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• *The Psychology of Dictatorship* (2013)
• *Mutual Radicalization: How Groups and Nations Drive Each Other to Extremes* (2018)
• *Threat to Democracy: The Appeal of Authoritarianism in an Age of Uncertainty* (2019)
From dictatorship to actualized democracies (Moghaddam, 2017)

• Societies shift along a **continuum** from democracy to dictatorship and back

• The transition to democracy is **fragile** because it requires psychological skills and institutions without which democracy fails

• **Rare, pro-social dictators/leaders** must attain political capital to build **institutions** supportive of democracy (e.g., courts, schools) & are resisted by elites

• Citizens must acquire **psychological skills** that constrain elites, such as questioning sacred beliefs; seeking to understand those who are different; & adhering to principles of right and wrong
Democracy failing?
(Mounk & Foa, 2016)
Democracy failing? (Mounk & Foa, 2016)
Factional Leadership, Intergroup conflict, Norms and Time

• Louis, W. R., Chonu, G. K., Achia, T., Chapman, C. M., Rhee, J. (in press). Building group norms and group identities into the study of transitions from democracy to dictatorship and back again. In B. Wagoner, I. Bresco, & V. Glaveanu (Eds.), *The Road To Actualized Democracy*.
Today, a question (and answer):

• (How) does the success or failure of collective action affect activists’ future tactics and support for democracy?

• Activists radicalise after failure

• Support for democracy varies inconsistently
Some definitions from Wright et al. (1990)

- **Collective action**: Actions intended to improve the status of the group
- **Conventional action**: Common, normative according to the advantaged group
- **Radical action**: Unusual, non-normative according to the advantaged group

Factors that predict collective action: social identity, norms, efficacy, anger, moral conviction (e.g., van Zomeren et al., 2012)

Factors that promote radical action, e.g., contempt (Tausch et al., 2011)

But then what? (Louis, 2009)
The DIME model: Choices of tactics evolve.

Louis, Thomas, McGarty, Amiot, & Moghaddam, 2016-2018
An experimental paradigm:

- Ps are sympathisers (pre-screened) who imagine participating as actors in a protest
- Convenience samples of students \((k=2)\) or online \((k=6)\)
- Causes, tactics are locally relevant: pro- and anti-immigration, marriage equality, anti-fracking, abortion rights
- The protest is **conventional** or **radical**
  - Rally or blockade
  - Rally or ‘street theatre’ with colourful hats/songs
- The protest **succeeds** or **fails**
  - E.g., the city takes a stand in support or opposition

Joshua Rhee, Tim Rach, Syasya Goh, Zoe McMaster, Grace Davies
Imagine that you are a resident in a "Sanctuary City":

You, along with a number of residents in your area are concerned that, by refusing to co-operate with Federal Immigration officials in deporting illegal immigrants, local law-enforcement agencies are putting your community in danger. In the wake of a recent refusal by your city's Board of Supervisors to abolish sanctuary protections for illegal immigrants, a number of concerned residents have decided that community action is necessary in order to bring about a change to sanctuary policies.
Imagine that you are now an active member of a protest movement to abolish sanctuary protections in your city.

In an effort to get the county’s Board of Supervisors to abolish sanctuary protections, protest members have decided to form a human blockade outside the county Governmental center. As a symbol that the community is united against illegal immigrants, protesters will encircle the building with arms linked, creating a complete blockade of the premises. All protesters will wear t-shirts with printed messages condemning the protection of illegal immigrants by county law-enforcement. The protest will block all entrances and exits of the building for two-hours.

Imagining that you are a member of the protest, please draft a short message to be printed on protesters' t-shirts that you think will be effective in convincing the county Government to abolish sanctuary policies for illegal immigrants:
A press release:

- All county employees will be encouraged to provide full co-operation to Immigration Customs Enforcement (ICE) officials; and
- All county law-enforcement will alert ICE officials when an apprehended individual is found to be an unregistered migrant.”

Victory!

Or failure ...
Outcomes of Success and Failure of Conventional and Radical Tactics (Louis et al., in prep)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Failure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disidentification</td>
<td>.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moralisation</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energisation</td>
<td>.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional intentions</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radical intentions</td>
<td>.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Democracy</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Failure leads to disidentification... but also more energy ... & also more radical intentions

Conventional action lowers disid and radical intentions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support for democracy law-breaking</td>
<td>disid Moral convictions</td>
<td>innovation law-breaking support for democracy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Personal Support for Democratic Values and Support for Democracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>$M$ ($SD$), $\alpha$ personal values</th>
<th>$M$ ($SD$), $\alpha$ support</th>
<th>Correlates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sanctuary US Mturk ($r = .49$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage Equality Mtk ($r = .60$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage Equality Aus ($r = .55$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Fracking US ($r = .43$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Fracking Aus ($r = .56$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlates of radical intentions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>US ME</th>
<th>Aus ME</th>
<th>US fracking</th>
<th>Aus fracking</th>
<th>US anti-immig</th>
<th>Abortion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.14+</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.16+</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DIME

- Overall failure radicalises ... & also increases disidentification ... & energy!

