor has positive loadings as follow: Human Rights .86, Environmentalism .82, Sustainability .82, Positive foreign policy .81, Kindly religious beliefs .65 and Public Democracy .52.

The negative loadings are: Warmongering -.86, Right Wing Authoritarianism -.66, Authoritarianism -.64, Religious Fundamentalism -.54, Terrorism Endorsement -.47 and At Risk for Violence -.37.

The scales measuring humiliation, mental illness, dignity, feeling loved, oppression and abuse, communication skills, and social disenfranchisement did not load strongly on this factor, again discounting the theory that humiliation and dignity are prominent direct contributors to human conflict or “rifts”.

Thus, the several traits loading prominently on this factor appear to reflect a basic pro-social / anti-social human dimension or a pro-culture / anti-culture dimension. This result is consistent with prior factor analytic studies of these same and similar traits by the present author (McConochie, 2007).

An estimate of the number of citizens that represent the two poles of this dimension can be computed by comparing frequency data for the traits loading positively and negatively on it.

Frequency data is provided in column 7 of Table 1. This is computed by calculating the percentage of persons with mean item scores equal to or greater than 3.5 (half way between Neutral and Agree). The mean percent of persons endorsing the six negatively loading traits (Warmongering through At Risk for Violence) is 4%. The mean percent for the six positively-loading traits (Human Rights through Public Democracy) is 83%. Thus, the “good guys” outnumber the “bad guys” 21 to 1 in this study. This group is somewhat more “civil” than other samples that the author has studied in which the percentage of persons endorsing the antisocial traits is closer to 6% or 7% and the overall ratio is about 13 to one with about 90% in the pro-social group. A carefully selected random sample of adults, including some of the 1 percent in prisons, might yield a ratio somewhat smaller, perhaps 10 to 1.

Discussion.

One possible interpretation of the present findings about humiliation as a psychological trait (feelings of humiliation) is that we tend to project or displace feelings of humiliation in our childhood families out into our views of our communities; if we felt humiliated in our families, we tend to view our local and even our more distant communities as humiliating. Thus, it appears that for some

persons their perceptions of the wider community as humiliating may be more a function of their unpleasant childhood experiences than of the objective realities of community events. This is not to say that all critical perceptions of one's community are unfounded, but to say that for persons who saw themselves as humiliated in childhood their perceptions of the negative aspects of their communities are likely to be exacerbated by childhood problems.

Regarding Dr. Lindner's hypotheses about the importance of promoting dignity feelings in citizens to cure social problems, the current data do not support this position. The correlations between the measures of humiliation and dignity on the one hand and several different pro-social attitudes on the other are insignificant.

Regarding Dr. Lindner's hypotheses about humiliation as a central or major cause of human conflict, the present data also do not support this conclusion. Many other traits correlate much more strongly with endorsement of terrorism and warmongering than do measures of humiliation. Humiliation mildly correlates with some antisocial traits and thus may indirectly contribute to willingness to participate in war and conflict. However, the present data and that from other studies by the author suggest that a major cause of civilians going to war is warmongering leadership that whips citizens into motives and attitudes that make them willing participants in overt conflict. Only a small fraction of current Americans endorse warmongering, two percent of the present sample and up to 6 percent in several other studies by the author.

It is possible that both childhood and community events feed into adult participation in war. For some persons (3 to 13 percent by the present data) a humiliating, abusive childhood may set them up for perceiving their communities as abusive, humiliating, and unjust and make them especially open to political or militant leadership that wants to overthrow local government or attack neighboring nations. For other persons, adult experiences such as harsh deprivation, social chaos, unemployment, and social persecution and discrimination may fuel resentments and anger that make them more willing followers of aggressive leaders. Some of these adult experiences may arouse humiliation, but the present data suggest that such humiliation does not strongly contribute directly to major antisocial reactions, especially compared to other traits, such as religious fundamentalism, social disenfranchisement and authoritarianism.

Frequency data from the present study and prior studies by the author suggest that for Americans at present only about 6 percent hold seriously antisocial

attitudes, such as endorsement of warmongering, military dictatorships and fundamentalist religious beliefs, all of which load on an antisocial factor in factor analysis of many traits (McConochie, 2007). Over 90 percent of citizens endorse pro-social attitudes, such as a positive foreign policy, government that serves citizens as members of the community overall, human rights and kindly religious beliefs, all of which load on the pro-social pole. This suggests that ongoing persistent military activity as promoted by the United States in one form or another since WW II may reflect not so much a majority citizen agenda as the agenda of a small minority, and a minority whose motives may lie in sources other than in objective community need.

