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Abstract

A long tradition of research into political culture argues that greater support for core liberal democratic values leads to a rejection of destructive political activities and reduced support for violent politics. Policymakers have long drawn on this line of enquiry, arguing that “exporting” democracy can reduce violent political activity such as terrorism. Unfortunately, there have been few direct tests of the hypothesis that mass-level support for democratic values correlates with the rejection of violence. We conduct such a test in Pakistan, a country that is both a significant source of militancy and one whose citizens suffer massively from terrorism. We designed, conducted, and analyzed an original 6,000-person provincially-representative survey and find that strong supporters of democratic values are actually more supportive of militant groups focused outside of Pakistan than Pakistanis less favorable towards liberal democracy. Consistent with the principle of azadi, this result is driven by those who believe that Muslim rights and sovereignty are being violated in Kashmir. Our results both challenge the conventional wisdom that has formed the basis of public policy as well as contribute to theoretical debates on the influence of civic culture on political stability and violence.
A long tradition of research into political culture has suggested that greater support for core liberal democratic values leads to a rejection of destructive political activities and produces a wide range of benefits from resistance to autocratic coups to greater economic growth (e.g. Almond and Verba 1963; Powell 1982; Huntington 1984; Dalton 1994; Gibson 1997; Traube 2008; Kirwin and Cho 2009; Persson and Tabbelini 2009). Scholars have posited numerous mechanisms that may underlie this posited relationship. For example, mass support for democratic values could induce citizens to peacefully work within their political system and engage in collective action to reject uprisings and preserve civil society. In the case of Pakistan, individuals committed to core liberal values may reject the vision offered by Islamist militants who seek to enforce their (often stylized) version of Shari’a law through violence.

Ostensibly drawing from this line of argumentation, a major tenet of U.S. foreign policy under the Bush administration—and one that still holds sway among many in the Obama administration—is that “exporting” democracy to regions of the world where it is absent may reduce support for violent political activity such as terrorism (see e.g. National Security Council 2006, Hamid and Brooke 2010). What has been missing from this discussion is individual-level data assessing whether democratic values relate to support for violent political organizations.

A thoughtful reflection upon the claims made by many militant groups over the last fifty years and on the nature of competition between governments and militant groups in many regions—suggests that theories about the palliative role of democratic values need to take careful consideration of political context. Since at least the American Revolution there has been no shortage of political movements that have rallied their followers to kill and risk death in the name of freedom, democratic representation, and other liberal democratic values. In South Asia and the Middle East today, many militant groups claim to be defending freedom, fighting for self-representation, and mobilizing against what they perceive to be corrupt governments. Moreover, the populations from
which these varied militant groups draw support appear to believe these claims. Accordingly, support for liberal democratic values may actually be positively correlated with support for militancy, and may be particularly dependent on people’s reactions to the political environment. Unfortunately, there exists scant evidence to test this conjecture.

In this paper, we empirically test the hypothesis that support for core democratic values is associated with a rejection of violent politics. We examine Pakistan, a country that is both a significant source of militancy and one whose citizens suffer massively from terrorism. We designed, conducted, and analyzed an original 6,000-person survey that is representative of adults in each of Pakistan’s four main provinces: Punjab, Sindh, Khyber-Pakhtunkwa (KPK), and Balochistan. Our survey is the first to measure affect towards a range of specific militant organizations in one country, the first to measure respondents’ beliefs’ about the importance of core democratic values, and the first to be representative of rural and urban regions for each province of Pakistan.

Most importantly, we apply a novel measurement strategy to mitigate item non-response and social desirability bias, which have plagued previous surveys due to the sensitive nature of militancy in the region.¹ Our “Endorsement Experiment” (detailed below) overcomes these issues. As described in more detail below, we measure differences in support for various policies unrelated to militancy between two experimental groups—those told only about the policy and those told a militant organization supports the policy. The difference between the two conditions reveals how much policy support increases or decreases as a consequence of being associated with a militant group, and therefore is an indirect measure of support for the group. Unlike a direct measure, however, non-response and social desirability are less prominent since respondents are reacting to the policy and not to the group itself. By asking respondents about multiple policy issues and

randomizing the pairing of issue with group, we can identify both average attitudes towards militancy across groups as well as support for individual groups in ways that are unlikely to be biased by the details of any specific policy.

Using this approach, we find that support for a set of liberal democratic values—property rights, free speech, independent courts, the ability of citizens to elect representatives, a separation of civilian and military power, and freedom of assembly—increases support for militancy. Moving across the range of this index measuring support for these values is associated with a 4-5 percentage point increase in support for militant groups that have engaged in violent political activity both within and outside of Pakistan. Consistent with the principle of azadi (freedom or self-determination in Urdu), this result is driven by those who believe that Muslim rights and sovereignty are being violated in Kashmir and in Afghanistan. In other words, supporters of democratic rights are more likely to favor militant groups if they believe that those militants are fighting against foreign forces that are denying Muslims their rights.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. The first section provides a brief background on militant groups in Pakistan and the political claims they make. Next, we provide a theoretical basis for our expected hypotheses, centered around the concept of azadi. We then describe our survey in detail including how we measure the core dependent and independent variables. Subsequently, we present our methods of analysis. We conclude by presenting the results and discussing their implications for the study of political violence as well as for foreign policy.

**Militancy in Pakistan**

Pakistan has employed Islamist militancy in India and Afghanistan as a tool of foreign policy since 1947 (the year Pakistan became independent) and this continues to date (Swami 2007; Hussain 2005; Jamal 2009). Many of these groups have also conducted attacks on Pakistani soil, both against
the state and against civilians they oppose on political or religious grounds. The militant landscape in Pakistan today is populated by groups that vary in their sectarian commitments, targeting choices, theatre of operations, ethnicity of operatives, and political objectives. To understand how views on democracy might relate to popular support for these groups, a nuanced picture of Pakistani militant organizations is in order. This section therefore outlines the major groups asked about in our survey.

**Militants Fighting in Kashmir**

There are several organizations Pakistanis group under the title of “Kashmiri tanzeems” (Kashmiri groups). Jaish-e-Mohammad (JM), Harkat-ul-Ansar/Harkat-ul-Mujahideen (HUA/HUM), and their splinter groups have traditionally focused upon Kashmir and while they recruit within Pakistan proper, their recruitment materials suggest a Kashmir-oriented mission. In recent years JM has become intimately involved with the Pakistan Taliban and has provided suicide attackers for assaults on Pakistani targets and international targets within Pakistan. A separate set of groups operating in Kashmir includes Hizbol Mujahideen, al Badr, and related factions. These groups primarily recruit Kashmiris and generally have remained focused on securing autonomy or independence for Kashmir. They have not been involved with the Pakistan Taliban, and have not targeted the Pakistani state or international targets within Pakistan.

The most prominent of Kashmiri tanzeem is Lashkar-e-Taiba (LeT), which has operated in Indian-administered Kashmir for much of the 1990s (Abou Zahab 2007). LeT conducted its first attack outside of Kashmir in 2000 and in recent years has attacked international targets in India—the November 2008 Mumbai hotel attacks are the most prominent example—as well as U.S. and allied forces fighting in Afghanistan (Fair 2010). LeT has not targeted the Pakistani state nor has it pursued western targets within Pakistan.

