

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

Supplementary Information for

A comparison of political violence by left-wing, right-wing and Islamist extremists in the United States and the world

Katarzyna Jasko

Institute of Psychology, Jagiellonian University, Poland 30-060

Gary LaFree

Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, 20742

James Piazza

Department of Political Science, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16801

Michael H. Becker

Department of Justice, Law, and Criminology, American University, Washington, DC, 20016

Katarzyna Jasko Email: katarzyna.jasko@uj.edu.pl

This PDF file includes:

Tables S1 to S5

33 Table S1. Comparison of individuals representing different ideological groups.

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Categories</i>	<i>Right-wing</i>	<i>Islamists</i>	<i>Left-wing</i>	<i>p (Chi-square test)</i>	<i>Cramer's V</i>
Education	Up to high school (1)	53%	42%	21%	<.001	.29
	College or vocational education (some or complete degree; (2)	40%	47%	58%		
	Post-graduate education (some or complete degree; (3)	7%	11%	21%		
Marital status	Yes (married)	62%	59%	76%	<.001	.14
	No	38%	41%	24%		
Immigrant background	Yes	0.2%	45%	3%	<.001	.60
	No	99.8%	55%	97%		
Military experience	Yes	23%	11%	10%	<.001	.18
	No	77%	89%	90%		
Gender	Male	94%	91%	75%	<.001	.26
	Female	6%	9%	25%		
Age¹		37.56 ^a	31.22 ^b	29.68 ^b	<.001	
Ethnicity (white)	Yes	95%	9%	70%	<.001	.67

	No	5%	81%	30%		
Previous violent criminal experience	Yes	27%	17%	16%	<.001	.13
	No	73%	83%	84%		
Decades	40s-60s	5%	0%	17%	<.001	
	70s	4%	0%	26%		
	80s	12%	0%	8%		
	90s	21%	1%	10%		
	00s	22%	38%	21%		
	10s	36%	61%	18%		

34 [†] Means with different superscripts are significantly different from each other.

35

36 Table S2. Logistic Regression Model (Study 1; Left-wing ideology as a reference category).

	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>OR</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>OR</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	-0.72	0.11	0.49	<.001	-0.71	0.44	0.49	.111
Islamist ideology	1.20	0.17	3.32	<.001	2.15	0.31	8.55	<.001
Right-wing ideology	1.15	0.13	3.17	<.001	1.70	0.21	5.50	<.001
Education (2)					-0.08	0.52	0.92	.877
Education (3)					-0.56	0.47	0.57	.252
Marital status					-0.30	0.19	0.74	.116
Immigrant background					-0.68	0.29	0.51	.020
Military experience					-0.10	0.21	0.91	.643
Gender (male)					0.18	0.24	1.20	.449
Age					-0.01	0.01	0.99	.089
Ethnicity (white)					-0.43	0.21	0.65	.045
Previous violent criminal experience					1.08	0.21	2.95	<.001
60s					0.56	0.31	1.74	.072
70s					1.39	0.30	4.01	<.001
80s					0.94	0.28	2.56	.001
90s					0.24	0.22	1.27	.291
00s					-0.50	0.18	0.60	.006

37 Note: The reference category for these models are individuals who identified as left-wing, achieved a high school or less
 38 education (Education 1), were not married, not an immigrant, did not have any military experience, did not engage in any
 39 previous criminal violence, and whose exposure event occurred in the 2010's. Significance here is determined using a two-
 40 tailed t-test based upon 50 pooled samples with the multivariate imputation through chained equations method.

41 Table S3. Distribution of Right-wing, Left-wing, and Islamist Attacks Over Time (Study 2).

Decades		70s	80s	90s	00s	10s
Right-wing ideology	N	232	2159	1055	273	416
	% within ideology	5.6%	52.2%	25.5%	6.6%	10%
Left-wing ideology	N	2 982	12 525	6 531	2 675	7 531
	% within ideology	9.2%	38.8%	20.3%	8.3%	23.4%
Islamist ideology	N	50	344	2 168	4 944	28 094
	% within ideology	0.1%	1%	6.1%	13.9%	78.9%

42

43

44 Table S4. Analysis of Fatalities in Global Terrorism Database (Study 2; after excluding
 45 generic groups from analyses)

	Zero-inflated negative binomial			
	Logistic regression		model	
	<i>b</i>	<i>OR</i>	Conditional model <i>b</i>	Zero-inflation model <i>b</i>
Intercept	-0.39	0.67	-0.26	-2.13
Left-wing ideology	-0.69	0.50***	-0.39	0.66***
Islamist ideology	0.50	1.64*	1.27***	-17.62
Random part				
Intercept Variance (groups)	1.29		1.79	
Intercept Variance (countries)	0.73		1.03	
Deviance	72133.9		244917.7	
Observations	N: 60,547		N: 60,547	
	Groups: 468		Groups: 468	
	Countries: 111		Countries: 111	

46 * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

47

48

49 Table S5. Analysis of Injuries in Global Terrorism Database (Study 2)

	Zero-inflated negative binomial			
	Logistic regression		model	
	<i>b</i>	<i>OR</i>	Conditional model <i>b</i>	Zero-inflation model <i>b</i>
Constant	-1.30	0.27	0.25	-0.36
Left-wing ideology	-0.24	0.79	-0.39	-0.22*
Islamist ideology	1.18	3.25***	1.36***	-17.67
Random part				
Intercept Variance (groups)	0.58		1.27	
Intercept Variance (countries)	0.18		0.48	
Deviance	75567.8		208576.4	
Observations	N: 63,810		N: 63,810	
	Groups: 523		Groups: 523	
	Countries: 128		Countries: 128	

50 * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

51 Note: Due to the way fatalities and injuries are coded in GTD we consider fatalities as the primary
52 variable. Specifically, if the source noted that the attack had resulted in fatalities but it did not mention any
53 injuries, the variable “injuries” was coded as 0 (suggesting that no people were injured). Similarly, when
54 the source noted that the attack had resulted in injuries but it did not mention any fatalities, “0” was
55 assigned to fatalities. Given the different level of visibility and clarity as to who is counted as killed vs.
56 injured, we think that it is less likely that the data miss real fatalities (and inaccurately assign “0”) than it is
57 that the data miss real injuries (and inaccurately assign “0”). In support of this interpretation, 37% of cases
58 in GTD report no fatalities or injuries and 25% of cases report both fatalities and injured victims. However,
59 among the inconsistent cases (i.e., fatalities but 0 injuries or injuries but 0 fatalities), 11% are attacks that

60 mention injuries but 0 fatalities, but 27% are attacks that mention fatalities but 0 injuries. Such selective
61 attacks that result only in fatalities but no injuries seem to be less likely. In short, we suggest that the
62 number of injuries might be underestimated (and the number of true zero injuries overestimated) and
63 misrepresent the actual numbers more so in the case of injuries than fatalities.

64