Herman Goering, Hitler's chief aide, clearly explained his view of this process:

"Naturally the common people don't want war: Neither in Russia, nor in England, nor for that matter in Germany. That is understood. But, after all, it is the leaders of the country who determine the policy and it is always a simple matter to drag the people along, whether it is a democracy, or a fascist dictatorship, or a parliament, or a communist dictatorship. Voice or no voice, the people can always be brought to the bidding of the leaders. That is easy. All you have to do is tell them they are being attacked, and denounce the peacemakers for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger. It works the same in any country."

--Goering at the Nuremberg Trials

Historian J. Rufus Fears, professor of classics at the University of Oklahoma, in his lecture course *The Wisdom of History* opines that "Along with the lust for power, religion and spirituality are the most profound motivators in human history," and that power is the universal value, not freedom. (Fears, 2007)

Ginges and Atran (2008), puzzling over their negative correlations between humiliation and violence suggest a possible indirect route through which humiliation can lead to violence, "there may be some type of 'rebound' effect of humiliation: those who are humiliated may become less rebellious or violent, but if they are subsequently 'empowered' by charismatic leaders or ideologies they might react with greater violence to avenge the insult...."

Thus, warmongering leaders, a la Goering, might be the match that lights the revenge fire under humiliated but cowed citizens.

The present study and others by the author imply that civilian attitudes or traits such as authoritarianism, fundamentalist religious beliefs, violence-proneness and social disenfranchisement make some citizens particularly prone to endorsing warmongering, and presumably by implication to following warmongering leadership. These traits correlate much more strongly with warmongering endorsement than do measures of humiliation, however, suggesting that they predispose citizens to warmongering more strongly than does humiliation.

But changing citizen endorsement of warmongering and terrorism and traits related strongly to them would seem rather impractical, especially considering that the correlations between these traits and years of education are generally insignificant: Warmongering -.01, Terrorism Endorsement .01, At Risk for Violence (-.07), Right Wing Authoritarianism (-.12), Authoritarianism (-.17), Kindly Religious Beliefs (-.14) and Religious Fundamentalism (-.22*).

Thus, in terms of preventing war and terrorism, it seems to be especially important to identify and exclude from political and military leadership persons high on the trait of warmongering-proneness, for it is they who can incite citizens with propaganda, as explained by Goering.

In addition, it seems important to promote evolution of government types that empower the majority of citizens and specifically pro-social citizens. Governments such as military dictatorships and special interest group democracies are too easily controlled by small, powerful minorities, such as arms manufacturers and warmongers, as warned by U. S. President Eisenhower upon leaving office decades ago. Until and unless those types of government are replaced with a more advanced form of democracy that empowers pro-social citizen agendas, nations will seem to be at continued risk for war and subject to policies that ignore pressing world problems that threaten civilization, including unchecked population growth, global warming, starvation, and depletion of life support resources such as fisheries and forests.

While some antisocial attitudes and worldviews seem to be exacerbated by childhood family mistreatment, including humiliation, improving all parenting skills seems a less practical approach to world problems than devising more sophisticated, safer political systems that make it easier to identify and keep dangerous types of leadership on the sidelines and that empower pro-social leadership guided by the desires of the vast majority of pro-social citizens.

To this end the author has designed reliable questionnaires for measuring warmongering-proneness and constructive leadership attitudes in political leaders from a distance and a model for a political party designed to serve these ends. (McConochie, 2009).

Caveats and future directions.

The present study is a correlation study. As such, it does not yield data that can be interpreted with confidence as indicating causal relationships between variables or traits. However, correlations can rule out probable causal relationships, as when correlations are insignificant or in the opposite direction from causal predictions. And correlations can imply causal relationships when supported by temporal information, e.g. childhood experiences preceding adult worldviews.

The present study operationally defines humiliation with specific scales. Other studies defining and measuring humiliation in other ways and with other instruments might yield results contrary to those of the present study.

The present study is limited by the size and restriction of its sample to 99 community college students in the United States. It would be interesting to replicate the study with larger and more diverse samples, especially ones including more males, prison inmates and persons from foreign countries. Studies of citizens in the Middle East might prove especially interesting, for example from Pakistan, Iraq, Palestine and Israel.