**Afghan Taliban**

As is well known, the Taliban government achieved dominance over most of Afghanistan in
1996 with Pakistani assistance (Rubin 2002). The September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks made it impossible for Islamabad to continue supporting the Taliban (Musharraf 2006) and when the United States-led coalition routed the Taliban in late-2001 many fled to Pakistan’s tribal areas to regroup. In 2005, the Afghan Taliban launched a renewed insurgent campaign run by leadership shuras in Quetta, Peshawar, and Karachi (Levin 2009). The Afghan Taliban, despite considerable organizational changes since 2001, remain focused on ousting foreign forces, aiding workers and other foreign civilians from Afghanistan, overthrowing the Karzai regime, and restoring their role in governing Afghanistan (Giustozzi 2009).

**Pakistan Taliban**

Since 2004 a cluster of militant groups whose activists describe themselves as “Pakistani Taliban” has developed in Pakistan.2 While we were unable to measure support for these groups due to the high level of political sensitivity surrounding them when our survey was fielded, understanding the differences between them and the Afghan Taliban is important for interpreting our results (Fair 2011).

The goals of the militants grouped by Pakistanis as the “Pakistan Taliban” are focused on undermining the Pakistani state in select areas and establishing their own parallel governance structures organized around commanders’ particular understanding of Shari’a. At the time our survey was in the field these groups had conducted few operations outside of attacking police forces in the FATA and parts of the Khyber Paktunkhwa (KPK, formerly the Northwest Frontier Province or NWFP). This unfortunately changed in subsequent months as TTP-affiliated militants conducted

---

2 The Pakistan Taliban became prominent in early 2006 as local militias established micro-emirates in large swathes of Pakistan’s Pashtun areas. Popular characterization of all Pakistan Taliban as being part of the Tehreek-e-Taliban Pakistan (TTP) are incorrect, the term most accurately refers to a loose group of local militias espousing a particular view of shari’a law. The so-called Talibanization of the tribal areas began in North and South Waziristan, but quickly spread to parts of the other tribal agencies. Beginning in 2007 local Taliban also emerged in parts of KPK (previously known as Northwest Frontier Province or NWFP). The Pakistan army has engaged in various operations to contend with these militant groups (Jones and Fair 2010).
attacks across Pakistan killing thousands in response to government offensives against them.

**Al Qaeda**

The most important militant group operating in Pakistan to Western policy makers and politicians is al-Qa’ida, the group responsible for the September 11, 2001 attacks. Former British Prime Minister Gordon Brown summed up these concerns when he reported that “three quarters of the most serious plots investigated by the British authorities have links to al Qa’ida in Pakistan” (Coates and Page 2008). Important al Qa’ida leaders remain in the FATA and many al Qa’ida operatives—Abu Zubaidah, Khalid Sheikh Mohammad, and others—have been arrested in Pakistani cities. Al-Qa’ida operatives in Pakistan have targeted the Pakistani state and executed terrorist plots targeting the West and its allies. The July 7, 2005, bombings in London have been linked to al-Qa’ida in Pakistan, for example, as have at least five foiled plots since 2004 (Jones and Fair, 2010).

**Sectarian Tanzeems**

Pakistan is also home to a number of militant groups seeking to advance a sectarian agenda. These *firqawara tanzeems* include the anti-Shia Lashkar-e-Jhangvi (LeJ) and Sipah-e-Sahaba Pakistan (SSP). The Sunni sectarian groups grew to prominence in the 1980s and are now a well-established part of Pakistan’s political landscape (Nasr 2000a). In the past, Shia sectarian groups targeted Sunni Muslims, although these groups have largely disappeared.

The anti-Shia groups all claim to be fighting for a Sunni Deobandi Pakistan by purging the country of Shias, whom they view as apostates. Their actions typically take the form of attacks on Shi’ite mosques and community gatherings and they have periodically attacked Christian and

---

3 Many Pakistanis are dubious about the existence of al-Qa’ida *per se*. All focus group participants in our pre-testing, however, understood what we were referring to when we explained that al-Qa’ida was “Osama bin Laden’s militia.”

4 Many of these groups have been proscribed numerous times only to re-emerge. Many now operate under new names. We use the names which are likely to be most familiar to readers.

5 While an exact accounting of Shia in Pakistan is impossible because the Pakistani census is not fielded in areas where Shia are populous (e.g. the Northern Areas), they are believed to comprise 20 percent of the population (CIA 2009).
Ahmediya targets as well. In reality, a great deal of the anti-Shia violence is motivated by class issues and urbanization. The large land-holding families in Pakistan have historically been Shia and have not treated their tenant farmers well. Thus a class agenda has been executed through a narrative of apostasy (Nasr 2000b; Zaman 1988).

**Consequences of Militant Violence in Pakistan**

Militant violence has long been a fact of life in Pakistan. Since the earliest years of the state there have been ethno-nationalist insurgencies ongoing in Balochistan, Sindh, and KPK, some of which continue to this day at low levels.\(^6\) Sectarian tanzeems (e.g. LeJ and SSP), which were involved in the anti-Soviet Jihad and which are now assisting the Afghan and Pakistani Taliban, have been conducting attacks since 1979 in key districts and cities in Southern Punjab as well as in the major provincial capitals (e.g. Quetta, Lahore, Peshawar and Karachi). In the last five years, these groups and some of the Kashmir tanzeems (i.e. Jaish-e-Mohammad) have been targeting Pakistani security forces, civilian government figures and civilian targets in FATA and adjacent territories under the umbrella of the Pakistan Taliban. They have conducted attacks throughout KPK (especially Peshawar and its environs), and hit Islamabad, Lahore, and Karachi (Gul 2009; Jones and Fair 2010). In the year before our survey was fielded, there 11,429 people killed or injured in terrorist attacks in KPK, 3,788 in Balochistan, 4,424 in Punjab, and 1,791 in Sindh.\(^7\)

**Theoretical Overview: The Concept of Azadi**

Understanding the concept of *azadi*, which many Islamist militant groups claim to be fighting for, is critical for making sense of the politics of militancy in Pakistan. Loosely translated, *azadi* refers to the combination of freedom and self-determination at the level of a polity (e.g.

---

\(^6\) A successful ethno-nationalist insurgency in Bengali-dominated East Pakistan led to the creation of Bangladesh after the 1971 Indo-Pakistan war

\(^7\) Author calculations based on data from the National Counter Terrorism Center’s Worldwide Incident Tracking System.
especially Afghans or Kashmiris). The concept is redolent of, but not isomorphic with, what we might term “democracy.” Azadi fundamentally conveys a sense that politics should be organized by and answerable to the groups seeking freedom rather than by the government or military forces (be they foreign or domestic) that control these populations by force. Assessing how azadi has been used over the years to justify militants’ actions suggests several testable hypotheses about the relationship between support for democratic values and support for militant groups in the Pakistani context.

Azadi literally means freedom in Urdu (as well as Hindi, Dari, Persian, Pashto among other related languages), with explicit reference to political self-determination of a specific group of people. During the period of British colonization, azadi referred to freedom from British occupation and an assertion of Indian self-rule where “Indian” referenced the indigenous population within the territorial dominion of the British Raj. After partition of the sub-continent into India and Pakistan in 1947, the concept of azadi has been used by a variety of separatist groups to assert sub-national autonomy and/or freedom in both post-partition India and Pakistan. For this paper, the key expression of sub-national “azadi” is that relating to the disputed territory of Kashmir.