- Overall, conventional action builds energy and ID

- Success/Failure x Conventional/Radical interaction : not consistent
Put simply ...

• Experimental data on the radicalising effects of unresponsive states?

• More unresponsive states create more disengaged and radicalised

• Political violence as communication
  Crelinsten (2002); Co-
  radicalisation (Pratt, 2016); Mutual Radica-
  lization (Moghaddam, 2018)
Thank you!

- socialchangelab.net
- w.louis@psy.uq.edu.au
Where next?

• Activist samples cross-sectionally & longitudinally

• Studying impact of small group discussions
  • Thomas, McGarty, & Louis (2014), *EJSP*: group discussion of failure of past conventional action increased lawbreaking willingness compared to rumination

• Impact on actors, sympathisers, bystanders, opponents
  • Thomas & Louis (2014), *PSPB*: non-violent action more effective in conveying illegitimacy of mining, whaling

• Leadership
  • Blackwood & Louis (2018), *EJSP*: Support for negotiating leaders dominates (85%) unless informed that outgroup is not willing to negotiate (53% choose oppositional leader)
The effects of pre-measured identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disidentification</td>
<td>-.33***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moralisation</td>
<td>.62***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energisation</td>
<td>.45***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional intentions</td>
<td>.57***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radical intentions</td>
<td>.26***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Democracy</td>
<td>.29***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ID is a strong predictor of everything

Consistent with Packer’s (2008, 2010) loyal dissent, ID predicts innovation and radical intentions

No consistent interactions
## Intentions measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- I intend to join protests involving blocking government offices to highlight the need to abolish Sanctuary Cities.
- I intend to participate at a sit-in at the state department in order to make cities and counties with "sanctuary" protections for illegal immigrants.
- I intend to donate to an organisation that fights to abolish Sanctuary Cities in America.
What else?

Moderation:
* People with high BAS-D (approach motivation) more likely to radicalise after the failure of conventional action. Also: Failure increased ostracism needs (control, belonging, purpose). (Mturk, anti-immigration)
Means across 5 studies (3 US Adults, 2 Australian students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immigration US Adults</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>3.66 (1.61)</td>
<td>4.13 (1.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.19)</td>
<td>(1.69)</td>
<td>(1.34)</td>
<td>(1.06)</td>
<td>(1.47) (1.59)</td>
<td>(1.47) (1.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage = US Adults</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>4.94 (1.30)</td>
<td>5.11 (1.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.05)</td>
<td>(1.63)</td>
<td>(1.36)</td>
<td>(1.00)</td>
<td>(1.36) (1.36)</td>
<td>(1.36) (1.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage = Aus Students</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.24 (0.93)</td>
<td>4.43 (1.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.78)</td>
<td>(1.88)</td>
<td>(1.09)</td>
<td>(0.82)</td>
<td>(0.93) (1.32)</td>
<td>(1.22) (1.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti Frack’g US Adults</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4.41 (1.51)</td>
<td>4.43 (1.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.92)</td>
<td>(1.84)</td>
<td>(1.34)</td>
<td>(1.93)</td>
<td>(1.51) (1.64)</td>
<td>(1.47) (1.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti Frack’g Aus Students</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.00 (1.36)</td>
<td>4.13 (1.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.07)</td>
<td>(1.60)</td>
<td>(1.53)</td>
<td>(0.93)</td>
<td>(1.36) (1.54)</td>
<td>(1.47) (1.59)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Energisation measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is necessary to slow the pace of action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is necessary to increase the frequency of action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is necessary to work less hard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is necessary to work twice as hard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is necessary to accelerate the pace of action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is necessary to put less effort into the action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is necessary to redouble our efforts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More on the innovation measure

"write a letter to legislators; sign an anti-fracking petition; attend a community presentation on preventing fracking locally; talk about the issue with friends; post an antifracking sign in the yard"

"Make Facebook posts; Become violent; Talk to people and rally; Donate 20 dollars; Educate my friends"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>M (SD) count</th>
<th>M (SD) count &gt;4 will</th>
<th>Correlates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sanctuary</td>
<td>1.71 (1.73)</td>
<td>1.24 (1.48)</td>
<td>Age, pol id, personally affected, moralisation, anger, conventional int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage Equality</td>
<td>2.71 (1.94)</td>
<td>2.05 (1.65)</td>
<td>Pol id, fear, PANAS neg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Fracking</td>
<td>3.07 (1.85)</td>
<td>2.69 (1.84)</td>
<td>Age, pol id, fracking movement id, moralisation, conventional intentions, PANAS pos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there other actions that you could imagine to take to convince local governments and Sanctuary Cities policies and decrease the number of illegal migrants in America? If so, please write up to 5 further actions below, and for each one, indicate how much you would intend to act. If not, simply progress to the next question.