Replication of the present study can be done rather easily with the assistance of interested researchers, as the study questionnaire is still loaded on the author's web site and available to any English-speaking person with access to the Internet, anywhere in the world. Such researchers are welcome to contact the author: Bill@Politicalpsychologyresearch.com, or Bill@PPRI.com.

References

- Fears, J., (2007), *The Wisdom of History*, The Teaching Company, Chantilly, Va., p. 5.
- Foo, L. & Margolin, G. (1995). A multivariate investigation of dating aggression. *Journal of Family Violence*, 10, 351-377.

Giacaman, R., Abu-Rmeileh, N., Husseini, A., Sasb, H., and Boyce, W., (2007), Humiliation: the invisible trauma of war for Palestinian youth, *Public Health*, 121, 563-571.

Ginges, J., & Atran, S., (2008), *Humiliation and the Inertia Effect: Implications for Understanding Violence and Compromise in Intractable Intergroup conflicts*, *Journal of Cognition and Culture*, (8) 281-294.

Giacaman, R. (et al, as above), (2007), Response to Commentary, *Public Health*, doi:10.1016/j.puhe.2006.10.020.

Kinsfogel, K., & Grych, J., (2004). Interparental Conflict and Adolescent Dating Relationships: Integrating Cognitive , Emotional, and Peer Influences, *Journal of Family Psychology*, Vol 18, No. 3, 505-515.

Hartling, L. & Luchetta, T., (1999). Humiliation: Assessing the impact of derision, degradation, and debasement. *The Journal of Primary Prevention*, 19(5): 259-278.

Lindner, E., (2007), *In Times of Globalization and Human Rights: Does Humiliation Become the Most Disruptive Force?*, [Http://www.humiliationstudies.upeace.org/](http://www.humiliationstudies.upeace.org/).

McConochie, W., (2006a), *Exploration of the Victoroff Oppression Questionnaire*, Politicalpsychologyresearch.com, Publications page, www.politicalpsychologyresearch.com.

McConochie, W., (2006b), *Making Peace; the psychology of violence-proneness, warmongering and a new democracy*, Politicalpsychologyresearch.com, Publication #3.

McConochie, W., (2006c), *Religious Beliefs for War, Peace and Species Survival*, Politicalpsychologyresearch.com, Publication # 3.

McConochie, W., (2007), *Sixteen Traits Study: Antisocial Traits, Religious Beliefs and Desired Government Features*, Politicalpsychologyresearch.com, Publication # 16.

McConochie, W., (2009), Politicalpsychologyresearch.com (various articles and research projects).

Neria, Y, and Neugebauer, R., (2006), Commentary, *Public Health*, doi: 10.1016/j.puhe.2006.10.022.

Nisbett, R., and Wilson, T., (1977). Telling more than we can know: Verbal reports on mental processes. *Psychological Review*. 84, 231-259.

Saucier, G. & Skrzypinska, K., Spiritual But Not Religious? (2006), Evidence for Two Independent Dispositions, *Journal of Personality*, 74:5, October 2006.

Saucier, G. (2000). Isms and the structure of social attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 366B385.

Schuon, F. (1953). *The transcendent unity of religions*. (P. Townsend, Trans.). New York: Pantheon.

Smokowski, P., Buchanan, R. & Bacallao, M., (2009). *Acculturation and Adjustment in Latino Adolescents: How Cultural Risk Factors and Assets Influence Multiple Domains of Adolescent Mental Health*. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, DOI 10.1007/s10935-009-0179-7 (Online publication).

Spilka, B., Hood, R., Hunsberger, B., & Gorsuch, R. (2003). *The psychology of religion, an empirical approach*. New York: Guilford.

Addendum: Questionnaire.
BHS (Brief Humiliation Study) (5/17/08).
Copyright 2008, William A. McConochie, Ph.D.

This questionnaire measures many personal opinions about many topics. The study hopes to discover important information related to conflict and cooperation between groups and nations.

The questionnaire has 287 items and takes about 1 hour and fifteen minutes. You can do some now and come

back and finish another time, if necessary. Please complete your form by August 1, 2008.

You don't have to complete it but if you do, please do so carefully and honestly.

In return for your participation you will receive immediately a report of our scores on many of the traits measured with an explanation of what they mean. You will be able to print this report and keep it. You may also receive additional credit (as a student) or other benefit from the sponsoring person or organization that is asking you to participate. You will need to ask your sponsor about this.