One of the principal means for the Pakistani state in this dispute has been using Islamist militants as proxies to conduct attacks in Indian Kashmir and elsewhere (Fair 2011). The mobilizing narrative for these groups has been attaining azadi or freedom for Muslim Kashmiris living under Indian (e.g. “Hindu”) oppression. Of course, azadi in most of this constructed discourse implies that if given the choice, India’s Kashmiris would join Muslim Pakistan to free themselves from

---

8 This is an oversimplification of course. Residents of the disputed area of Jammu and Kashmir under Indian control include Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, and Buddhists among others. Since violence there erupted in the late 1980s, there has been considerable ethnic cleansing with Hindus moving out of the valley of Kashmir to Jammu along with Sikhs. Buddhists have tended to be in the Leh-Ladakh area and remain so. Currently, the dispute is most intense over the valley of Kashmir, which is dominated by Muslims. The Pakistani claims that India is a “Hindu” state is also deeply problematic because India is technically a democratic state that, while not secular in the American sense, adheres to a notion of religious equality. Nonetheless, due to the preponderance of Hindus in the security forces, this facile and polemic characterization of “Hindu” oppression is sustainable for many Pakistanis.
Hindu domination. Reflective of this discourse, Pakistan-administered Kashmir is called “Azad” Kashmir (Free Kashmir) while that under India’s administration is called “Maqbuza Kashmir” (or Occupied Kashmir).

Kashmiri azadi is crucially important in Pakistani domestic politics and society. Pakistan’s textbooks rehearse the elemental unfairness of the partition which deprived Pakistan of Kashmir. Pakistan’s media on a daily basis report on the Indian state’s abuses and other missteps in Kashmir. Pakistan’s civilian and military leaders alike refer to the militant groups which claim to fight on behalf of Kashmir’s freedom as “freedom fighters” rather than terrorists. On February 5, Pakistan celebrates Kashmir Day with demonstrations in Azad Kashmir and elsewhere to show solidarity with Kashmiris living under Indian “occupation.” Pakistanis driving to Azad Kashmir do so on the “Srinagar Highway,” named for the capital of Maqbuza Kashmir. Pakistan’s cities are strewn with public commemorations and memorializations of Kashmir and many of Pakistan’s leadership (e.g. the Sharifs of the Pakistan Muslim League) are Kashmiri. Many products such as cooking oil are sold and marketed under the brand name “Kashmir.” Pakistan’s various tanzeems operating in Kashmir and the rest of India do so under the stated aims of “freeing” India’s Muslims from Hindu hegemony and allowing them to join Pakistan (Fair 2011).

The notion of azadi also applies to Afghanistan in Pakistani discourse, albeit in a much less intense fashion. In the 1980s, “mujahideen” were mobilized to free the Afghans from the secular Soviet occupation. Throughout the 1990s, Pakistan continued to justify its involvement and that of its so-called “mujahideen” proxies in Afghanistan by arguing that it was “liberating” Afghanistan from vicious warlords enjoying the support of India, Russia and Iran among others (Rashid, 2000). With the U.S. invasion in 2001, Pakistanis have again viewed Afghanistan as occupied and the

---

9 Recent polling results published the Chatham House finds evidence that, in fact, Kashmiris on both sides of the LOC prefer independence from both India and Pakistan (Brandnock 2010). However, few Pakistanis believe this to be the case (WorldPublicOpinion 2008).
10 Azadi is the noun related to the adjective azad.
Afghan Taliban as a legitimate group fighting *jihad* for the *azadi* of Afghans. Hence, concepts of democracy, self-determination, and violent uprising are intertwined in Pakistani culture.

This history suggests two testable hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 1 (H1):** *Pakistanis more supportive of liberal democratic principles consistent with azadi should be more supportive of militant groups operating from Pakistan.*

**Hypothesis 2 (H2):** *The relationship posited by H1 should be strongest among Pakistanis whose beliefs about Muslims in Kashmir and India’s presence in the region map strongly onto the azadi narrative.*

### The Survey

Our survey was designed to achieve three goals. First, we wanted to survey a representative sample of the Pakistani population, including rural and urban areas in each of Pakistan’s four main provinces. Second, we sought to measure attitudes towards specific militant organizations in a way that minimized item non-response on sensitive questions which had plagued previous surveys in Pakistan.\(^{11}\) Third, we wanted to mitigate social desirability bias in measuring affect towards militants, our key dependent variable. As is well known, respondents in many survey settings anticipate the views of the enumerator and thus answer in ways to please or seem high-status to the enumerator (Krosnick 1999; Marlowe and Crowne 1964, p. 109). These tendencies may be exacerbated on sensitive issues where fear and the desire to avoid embarrassment come into play. In Pakistan, respondents can often determine significant information about class, ethnicity, and sectarian orientation based on the name and accent of the enumerators. This makes social desirability concerns even stronger for surveys studying the politics of militancy in Pakistan, as respondents may be wary to signal pro-militant views to high-status enumerators.

---

\(^{11}\) Surveys in Pakistan which ask directly about affect towards militant groups obtain don’t know/no opinion rates in the range of 40% (Terror Free Tomorrow 2008; Pew 2009). Surveys which indirectly measure affect by asking whether groups “operating in Pakistan are a problem” (IRI 2009) or pose “a threat to the vital interests of Pakistan” (WPO 2009) still obtain item non-response rates as high as 31 percent.
Working with our Pakistani partners, Socio-Economic Development Consultants (SEDCO), we drew a random sample of 6,000 adult Pakistani men and women from the four “normal” provinces of the country which are governed by Pakistan’s 1973 constitution: Punjab, Sindh, KPK, and Balochistan using the Pakistan Federal Bureau of Statistics sample frame. The respondents were selected randomly within 500 primary sampling units (PSU), 332 in rural areas and 168 in urban ones (following the rural/urban breakdown in the Pakistan census). We substantially oversampled in the smaller provinces (Balochistan and KPK) to ensure we could generate valid estimates in these sparsely populated provinces. We calculated post-stratification survey weights based on population figures from the 1998 census, the most recent one available. Following procedures outlined by Lee and Forthofer (2006), all analyses reported below were weighted and clustered to account for survey design effects.

The face-to-face questionnaire was fielded by six mixed-gender teams between April 21, 2009 and May 25, 2009. The overall response rate was over 90 percent, which rivals the extremely high response rates achieved by the United States Census Bureau. Online Appendix A reports the sample demographics. Full question wordings are provided in Online Appendix B. All variables described below were coded to lie between 0 and 1, so that we can easily interpret a regression coefficient as representing a \( \beta \)% change in the dependent variable associated with moving from the lowest possible value to the highest possible value of the independent variable.

We pre-tested the questionnaire to residents of Islamabad, Peshawar, and Rawalpindi between March 20 and 26, 2009, in order to assess the functioning of the items and experiments. Several design decisions came about as a result of what we learned during pretesting.