1. Write a letter to legislators.
2. Sign an anti-fracking petition.
3. Attend a community presentation on preventing fracking locally.
4. Talk about the issue with friends.
5. Post an antifracking sign in the yard.

6. Make Facebook posts.
7. Become violent.
8. Talk to people and rally.
10. Educate my friends.

If you want to take any of these actions, please rate your intention to act on a scale of 1 (Definitely No) to 7 (Definitely Yes).
Sanctuary Cities

A “Sanctuary City” is an unofficial term used to describe a City or County in the United States that has adopted a policy prohibiting city employees from co-operating with Federal Immigration Customs Enforcement (“ICE”) officials in conducting investigations or arrests (unless such co-operation is required by a legal warrant or by an express State/Federal Law).

There has been ongoing debate throughout the country about whether “sanctuary protections” should be abolished or retained by their respective municipal governments. Some people say that sanctuary protections for illegal immigrants put the safety of the community at risk by allowing undocumented migrants, who may have a prior history of criminal misconduct, to roam free without the knowledge of Federal Immigration authorities.

Others disagree, stating that abolishing sanctuary protections would in lead to undue oppression of the significant number of undocumented migrants living in American communities, who would become reluctant to call upon local law-enforcement agencies for assistance in emergency situations, or for the purposes of reporting a crime.

Thinking about your own position on this issue, which statement would you say better describes how you feel? (please select one)

- Those local governments in America that have adopted “Sanctuary City” policies, should abolish them immediately and encourage their employees to provide full co-operation to Federal Immigration authorities (Against Sanctuary Cities)

- Those local governments in America with “Sanctuary City” policies, should retain them and continue to prevent their employees from co-operating with Federal Immigration authorities (Pro-Sanctuary Cities)
Imagine that you are now an active member of a protest movement to abolish sanctuary protections in your city.

In an effort to get the county’s Board of Supervisors to reconsider their stance, you and a number of your fellow protesters have decided to stage a demonstration outside the county’s Governmental center. As a symbol of your determination, you and your fellow protesters will wear t-shirts with messages calling for the abolition of sanctuary policies for illegal immigrants.

Imagine that two weeks after the protest outside the Governmental center, the president of the county’s Board of Supervisors issues the following press release:

"Yesterday afternoon, the county’s Board of Supervisors held a special meeting to rediscuss the matter of abolishing the county’s “sanctuary protection” policies. This special meeting was called following protests by a number of county residents regarding our recent decision to retain the county’s policy refusing to co-operate with Federal Immigration Authorities in the investigation and apprehension of unregistered migrants.

As the county’s elected legislative body, the Board of Supervisors believe that the views of our residents should be an integral part of our decision making process. As such, given the significant number of county residents who have voiced their concerns on the matter, the Board made the decision to take a second vote regarding abolishment of sanctuary policies.

In the second vote, a majority of Board members voted in favor of abolishing the county’s sanctuary protections of unregistered migrants. As a result, the county’s official policy on co-operation with Federal Immigration Authorities will soon be amended such that:

- All county employees will be encouraged to provide full co-operation to Immigration Customs Enforcement (ICE) officials; and
- All county law-enforcement will alert ICE officials when an apprehended individual is found to be an unregistered migrant."
The Success/Failure x Conventional Radical interactions on Support for Democracy

Environmentalists - MTurk

Anti-Immigration - MTurk
Thank you!

- Defunding research
- Suppressing and censoring findings
- Academic self-censorship
- Political attacks from colleagues
- Purges, Dismissals
- Imprisonment
- Torture
- Murder

[Image: Turkish academics, students protest against post-coup purges]

socialchangelab.net
w.louis@psy.uq.edu.au
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Where next for us?

• Defunding research
• Suppressing and censoring findings
• Academic self-censorship
• Political attacks from media, institutions, colleagues
• Purges, Dismissals
• Imprisonment of students and colleagues
• Torture
• Murder

Thank you!

• socialchangelab.net
• w.louis@psy.uq.edu.au