At the end of the study you will be able to read a report of the overall study findings, for example over the Internet, or via an e-mail message sent to you. Thus, this should be an interesting learning experience for you. You will be able to contact the principle investigator, Dr. William McConochie, if you have questions: Bill@Politicalpsychologyresearch.com.

No particularly unusual unpleasant experiences are anticipated for participants.

Please provide the following information:

A1. Your name or a code name you choose. Write it down so you won't forget it.

First name: _____ Last name: _____

A2. Your research group number (RGN): Ask the person who has sponsored your participation for this name.

A3. Age: _____

A4. Gender: M F .

A5. Years of formal education completed (12 = high school, 16 = college, etc.): _____

A6. Your overall grades in high school: _____ 1. Well below average 2. Below average. 3. Average. 4. Above average. 5. Well above average.

A7. Nation of citizenship: _____ (Choose one.)

A8. Primary ethnic group: _____ (Choose one.)

A9. Social/ economic class: _____ Choose one: 1 Very low, 2 low, 3Average for my nation, 4. High, 5.Very high.

A10. Family/marital status: _____ Choose one: Dependent teen or child, Single, Married, Divorced, Separated, Widow or Widower.

A11. Preferred spiritual orientation: Choose one: _____. None, Fundamentalist Christian, Other Christian, Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist, Other: _____).

Feeling "humiliated" means feeling one or more of these feelings: ashamed, foolish, belittled, ridiculed, disrespected or dis-empowered.

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the statements below using this code:

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral or uncertain	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

1. I often felt humiliated in my childhood family.
2. I often felt humiliated by my father or surrogate father (e.g. stepfather, foster father, grandfather).
3. I often felt humiliated by my mother or surrogate mother (e.g. stepmother, foster mother, grandmother).
4. As a child I often felt humiliated by children in my neighborhood or school.
5. I often felt humiliated by teachers as a child.
6. I have often felt humiliated in work situations, either at home when doing chores or on the job for an employer.
7. I have often felt humiliated by police persons.
8. I have often felt humiliated by one or more religious leaders.
9. I have often felt humiliated by my local city or state government.
10. I have often felt humiliated by my national government.
11. I have often felt humiliated by other nations.
12. I have often felt humiliated by persons of a social or economic class different from my own.
13. I have often felt humiliated by persons of ethnic background different from my own.
14. I have often felt humiliated by persons of different religious background from my own.

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the items below using this code:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

15. I often felt humiliated by my mother.
16. I often felt humiliated by my father.
17. My mother often caused me to feel ashamed.
18. My father often caused me to feel ashamed.
19. I seldom sensed that my mother felt proud of me.
20. I seldom sense that my father felt proud of me.
21. I was often made to feel foolish by my mother.
22. I was often made to feel foolish by another member of my family (parent, brother, sister, etc.).
23. I was often made to feel belittled by one or more of my peers as a child.
24. I often felt belittled by teachers in school.
25. I felt mistreated and disliked by police in my town.
26. I felt discriminated against unfairly by my town or city government.
27. I felt poorly served by my state government.
28. I felt deliberately singled out for mistreatment by my national government.
29. I have felt the victim of very unfair fate.
30. I often felt worthless in one or more of my parents' eyes as a child.
31. I often felt a lack of respect for me by other members of my childhood family.
32. I often felt disliked by other members of my childhood family.
33. I often felt unfairly treated in my childhood family.
34. I felt abused by one or more of my family members as a child.
35. I usually felt treated with dignity by my parents.
36. I usually felt treated with dignity by my siblings.
37. I usually felt treated with dignity by my childhood peers.
38. I usually felt treated with dignity by my teachers.

39. I have often tried to avoid or prevent others from expressing their anger towards me.
40. I have often rejected persons who seemed to want me to accept them.
41. I have often threatened others who seemed to want my protection or friendship.
42. I have often disliked persons who wanted to be liked by me.
43. I have often been critical of other people.
44. I have often hit other people in anger.

- 45. I have often teased or made fun of other people.
- 46. I have often hated other people.
- 47. I have often betrayed persons who might have thought they could trust me.

- 48. I often worry.
- 49. I often feel anxious.
- 50. I often feel worthless.
- 51. I often feel lonely.
- 52. I often feel angry.
- 53. I often feel rejected.
- 54. I often feel depressed.
- 55. I often feel in physical pain.
- 56. I often feel afraid.
- 57. I often feel irritated.
- 58. I often feel angry.