**Measuring Support for Islamist Militant Organizations: The Endorsement Experiment**

Asking respondents directly whether they support militant organizations has numerous
problems in places suffering from political violence. First, and perhaps most importantly, it is unsafe for enumerators and respondents to discuss such issues. Second, item non-response rates to such sensitive questions are often quite high given that respondents fear that providing the “wrong” answer will threaten their own and their family’s safety. We therefore use an endorsement experiment to measure support for specific Islamist militant organizations.\(^\text{12}\)

The experiment involves assessing support for various real policies, which are relatively well known but about which Pakistanis do not have strong feelings (as we learned during pretesting) and works as follows:

- Respondents are randomly assigned to treatment or control groups (one-half of the sample is assigned to each group).
- Respondents in the control group were asked their level of support for four policies, which is measured on a five-point scale, recoded to lie between 0 and 1 for the analysis.
- Respondents in the treatment group are asked identical questions but then are told that one of four groups mentioned in the first section supports the policy in question. Which group is associated with each of the four policies is randomized within the treatment group.
- The difference in means between treatment and control groups provides a measure of affect towards the groups, since the only difference between the treatment and control conditions is the group endorsement.

Figure 1 provides a sample question, showing the treatment and control questions, and illustrates the randomization procedure in visual form. Online Appendix B describes all questions measuring support. Online Appendix C presents randomization checks showing balance on observables between treatment and control groups.

The advantage of this approach is that the militant organization is not the primary object of

\(^{12}\) This approach builds on the technique introduced in Lupia and McCubbins (1998).
evaluation; the policy is. We expected respondents to be more willing to share their opinions on uncontroversial policies rather than controversial groups. However, by embedding endorsements within the questions, we are able to indirectly ascertain support for militant organizations. Because we randomize both assignment to the group endorsement and the pairing of issues with groups, any difference in policy support can be attributed solely to the group.

We used this method to measure support for four groups: the Kashmiri tanzeems, the Afghan Taliban, al-Qa’ida, and the sectarian tanzeems. This required asking about four policy issues: polio vaccinations, reforming the frontier crimes regulation (the legal code governing the FATA), redefining the Durand line (the border separating Pakistan from Afghanistan), and requiring madrassas to teach math and science. By randomizing which group is associated with which policy among the treatment group, we control for order effects and randomize the pairing of issue with group. This allows us to identify effects for multiple groups that are unlikely to be biased by the details of any specific policy.

For an endorsement experiment of this type to work the policies need to have two characteristics. First, they need to be ones about which respondents do not have overly strong prior opinions so that a group’s endorsement might affect their evaluation of the policy. This procedure would not work in the U.S., for example, if one asked about banning abortion, for which prior attitudes are strong. Second, the policies have to be at least somewhat familiar to respondents since the group endorsement has to be meaningful and salient. For example, in the U.S., one could not ask about an obscure mining regulation since respondents may not provide meaningful responses and endorsements may have limited impacts. While the policies we studied may seem high valence to

---

13 We did not employ this method to assess support for the Pakistani Taliban. Within our budget for the survey we could only interview 6,000 respondents (twice as large as any other extent survey of Pakistani public opinion). This meant we could only study four groups (i.e., divide the sample into four cells) while getting reasonable precision at the provincial level. Given this constraint, we omitted an endorsement experiment on the Pakistan Taliban because: (1) at the time the survey was designed, the group was not as prominent as it has since become; and (2) there were safety concerns for enumerators as mentioned above.
professional students of politics, they do not appear to be so for most Pakistanis. During pre-testing, we found that most respondents knew about all four issues but did not have strong opinions on them. Our enumerators likewise felt these issues would be ones respondents would know something about but at the same time not have extremely rigid positions, a telling fact since our enumerators were all professionals averaging 4.6 years of experience.

There is empirical evidence in the survey that attests to the validity of the policies as well. Figure 2 shows the distribution of attitudes of policies in the control group. Importantly, it is single peaked on all but one issue, implying respondents do not have highly-polarized attitudes, as they would for something like abortion in the United States. The variance in responses to these policies in the control group was fairly large, ranging from .98 (polio vaccinations) to 1.28 (redefining the Durand line) on a five-point scale, suggesting potential malleability. For comparison purposes the 1987 General Social Survey (GSS) asked whether respondents agreed that “The government should provide a decent standard of living for the unemployed” on a five-point scale. The variance in responses in the GSS was approximately .657.

This approach unambiguously drove down item non-response. Our survey posed a number of direct questions (i.e., without an endorsement experiment) such as “What is the effect group X’s actions on their cause?” Non-response on these items ranged from 22% for al-Qa’ida to 6% for the Kashmir Tanzeem. Item non-response on the endorsement experiment questions, by contrast, ranged from a high of 7.6% for al-Qa’ida endorsing Frontier Crimes Regulation reform to a meager 0.6% for the sectarian tanzeems endorsing polio vaccinations. While this approach is not perfect, the low item non-response rate in our survey provides prima facie evidence that this technique reduced respondents’ concerns about reporting sensitive information.\footnote{Compared to other surveys, the contrast between direct questions and this approach is even starker. The PIPA 2007 survey of urban Pakistanis, for example, had a DK/NR rate of around 20 percent on most of the questions but for questions about the activities of Pakistan-based militant groups, the DK/NR rate was}
drives down item non-response is not necessarily evidence that it also ameliorates social desirability bias. Nonetheless, one would need to tell a fairly contorted story to explain why a technique that drives down item non-response so dramatically would fail to address social desirability biases that stems from respondents’ concerns about how enumerators will react to their answers.

To construct our dependent variable of support for militancy, we measure the average support the respondent reports for the four policies. Recall that one of the four militant groups was randomly assigned to be associated with each policy in the treatment group. Below, we leverage random assignment into treatment (endorsement) and control to measure differential support for militancy—as proxied by support for the policies. The main dependent variable therefore was a twenty-point scale, recoded to lie between 0 (no support for all four policies) to 1 (a great deal of support for all four policies). In the control group, the policy scale had a mean value of .79 (s.d. = .15). As described below, we also examined support for each of the groups individually.

**Measuring Support for Democratic Values**

We measured support for six core features of liberal democratic societies using questions which draw on the widely-used Freedom in the World (FIW) survey (Freedom House 2011).

*Free Speech.* “How important is it that individuals be able to express their political views, even though other people may not agree with them?” (Freedom of Expression and Beliefs module)

*Independent Courts.* “How important is it for you to live in a country where the decisions of the courts are independent from influence by political and military authorities?” (Rule of Law module)

---

sometimes in excess of 50 percent. When PIPA asked different samples of Pakistanis “How do you feel about al Qaeda?” in 2007, 2008 and 2009, DK/NR rates were 68 percent, 47 percent and 13 percent, respectively. When Pakistanis were asked who perpetrated the 9/11 attacks, DK/NR rates were 63 percent and 72 percent in 2007 and 2008, respectively (Fair et al. 2008). The Pew Global Attitudes Survey encountered similar problems when they asked (predominantly urban) Pakistanis whether they have “a very favorable, somewhat favorable, somewhat unfavorable, or very unfavorable opinion” of al Qa’ida. In 2008 and 2009, the DK/NR rates were 41 percent and 30 percent, respectively. When the same question was posed about the Taliban in 2008 and 2009, the DK/NR rates were 40 percent and 20 percent, respectively (Pew 2009).
Freedom of Assembly. “How important is it that individuals be able to meet with others to work on political issues?” (Associational and Organizational Rights module)

Being Governed by Elected Representatives. “How important is it for you to live in a country that is governed by representatives elected by the people?” (Functioning of Government module)

Property Rights. “How important is it that individual property rights be secure? This means the state cannot take away their things without proper court proceedings.” (Personal Autonomy and Individual Rights module)

Having Civilian Control over the Military. “The 1973 Constitution of Pakistan says civilians should control the military. This means the military cannot take action without orders from civilian leaders. In your opinion, how much control should civilians have over the military?” (Functioning of Government module)

The first five items were measured on a five-point scale (“extremely important,” “very important,” “moderately important,” “slightly important,” “not important at all”). The civilian control item was measured on a different five-point scale (“complete control,” “a lot of control,” “a moderate amount of control,” “a little control,” “no control at all”).

As shown in Table 1, about half of respondents select the most-democratic response (“extremely important” or “complete control”) and very few select response options in the bottom categories expressing little support for democracy. Accordingly, we bifurcate respondents into two groups—those selecting the highest response category and all others. We also estimated specifications in which responses were treated as continuous measures and we obtained similar results. In addition, we construct a scale in which we average the six items together to reduce measurement error. Cronbach’s alpha for the six items was .75, suggesting a high level of scale reliability. The democratic support index had a mean of .48 (s.d. = .33).

To test Hypothesis 2, we also needed to measure respondents’ beliefs about the status of
Muslims living in Kashmir. To do so, we constructed a three-point scale measuring perceptions that Muslims are being oppressed in Kashmir based on two binary indicators. The first question asked respondents “How well does India protect the rights of its Muslim citizens in Kashmir?” (response options: “extremely well,” “somewhat well,” “neither well nor poorly,” “somewhat poorly,” “extremely poorly.”) Respondents answering “extremely well” and “somewhat well” were coded as 0 and all others were coded as 1. The second question asked respondents “Thinking about the political preferences of Muslims in occupied Kashmir, please tell us which statement you agree with the most” (response options: “In occupied Kashmir, the majority of Muslims want to be part of India,” “In occupied Kashmir, the majority of Muslims want an independent state,” “In occupied Kashmir, the majority of Muslims want to be part of Pakistan”). Respondents answering that Muslims want to be part of India were coded as 0 and all others were coded as 1.

**Control Variables**

We additionally measured several control variables, which we include in our models both additively and multiplicatively: gender, marital status, age, access to the Internet, ability to read, write, and do math, education level, income, and sectarian affiliation (Sunni/Shia). These variables have all been cited as potential correlates of support for violent politics including: age (Russell and Miller, 1977), marriage (Berrebi, 2007), media access (Bell, 1978; Dowling 2006), education (Becker, 1968), income (Muller, 1985), and religion (Juergensmeyer, 2003). We also controlled for various attitudinal measures including views on the U.S. government’s influence on the world, views on the U.S. government’s influence on Pakistan, and belief that Shari’a law is about physical punishment. We

---

15 We also examined the conditional effects of these two variables in isolation and obtained similar results to using the averaged measure.

16 Prior to asking this question, we randomly presented some respondents with information about the relative strength of the Indian and Pakistani militaries. This manipulation had no significant or substantial effect of responses to this question.
hypothesize that negative views of the U.S. and belief in the corporal punishment aspects of Shari’a should be positively related to militancy. Finally, in the regression models, we also include province fixed effects.

**Methods of Analysis**

To test Hypothesis 1, we estimate the following OLS regression model:

\[ P_i = \alpha + \beta_1 T_i + \beta_2 D_i + \beta_3 (T_i \times D_i) + \gamma_i + \varepsilon_i \] (1)

where \( P_i \) is a continuous variable representing support for the four target policies, \( T_i \) is a dummy variable representing assignment to the group endorsement group, \( D_i \) is a continuous variable ranging from support for zero democratic values (0) to support for all six values (1), \( \gamma_i \) is a vector of region fixed effects, and \( \varepsilon_i \) is a normally-distributed error term. \( \beta_1 \) represents our measure of support for militancy—the change in support for the policy due to the group endorsement—among respondents who score lowest on the democracy index. \( \beta_2 \) represents the effect of democratic values on support for policies among respondents in the control group. \( \beta_1 + \beta_2 \) represents support for militancy among respondents who are the strongest supporters of democracy. Hence, the key parameter of interest is \( \beta_3 \), from which we can derive the marginal effect of support for democracy on support for militancy (following Brambor et al. 2005).

Note that the difference in variances across policies suggests that some may exhibit greater treatment effects than others because prior attitudes are less well-formed. We therefore use the variance of the responses in the control group to proxy looseness of pre-treatment attitudes and account for its influence by weighting each policy response by this variance. Hence, we place greater weight on policies where the survey responses lead us to expect a greater likelihood that attitudes
will be shifted in response to the endorsements.\footnote{The results are substantively similar without this weighting and so we report weighted results throughout as we believe they more accurately capture the impact of cues on attitudes. The weight vector $\mathbf{w}$ for the four policies (vaccination plan, FCR reforms, Durand line, curriculum reform) was: (0.983, 1.15, 1.28, 1.18), meaning that the weight for the control group was the average of these four individual weights (1.15). The post-stratification weight was multiplied by $\mathbf{w}$ to produce the overall sampling weight.}

To test the robustness of our results, we also estimate a series of more-saturated models, the most complex of which is represented by equation (2):

$$
P_i = \alpha + \beta_i T_i + \beta_2 D_i + \beta_3 (T_i \times D_i) + \gamma_i + \eta x_i + \lambda z_i + \xi T x_i + \psi T z_i + \epsilon_i \quad (2)
$$

where $x_i$ represents a vector of demographic control variables and $z_i$ represents a vector of attitudinal control variables. Note that equation (2) includes not only the main effects of these controls on support for the policy but also the interactive effects with the treatment dummy.

To test Hypothesis 2, we estimate an analogous set of models:

$$
P_i = \alpha + \beta_i T_i + \beta_2 D_i + \beta_3 K_i + \beta_4 (T_i \times D_i) + \beta_5 (T_i \times K_i) + \beta_6 (D_i \times K_i) + \beta_7 (T_i \times D_i \times K_i) + \gamma_i + \epsilon_i \quad (3)
$$

$$
P_i = \alpha + \beta_i T_i + \beta_2 D_i + \beta_3 K_i + \beta_4 (T_i \times D_i) + \beta_5 (T_i \times K_i) + \beta_6 (D_i \times K_i) + \beta_7 (T_i \times D_i \times K_i)
$$

$$
+ \gamma_i + \eta x_i + \lambda z_i + \xi T x_i + \psi T z_i + \epsilon_i \quad (4)
$$

where $K_i$ represents respondents’ beliefs about the state of Muslims in Kashmir. As mentioned in the section entitled “Meaning Support for Democratic Values,” it is measured using the index based on three questions about each groups’ goals. Interpreting these models is complex; we follow procedures laid out by Brambor et al. (2005). The main parameter of interest is represented by $\beta_7$, which allows us to test whether the democracy-militancy relationship implied by H1 is significantly stronger amongst respondents high on the “Kashmir beliefs” index than among those lower on the index.

**Results**

Consistent with Hypothesis 1, we find that support for democratic values increases support
for militancy across all groups. In the first column of Table 2, we present the estimates from the simple model described in equation (1). Controlling for provincial differences in support, we find that among those scoring zero on the democracy scale, the group endorsement actually decreases support for the policies by about 2.8 percentage points ($\beta_i = -.028, p < .01$, two-tailed). However, among the strongest supporters of democracy, we estimate the treatment effect of the endorsements to be positive 2.3 percentage points ($\beta_i + \beta_i = .023, p = .04$). Therefore, the overall effect of democracy on support for militancy is 4.5 percentage points ($\beta_i = .045, p < .01$). In Figure 3, we plot the marginal effect of support for democracy along with the associated 95% confidence interval. Confirming the model estimates, among low supporters of democracy, the treatment effect of the endorsement cues is negative. However, strong supports of democracy are more supportive of the policies as a result of the endorsements.

[FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE]

How big is this effect in substantive terms? In the control group, support for democratic values increases support for the government policies (as one would expect) by about 12.2 percentage points, as indicated by the parameter estimate of $\beta_2$. Hence, our difference-in-difference estimate represents about 37% of this main effect, and is therefore substantively meaningful. Another way to assess the effect size is to compare it to the effect of income—an expectedly strong predictor—on support for the policies. Unsurprisingly, going from the bottom income group to the top income group decreases support for these social services by 6.4 percentage points. Hence, the difference-in-difference estimate ($\beta_i$) represents 70% of the main income effect.

This finding is highly robust. In column two of Table 2, we present estimates from a regression specification including demographic controls, along with a dummy variable for respondents who did not answer the income question. In column three, we listwise delete cases for
which we do not have a valid income response. In column four, we include attitudinal controls in
the model. Finally, in column five, we estimate the model represented by equation (2), which
includes all the main and interactive effects. Our estimate of $\beta_i$ is highly stable across all
specifications, representing between 3.7-4.5 percent of the range of the dependent variable.

Consistent with Hypothesis 2, we find that the positive democracy-militancy relationship
shown in Figure 2 is driven by those who feel that the groups are fighting for democratic values. We
present estimates from equation (3) in the first column of Table 3. The parameter estimate of $\beta_i$ is
positive and statistically significant ($\beta_i = .127, p = .08$), indicating that the effect of democracy on
militancy increases by 12.7% as we move from belief that Muslims are not being mistreated in
Kashmir and desire to live under Indian control ($K_i = 0$) to belief that Muslims are disenfranchised
($K_i = 1$). Figure 4 illustrates these results. Note that the slope of the relationship between democracy
and militancy is essentially flat among those low on the Kashmir index ($K_i < 1$), and becomes
positive and steep as the value of the index increases to 1. As shown in columns (2)-(5) of Table 3,
this result only becomes stronger as additional variables are added to the model and the overall
estimate of $\beta_i$ is stable.

Finally, we analyzed the results separately for each militant group and each democratic value.
As shown in Table 4, the estimate of $\beta_i$ from equation (1) is positive and significant for all four
groups. A shown in Table 5, the estimate of $\beta_i$ is correctly signed for all six components of the
democracy index, with the strongest relationship being for four particular indicators—property
rights, independent courts, elected representatives, and freedom of assembly.

Discussion

To better understand the politics of militancy in Pakistan and to shed light on larger theories
about the relationship between democratic values and support for violent political organizations, we
designed and conducted a 6,000-person nationally and provincially representative survey of Pakistani
adults, measuring affect towards four specific militant organizations. We applied a novel
measurement strategy to mitigate social desirability bias and item non-response given the sensitive
nature of militancy in the region. Our endorsement experiment overcomes several issues that have
plagued past efforts to use surveys to study the politics of militancy.

Using this innovative approach we find that support for a set of core liberal democratic
values correlates with higher support for militant groups. This finding contravenes the conventional
wisdom which underlies recent U.S. policy approaches to Pakistan in particular and the Muslim
World in general. We measure support for democratic values using an index that aggregates support
for six key values: property rights, free speech, independent courts, being ruled by elected
representatives, civilian control of the military, and freedom of assembly. Moving from the lowest
value on this index to the top is associated with a 4-5 percentage point increase in support for
militant groups.

This result may seem puzzling, but it makes sense in the particular context of Pakistan where
militant groups (and their advocates in government) have long justified their actions as defending
azadi, a concept that loosely translates as freedom and self-determination. We find exactly what one
would expect if this history were driving our results; the democracy-militancy relationship is
strongest among respondents whose beliefs about Kashmir are consistent with the azadi narrative
and who believe the groups are fighting for justice, democracy, and to protect Muslims.

Moving beyond Pakistan, our larger theoretical contribution is to demonstrate that the
relationships between individual values on the one hand, and attitudes towards political
organizations on the other, depend strongly on beliefs about the political context. Accordingly, there
is no simple mapping between personal attitudes that seem normatively attractive, such as a belief in
individual liberty, and rejection of normatively unappealing methods of political contestation. In Pakistan, for example, some militant groups’ rhetoric justifying fighting for azadi has been so widely accepted that it is exactly those who believe most deeply in democratic values that were most supportive of violent groups.

The policy implications of this research are stark. Whether democratic values are a force for peace or for conflict depends on the how people understand the political context. Those seeking to promote pacific dispute resolution and orderly politics in Pakistan and elsewhere therefore need to move beyond efforts to delegitimize violence in a normative sense to efforts to convince potential supporters that it is a counterproductive method. In less fraught political realms advocates should consider that it may be easier to convince people that the facts of the world imply different political behavior than it is to change their underlying attitudes.

Finally, this paper suggests some new lines of inquiry for students of both violent politics and political behavior. For those studying violent politics, the paper highlights the potential importance of learning about how beliefs about the strategic environment interact with deeply-seated attitudes to generate support for specific militant organizations. Future studies can potentially manipulate beliefs about the strategic impact of the groups’ actions and measure resulting changes in support for militancy. For those studying political behavior, the paper shows clearly that beliefs about the political environment interact with long-standing beliefs to generate attitudes towards specific actors. This means one cannot look solely at what is going on inside peoples’ heads, but also how those attitudes interact with political structures, organizations, and institutions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Distribution of Democratic Values Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elected Representatives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Important at All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Independent Courts**                            | **Civilian/Military Separation** |
| Extremely Important                               | Extremely Important |
| 54.9%                                             | 39.6%               |
| Very Important                                     | Very Important      |
| 25.9%                                             | 17.6%               |
| Moderately Important                              | Moderately Important|
| 14.4%                                             | 25.7%               |
| Slightly Important                                | Slightly Important  |
| 3.2%                                              | 10.7%               |
| Not Important at All                              | Not Important at All|
| 1.6%                                              | 6.4%                |
| N                                                 | N                   |
| 5885                                              | 5770                |

| **Free Speech**                                    | **Freedom of Assembly** |
| Extremely Important                               | Extremely Important |
| 48.1%                                             | 53.5%               |
| Very Important                                     | Very Important      |
| 33.3%                                             | 29.6%               |
| Moderately Important                              | Moderately Important|
| 13.5%                                             | 12.7%               |
| Slightly Important                                | Slightly Important  |
| 4.1%                                              | 3.6%                |
| Not Important at All                              | Not Important at All|
| 1.0%                                              | 0.6%                |
| N                                                 | N                   |
| 5887                                              | 5893                |