- 59. Being shamed or ridiculed helps you build strong character in yourself.
- 60. Humiliating children and others is a necessary part of teaching obedience.
- 61. It is appropriate that some social classes, castes, ethnic groups, or religious sects dominate and humiliate weaker ones.
- 62. It is appropriate that men and adults have strict authority over women and children.
- 63. It is natural for people to form a political party that gives them maximum control over government and other people in their community and nation.
- 64. It is natural for a nation to seek maximum military power by belittling and disempowering other nations.

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements, using this code:

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral or uncertain	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

I and people like me have been treated differently and unpleasantly by:

- 65. ... parents.
- 66. ...teachers.
- 67. ...peers (children or adults my own age).
- 68. ...police persons.
- 69. ...persons of different religions from my own.
- 70. ...my local government.
- 71. ...my national government.
- 72. ...foreign governments.
- 73. ...citizens living in other nations.
- 74. ...persons of different ethnic backgrounds from my own.

- 75. As a child I was physically abused by my father or father surrogate.
- 76. As a child I was mentally abused by my father or father surrogate.
- 77. As a child I was sexually abused by my father or father surrogate.
- 78. As a child I was physically abused by my mother or mother surrogate.
- 79. As a child I was mentally abused by my mother or mother surrogate.
- 80. As a child I was sexually abused by my mother or mother surrogate.
- 81. As a child I was neglected, not given enough food, clothing or shelter.
- 82. As a child I was neglected in that I was not given enough love.

As a child ,..

- 83. ... it seemed to me to be okay to feel angry toward my parents.

84. ... it seemed to me to be okay to talk to my parents about my angry feelings toward them.
85. ... it was okay to talk back politely to my parents.
86. ... I did discuss with my parents my angry feelings toward them.
87. ... our family members often discussed and resolved their negative feelings (anger, annoyance, etc.) toward each other.
88. ... our family members often discussed and resolved their negative feelings toward persons and problems outside the home (e.g. at school or in the neighborhood).
89. ...our family members apologized, said "I'm sorry", when they hurt others' feelings.
90. ...our family members forgave others who apologized.
91. ... our family members did not hold grudges toward each other
92. ... I apologized, forgave and did not hold grudges toward members of my family.
93. ... some family members often listened carefully to me talk about my personal worries and troubles.
94. ...in turn, I often listened to them in a similar manner.
95. ...I had relatives outside my immediate family who loved me and whom I loved.
96. ...I had friends among my peers who loved me and whom I loved.
97. ...I had teachers or other adults who loved me and whom I loved.

Humiliation may be defined as a feeling of resentment and discomfort when treated unpleasantly by other people, e.g. when criticized, rejected, ignored, teased, belittled, or abused.

Please indicate how you tend to handle humiliation by choosing one option for each item below using this code:

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral or uncertain	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

When humiliated, I tend to...

98. ... talk to the person and persuade them to stop.
99. ... joke them out of their mistreatment to get them to stop.
100. ... avoid them to protect myself from further humiliation.
101. ... tell others about the mistreatment and ask for their understanding and support.
102. ... seek spiritual help and strength to endure the mistreatment.
103. ... talk to myself to reassure myself that I don't deserve the mistreatment.
104. ... seek stronger friendships with other people who treat me nicely.
105. ... retaliate in some mean way against the person mistreating me.
106. ... fight with them.
107. ... do nothing, just endure the humiliation.
108. ... believe that I deserve to be mistreated.
109. ... withdraw from all people to protect myself from further mistreatment.
110. ... criticize myself for causing the mistreatment.
111. ... feel sad, depressed and lonely.
112. Some people look down on me and my group.
113. We are treated as inferior.
114. Some people treat us unjustly.
115. They want to humiliate us.
116. We are denied our equal rights.
117. We feel humiliated.
118. We are distrustful of others.
119. They try to make us feel helpless.
120. We feel vulnerable to mistreatment by them.
121. We tend to feel superior to them.
122. I feel reassured by parades of soldiers and induction ceremonies of Presidents or other national leaders.