*Note: Data weighted and adjusted for sampling design.*
Table 2: Support for Democratic Values Predicts Support for Militancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_1$: Group Cue</td>
<td>-.028***</td>
<td>-.028***</td>
<td>-.028***</td>
<td>-.026***</td>
<td>-.045*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.007)</td>
<td>(.007)</td>
<td>(.006)</td>
<td>(.006)</td>
<td>(.026)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_2$: Support for Democratic Values</td>
<td>.122***</td>
<td>.098***</td>
<td>.096***</td>
<td>.093***</td>
<td>.092***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.016)</td>
<td>(.014)</td>
<td>(.015)</td>
<td>(.014)</td>
<td>(.014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_3$: Group Cue x Support for Democratic Values</td>
<td>.045***</td>
<td>.042***</td>
<td>.043***</td>
<td>.037***</td>
<td>.041***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.012)</td>
<td>(.011)</td>
<td>(.011)</td>
<td>(.011)</td>
<td>(.013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.747***</td>
<td>.844***</td>
<td>.843***</td>
<td>.810***</td>
<td>.819***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.011)</td>
<td>(.022)</td>
<td>(.022)</td>
<td>(.029)</td>
<td>(.031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>5358</td>
<td>5358</td>
<td>5183</td>
<td>5243</td>
<td>5243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Region Fixed Effects
- Y
- Y
- Y
- Y
- Y

Demographic Controls
- N
- Y
- Y
- Y

Income Listwise Deleted
- N
- N
- Y
- N

Attitudinal Controls
- N
- N
- N
- Y

Group Cue-Demographics Interactions
- N
- N
- N
- N

Group Cue-Attitudinal Interaction
- N
- N
- N
- N

Note: OLS regressions predicting support for policies. Data weighted and adjusted for sampling design. Demographic controls include: gender, marital status, age, access to Internet, possession of cellular phone, ability to read, ability to write, ability to perform arithmetic, formal education level, income, and religion sect. Attitudinal controls include two measures of attitudes toward United States and view of Shari'a law.

***p<.01; **p<.05; *p<.10 (two-tailed)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_1$: Group Cue</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.030)</td>
<td>(.029)</td>
<td>(.029)</td>
<td>(.030)</td>
<td>(.037)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_2$: Support for Democratic Values</td>
<td>.183***</td>
<td>.171***</td>
<td>.171***</td>
<td>.164***</td>
<td>.165***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.048)</td>
<td>(.043)</td>
<td>(.046)</td>
<td>(.042)</td>
<td>(.042)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_3$: Perception of Muslims in Kashmir</td>
<td>.082***</td>
<td>.067***</td>
<td>.076***</td>
<td>.059***</td>
<td>.058**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.023)</td>
<td>(.022)</td>
<td>(.022)</td>
<td>(.022)</td>
<td>(.023)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_4$: Group Cue x Support for Democratic Values</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>-.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.069)</td>
<td>(.064)</td>
<td>(.068)</td>
<td>(.065)</td>
<td>(.065)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_5$: Group Cue x Perception of Muslims in Kashmir</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>-.058*</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.033)</td>
<td>(.032)</td>
<td>(.031)</td>
<td>(.032)</td>
<td>(.033)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_6$: Support for Democratic Values x Perception of Muslims in Kashmir</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>-.080*</td>
<td>-.074*</td>
<td>-.076*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.050)</td>
<td>(.044)</td>
<td>(.047)</td>
<td>(.043)</td>
<td>(.043)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_7$: Group Cue x Support for Democratic Values x Perception of Muslims in Kashmir</td>
<td>.127**</td>
<td>.144**</td>
<td>.141**</td>
<td>.139**</td>
<td>.139**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.072)</td>
<td>(.067)</td>
<td>(.071)</td>
<td>(.067)</td>
<td>(.068)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.675***</td>
<td>.787***</td>
<td>.778***</td>
<td>.766***</td>
<td>.775***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.023)</td>
<td>(.031)</td>
<td>(.032)</td>
<td>(.036)</td>
<td>(.037)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>5077</td>
<td>5077</td>
<td>4933</td>
<td>5002</td>
<td>5002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Region Fixed Effects**
- Y
- N

**Demographic Controls**
- Y
- N

**Income Listwise Deleted**
- N

**Attitudinal Controls**
- N

**Group Cue-Demographics Interactions**
- N

**Group Cue-Attitudinal Interaction**
- N

---

***p<.01; **p<.05; *p<.10 (two-tailed)

Note: OLS regressions predicting support for policies. Data weighted and adjusted for sampling design. Demographic controls include: marital status, age, access to Internet, possession of cellular phone, ability to read, ability to write, ability to perform arithmetic, formal education level, income, and religion sect. Attitudinal controls include two measures of attitudes toward United States and view of Shari'a law.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kashmeer Tanzeem</th>
<th>Afghan Taliban</th>
<th>Al Qaeda</th>
<th>Sectarian Tanzeem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_1$: Group Cue</td>
<td>-.034***</td>
<td>-.037***</td>
<td>-.024***</td>
<td>-.021**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.009)</td>
<td>(.009)</td>
<td>(.008)</td>
<td>(.008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_2$: Support for Democratic Values</td>
<td>.091***</td>
<td>.096***</td>
<td>.094***</td>
<td>.094***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.014)</td>
<td>(.014)</td>
<td>(.014)</td>
<td>(.014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta_3$: Group Cue x Support for Democratic Values</td>
<td>.045***</td>
<td>.043***</td>
<td>.029**</td>
<td>.025*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.015)</td>
<td>(.016)</td>
<td>(.014)</td>
<td>(.015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.815***</td>
<td>.801***</td>
<td>.804***</td>
<td>.822***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.031)</td>
<td>(.033)</td>
<td>(.032)</td>
<td>(.033)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>5243</td>
<td>5243</td>
<td>5243</td>
<td>5243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p<.01; **p<.05; *p<.10 (two-tailed)

Note: OLS regressions predicting support for policies. Data weighted and adjusted for sampling design. Regression models include region fixed effects, demographic controls, and attitudinal controls. Demographic controls include: gender, martial status, age, access to Internet, possession of cellular phone, ability to read, ability to write, ability to perform arithmetic, formal education level, income, and religion sect. Attitudinal controls include two measures of attitudes toward United States and view of Shari’a law.
Table 5: Support for Six Democratic Values Predicts Support for Militancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \beta_1 ): Group Cue</td>
<td>-.016***</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.022***</td>
<td>-.016***</td>
<td>-.011**</td>
<td>-.017***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.006)</td>
<td>(.005)</td>
<td>(.005)</td>
<td>(.005)</td>
<td>(.005)</td>
<td>(.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \beta_2 ): Support for Democratic Values</td>
<td>.043***</td>
<td>.028***</td>
<td>.024***</td>
<td>.041***</td>
<td>.061***</td>
<td>.019**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.008)</td>
<td>(.008)</td>
<td>(.008)</td>
<td>(.009)</td>
<td>(.008)</td>
<td>(.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \beta_3 ): Group Cue x Support for Democratic Values</td>
<td>.013*</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.028***</td>
<td>.018**</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.020**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.008)</td>
<td>(.008)</td>
<td>(.008)</td>
<td>(.008)</td>
<td>(.007)</td>
<td>(.008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.819***</td>
<td>.835***</td>
<td>.833***</td>
<td>.836***</td>
<td>.814***</td>
<td>.839***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.029)</td>
<td>(.028)</td>
<td>(.029)</td>
<td>(.028)</td>
<td>(.029)</td>
<td>(.029)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R(^2)</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>5243</td>
<td>5243</td>
<td>5243</td>
<td>5243</td>
<td>5243</td>
<td>5243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p<.01; **p<.05; *p<.10 (two-tailed)

Note: OLS regressions predicting support for policies. Data weighted and adjusted for sampling design. Regression models include region fixed effects, demographic controls, and attitudinal controls. Demographic controls include: gender, marital status, age, access to Internet, possession of cellular phone, ability to read, ability to write, ability to perform arithmetic, formal education level, income, and religion sect. Attitudinal controls include two measures of attitudes toward United States and view of Shari’a law.
Figure 1: Illustration of The Endorsement Experiment

Control

[POLICY DESCRIPTION]. How much do you support such a plan?