123. I often feel comforted by thinking about persons in authority whom I trust.
124. I usually feel disappointed by major public speeches by top government leaders, such as Presidents.
125. Most religious sermons I hear are boring and uninspiring.
126. Persons in positions of authority should be respected and honored more than doubted and challenged.
127. Journalists should be free to criticize and make fun of politicians and other leaders.
128. Military personnel should obey their officers under all circumstances.
129. I find comfort in frequent reminders of what is right and wrong.
130. Persons should learn to trust their own judgment more than depend on rules given by authorities.
131. Society will completely fall apart if everyone does not know and obey laws and regulations.
132. Some groups of people are almost all good and righteous while other groups are almost all bad and unrighteous.
133. I am a member of a group that is almost all good and righteous.
134. Citizens should obey leaders who tell them to reject or wage war against a bad group.
135. I prefer a simple, clear explanation of the world and my place in it rather than a complex, incomplete explanation.
136. I often look to persons in authority for reassurance and guidance.
137. I trust intellectuals and scientists more than top government and military leaders.
138. I trust elected state representatives and Governors for whom I vote to always do the right thing.
139. On foreign policy, I trust the top political leader of my country (e.g. the President) more than my own opinions.
140. We should carefully question persons in positions of authority rather than take them at their word.
141. In conversations with others, I prefer the clear guidelines of rules and doctrine to the uncertainties of personal opinions.
142. Punishment is a more appropriate response to rule-breaking than forgiveness is.

143. Rewards should only be given to persons who do what is right.
144. High school and college students should respect and trust their teachers without question.
145. Teenage children should respect and obey their parents without question.
146. I get comfort and reassurance from religious rituals and ceremonies.
147. Divine authority (God) sanctions wars against the unjust.
148. The world would be a safer place if some bad people did not exist.
149. Most world problems are caused by bad people in far away lands.
150. For handling everyday problems I trust religious authority more than I trust my own judgments.
151. Top leaders in government, the military and religion are more important to a nation than are their followers.
152. Our country needs a powerful leader, in order to destroy the radical and immoral currents prevailing in society today.
153. Our country needs free thinkers, who will have the courage to stand up against traditional ways, even if this upsets many people.
154. The “old-fashioned ways” and “old-fashioned values” still show the best way to live.
155. Our society would be better off if we showed tolerance and understanding for untraditional values and opinions.
156. God's laws about abortion, pornography and marriage must be strictly followed before it is too late, violations must be punished.
157. The society needs to show openness towards people thinking differently, rather than a strong leader, the world is not particularly evil or dangerous.
158. It would be best if newspapers were censored so that people would not be able to get hold of destructive and disgusting material.
159. Many good people challenge the state, criticize the church and ignore “the normal way of living”.
160. Our forefathers ought to be honored more for the way they have built our society, at the same time we ought to put an end to those forces destroying it.
161. People ought to put less attention to the Bible and religion, instead they ought to develop their own moral standards.
162. There are many radical, immoral people trying to ruin things; the society ought to stop them.
163. It is better to accept bad literature than to censor it.
164. Facts show that we have to be harder against crime and sexual immorality, in order to uphold law and order.
165. The situation in the society of today would be improved if troublemakers were treated with reason and humanity.
166. If the society so wants, it is the duty of every true citizen to help eliminate the evil that poisons our country from within.
167. The peoples of all nations should learn to live peacefully together, resolving differences not by economic or military might but by discussion, working together,

increasing understanding of one another and compromising.

168. The peoples of all nations should compete with each other in business, trade and, if necessary, in war, to let the Abest nation win@.

169. There is only one true god (or God) that all people of the world should worship.

170. All religions that do not ascribe to this belief (item immediately above) are wrong.

171. Violence toward one=s fellow humans is not appropriate.

172. Stealing from one=s fellow humans is not appropriate.

173. Lying, slander and tattling are not appropriate.

174. We should strive for good and stop bad.

175. Meditating on feelings of personal inner serenity is appropriate.

176. *Any* specific personal religious beliefs are appropriate and acceptable as long as they respect human dignity and welfare.

177. Killing other people is not appropriate.

178. One should love his neighbor as himself and treat others as he would like to be treated.

179. One should not treat others the way he would not want to be treated.

180. Using a god=s name as an excuse for or justification of evil against one=s fellow man is inappropriate.

181. One should forgive rather than retaliate against wrongdoers.

182. One should help others who are less fortunate or are suffering.

183. One should submit to the will of god (or God).

184. One should submit to the will of religious or political leaders who say they know what god (or God) wants.

185. Unquestioning loyalty to superiors, including political leaders, is appropriate.

186. Feeling envy or jealousy is inappropriate.

187. Experiencing life as a good person is more important than practicing rituals or believing certain ideas or obeying any code of fixed rules, Ados@ and Adon=ts@.