Treatment

[POLICY DESCRIPTION]. [GROUP NAME] have voiced support for this program. How much do you support such a plan?

Randomization Procedure

![Diagram of randomization procedure]
Figure 2: Distribution of Support for Policies in Control Group
Figure 3: Support for Militancy by Support for Democratic Values
Figure 4: Moderating Effect of Views of Muslims in Kashmir on Democracy-Militancy Relationship

(a) Low on Kashmir Index

(b) High on Kashmir Index
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# Appendix to “Democratic Values and Support for Militancy: Evidence from a National Survey of Pakistan”

## Online Appendix A: Sample Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>53.1%</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>77.8%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>Not Married</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban/Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>32.5%</th>
<th>Online Status</th>
<th>Online</th>
<th>7.1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>Not Online</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Punjab</th>
<th>55.6%</th>
<th>Own Cellphone</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>47.6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sindh</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NWFP</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balochistan</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>Ability to Read</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Sect</th>
<th>Sunni</th>
<th>96.1%</th>
<th>Ability to Write</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>69.7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shi’ite</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Age             | 18-24    | 22.9% | Ability to Do Math| Yes     | 76.0% |
|-----------------|----------|-------|                   | No      | 24.0% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Illiterate</th>
<th>32.2%</th>
<th>Views on U.S. government’s influence on world</th>
<th>Extremely positive</th>
<th>1.3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>Somewhat positive</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>Neither positive nor negative</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matriculant</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>Somewhat negative</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>Extremely negative</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>Extremely positive</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat positive</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Income</th>
<th>Less than 3000 PKR</th>
<th>12.3%</th>
<th>Neither positive nor negative</th>
<th>9.8</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,000-10,000 PKR</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>Somewhat negative</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,001-15,000 PKR</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>Extremely negative</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15,001-25,000 PKR</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 25,000 PKR</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>Believe that Shari’a law is about physical punishment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=6000 for all variables except monthly income (N=5779), views on U.S. government’s influence on world (N=5859), and views on U.S. government’s influence on Pakistani politics (N=5874). Data weighted and adjusted for sampling design.
Online Appendix B: Question Wordings

**Policies for Endorsement Experiment**

The World Health Organizations recently announced a plan to introduced universal Polio vaccination across Pakistan. How much do you support such a plan?
- A great deal
- A lot
- A moderate amount
- A little
- Not at all

The newly-elected national government has proposed reforming the Frontier Crimes Regulation and making tribal areas equal to other provinces of the country. How much do you support such a plan?
- A great deal
- A lot
- A moderate amount
- A little
- Not at all

Governments of Pakistan and Afghanistan have explored using peace jirgas to resolve their disputes for example the location of the boundary [Durand line/Sarhad]. How much do you support such a plan?
- A great deal
- A lot
- A moderate amount
- A little
- Not at all

In recent years the government of Pakistan has proposed curriculum reform for madaris to minimize sectarian discord. How much do you support such a plan?
- A great deal
- A lot
- A moderate amount
- A little
- Not at all

**Components of Kashmir Index**

How well does India protect the rights of its Muslim citizens?
- Extremely well
- Somewhat well
- Neither well nor poorly
- Somewhat poorly
- Extremely poorly

Thinking about the political preferences of Muslims in occupied Kashmir, please tell us which statement you agree with the most:
- In occupied Kashmir the majority of Muslims want to be part of India.
- In occupied Kashmir the majority of Muslims want an independent state.
- In occupied Kashmir the majority of Muslims want to be part of Pakistan.
Democratic Values

How important is it for you to live in a country that is governed by representatives elected by the people?

- Extremely important
- Very important
- Moderately important
- Slightly important
- Not important at all

How important is it for you to live in a country where the decisions of the courts are independent from influence by political and military authorities?

- Extremely important
- Very important
- Moderately important
- Slightly important
- Not important at all

How important is it that individuals be able to express their political views, even though other people may not agree with them?

- Extremely important
- Very important
- Moderately important
- Slightly important
- Not important at all

How important is it that individuals be able to meet with others to work on political issues?

- Extremely important
- Very important
- Moderately important
- Slightly important
- Not important at all

How important is it that individual property rights be secure? This means the state cannot take away their things without proper court proceedings?

- Extremely important
- Very important
- Moderately important
- Slightly important
- Not important at all

The 1973 Constitution of Pakistan says civilians should control the military. This means the military cannot take action without orders from civilian leaders. In your opinion, how much control should civilians have over the military?

- Complete control
- A lot of control
- A moderate amount of control
- A little control
- No control at all
Attitudinal Controls

Tell us if you agree with this opinion: a Shari’a government means a government that uses physical punishments (stoning, cutting off hands, whipping) to make sure people obey the law.
- Agree
- Disagree

Please tell us about the U.S. government’s influence on the world, if it is: extremely positive, somewhat positive, neither positive nor negative, somewhat negative, or extremely negative?
- Extremely positive
- Somewhat positive
- Neither positive nor negative
- Somewhat negative
- Extremely negative

Please tell us about the U.S. government’s influence on Pakistan’s politics, if it is: extremely positive, somewhat positive, neither positive nor negative, somewhat negative, or extremely negative?
- Extremely positive
- Somewhat positive
- Neither positive nor negative
- Somewhat negative
- Extremely negative

Demographics

Are you married?
- Yes
- No

Are you Sunni or Shi’ite?
- Sunni
- Shi’ite
- Non-Muslim [WRITTEN IN BY INTERVIEWER IF NON-MUSLIM]

What is your age in years?

What was the highest class you completed?
- Primary
- Middle
- Matriculant
- Intermediate (F.A./F.Sc)
- Graduate (B.A./B.Sc.)
- Professionals (M.S.C., M.A., Ph.D. or other professional degree)
- Illiterate

What is the approximate monthly income in your household?
- Less than 3000 rupees
- 3000 to 10,000 rupees
- 10,001 to 15,000 rupees
- 15,001 to 25,000 rupees
- More than 25,000 rupees
Do you ever go online to access the Internet, do website browsing, or to send and receive email?
- Yes
- No

Do you have a personal cell phone?
- Yes
- No

Read in any language with understanding?
- Yes
- No
- If yes, what language?

Can you write in any language, more than signing your name?
- Yes
- No
- If yes, what language?

Can you solve simple math (addition, subtraction) problems? Like 10 plus 7, or 30 divided by 5?
- Yes
- No
- Not sure

Sex:
- Male
- Female
### Online Appendix C: Randomization Checks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F: p=.99</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban/Rural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F: p=.78</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Province</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjab</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindh</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWFP</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balochistan</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F: p=.72</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious Sect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shi‘ite</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F: p=.51</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F: p=.63</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matriculant</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F: p=.21</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monthly Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3000 PKR</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000-10,000 PKR</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,001-15,000 PKR</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,001-25,000 PKR</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 25,000 PKR</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F: p=.31</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N=6000 for all variables except monthly income
(N=5779). Data weighted and adjusted for sampling design.