188. One should joyfully accept nature.

189. One cannot and should not own the land.

190. Practicing rituals and taboos is appropriate.

191. Honoring and respecting parents and elders is appropriate.

192. Worshiping the spirits of dead ancestors is appropriate.

193. Church and state should not be separated; religion should strongly guide political behavior and government legislation.

194. Politicians and elected government persons should keep their personal religious beliefs to themselves and not use them in campaign speeches or promises to voters.

What features do you think an ideal god (or God) should have?

195. Is vengeful, punishes wrong-doers.

196. Is kind and forgiving of wrong-doers.

197. Is the creator of the universe and everything in it, including people.

198. Is an abstract concept, a creation of humans to help them live constructively with each other.

199. Can be well defined simply as the spirit of human kindness and love.

200. Takes many forms that guide the religious lives of many different peoples around the world.@

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following ideas:

201. All people of all nations should have the same basic human rights, such as life and liberty.

202. No one should be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile from his/her nation.

203. Everyone should have the right to freedom of opinion and expression.

204. Everyone should have the right to take part in the governance of his country.

205. The people should have the right to vote on government policy, not just on persons running for government office.

206. Everyone should have the right to work for a living in a job freely chosen and for a reasonable wage.

207. Everyone should have the right to a free basic education that, among other things, promotes understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations and all racial and religious groups.

208. Everyone has the right to food, clothing and shelter.

209. Everyone has the duty to support and sustain life, longevity and livability of the environment of all people.

210. Everyone has the right to choose his own religion and the duty to promote peace and tolerance among different religions and ideologies.

211. Everyone has the right to health and to universal medical insurance.

212. Everyone is duty-bound, when asserting one's rights, to take into consideration the rights of other human beings and of past, present and future generations, and the rights of nature and the earth.

213. All beings are interdependent and every form of life has value regardless of its current worth to human beings.

214. Everyone has the duty to prevent environmental harm.

215. With increased freedom, knowledge and power comes increased responsibility to promote the common good.

216. We should adopt at all levels sustainable development plans and regulations that take into consideration environmental conservation and rehabilitation.

217. We should manage the use of renewable resources, such as water, soil, forests and marine life, in ways that do not exceed rates of regeneration and that protect the health of ecosystems.

218. We should carefully conserve and manage our extraction and use of non-renewable resources, such as fossil fuels and minerals.

219. We should encourage and support mutual understanding, solidarity and cooperation among all peoples and within and among nations.

For each of the following five items, indicate how strongly you agree that it is a desirable form of government by circling one number, using this code:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

220. Anarchy. No government at all, just roving bands of armed bandits who rob, kill and do whatever they want.

221. Military dictatorship, headed by a powerful military leader who controls everything and everyone in the country and prevents anyone else from replacing him.

222. Monarchy, headed by a king or queen, with a supportive parliament of elected representatives. They run the country as they benevolently see fit.

223. Tribal democracy. Elected officials run the government to serve the short-term economic interests of the special interest groups (economic tribes) that helped them get elected.

224. Public democracy. Elected officials run the government to serve the current and long-term best interests of the community overall, including sustainable programs such as conservation of resources and control of pollution and global warming. No one special interest group or groups are favored.

Regarding Foreign Policy, how your nation relates to other nations, how strongly do you agree or disagree with each of the following foreign policy positions?

In foreign policy, my nation should:

225. Get as much natural resources from other countries as we can afford.

226. Buy as much inexpensive products as we can, even if it means some adult citizens are unemployed as a result.

227. Control the world with military power.

228. Ignore how much pollution of air and water we cause by our use of natural resources such as oil and coal.

229. Set limits on our consumption so resources are available for other nations.

230. Help other countries with peaceful means rather than military ones.

231. Promote prosperity, stability and peace in other nations by student exchanges, cultural and sport exchanges and tourism.

232. Help other countries by medical aid to fight AIDS and other diseases.

233. Help other countries by supporting the United Nations.

234. Fight civil wars in and terrorism from other countries by helping other countries provide opportunities, jobs, education and better standards of living.

235. Help other countries develop and maintain sustainable communities and economies by population control, agricultural development, education, women's rights promotion, etc.

236. Agree to international arms control and pollution control treaties to reduce the dangers from wars, global warming and destruction of forests, ocean fisheries, etc.

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following items.

My national government should support...

- 237. ...international treaties and efforts to reduce greenhouse gasses and global warming.
- 238. ...international treaties and efforts to reduce nuclear weapons and missiles that deliver them.
- 239. ...the United Nations with money and cooperation.
- 240. ...replacement of gasoline and diesel fuels with non-polluting fuels.
- 241. ...replacement of gas and coal-fired generators with non-polluting nuclear and solar generators.
- 242. ...restriction of harvesting from forests and fisheries to levels that are sustainable for generations (forever).
- 243. ...use of prime agricultural land for agricultural use only (forever).
- 244. ...restriction of use of fresh water resources (rivers and wells) to sustainable levels (forever).
- 245. ...development of reasonable population limits and helping communities maintain them.
- 246. ...a national health care system that provides basic, affordable care.
- 247. ...local community rights to restrict the broadcasting or marketing of products that have been shown by research to promote violent thinking and behavior.
- 248. ...local community rights to restrict the marketing or broadcasting of products that have been shown by research to promote criminal sexual behavior.

Please circle one number in each of the following five rows to indicate where you fall on each of these personality traits:

249. Talkative, social, outgoing ...	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	or...	Quiet, shy, introverted
250. Argumentative, critical, rude ...	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	or...	Kind, helpful, trusting.
251. Thorough, organized, efficient ...	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	or ...	Careless, disorganized, lazy.
252. Nervous, tense, depressed ...	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	or ...	Relaxed, calm, seldom upset.
253. Deep thinker, imaginative, creative ...	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	or ...	Prefer routine activities, not into art or literature.

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements, using this code:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

- 254. I often fall asleep feeling mad or angry.
- 255. I feel angry more often than most people I know.

- 256. During the past year, I have enjoyed destroying someone else's property.
- 257. I enjoy daydreaming about killing other people.
- 258. I think it is stupid for employers to try to reduce violence in companies.
- 259. I would enjoy making a plan to kill someone.
- 260. Employees who have shot other workers and supervisors at their companies probably had good reasons to do so.
- 261. I would be willing to help an employee who had shot others at their place of work to escape from the police.
- 262. I have given false answers to one or more of the questions on this form.
- 263. I have enjoyed slapping or punching other people when mad at them.
- 264. With just a little more stress I think I could lose control and hurt someone right now.
- 265. I can think of at least one person I know that I would like to kill if I was sure I would get away with it.

- 266. My national government should do what best serves our nation=s interests, at the expense of other nations, enforced by military action if necessary.
- 267. President Bush was justified in attacking Iraq and tracking down Saddam Hussein.
- 268. It is more reasonable to spend money for a stronger military force than for a national health care program.
- 269. It is wiser to spend more money for a strong military than for non-military peace-promoting foreign aid, trade, student exchanges and tourism.
- 270. It is more honorable to serve one=s nation as a warrior in combat than as an anti-war protester.
- 271. The United States should have stuck it out in South Vietnam until it won the war.
- 272. The United States was justified in killing off Native American Indians and taking control of their land.
- 273. Centuries ago, the Spaniards were justified in killing natives in Central and South America to get their silver and gold.
- 274. A good reason for our nation going to war is to kill enemy soldiers and civilians in order to reduce population numbers so there are more resources for the people of our nation.
- 275. A good reason for our nation going to war is to assure access to whatever raw materials, such as oil, we need from other nations.@

For each item below circle only one number to indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with it using the following code:

1	2	3	4	5
Disagree	Strongly disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree

- 276. If people refused to help you with your problems, you might be justified in killing them.
- 277. If you are mad at the whole world, then it makes sense to destroy the whole world.
- 278. The United States deserved the September 11, 2001 destruction of the World Trade Center buildings in New York City.
- 279. I have the courage to die in committing an act of terrorism.
- 280. I would be willing to join a terrorist organization.
- 281. A good way to bring down a corrupt government is to kill its civilians in terrorist acts.
- 282. People who feel very mistreated by a country have the right to commit terrorist acts against that country.
- 283. I would enjoy steering a big plane into the Pentagon building, or another military headquarters, to destroy it.
- 284. If I were wealthy, I would be willing to donate money to a terrorist organization.
- 285. I would feel honored if I were invited to join a terrorist group.
- 286. I want to learn more about how to become a terrorist.
- 287. I admire terrorists who die for their cause.

- 288. Some people look down on me and my group.
- 289. They think we are not as good as them.
- 290. My group is often looked down upon.

- 291. We are treated as if we are inferior.
- 292. We are not cared about.

End.