

The psychology of state repression: Fear and dissent decisions in Zimbabwe

Lauren E. Young*

July 29, 2018

Please access the latest version here.

Abstract

Many authoritarian regimes use frightening threats of repression to suppress dissent. Theory from psychology suggests that emotions should affect how citizens perceive and process information about repression risk, and ultimately whether or not they dissent. I test the effects of emotions on dissent in autocracy by running a lab-in-the-field experiment with 671 opposition supporters in Zimbabwe that randomly assigns some participants to an exercise that induces a mild state of fear, while others complete a neutral placebo. The fear treatment significantly reduces hypothetical and behavioral measures of dissent by substantively large amounts. It also increases pessimism about parameters that enter into the dissent decision, as well as risk aversion. These results show that emotions interact in important ways with strategic considerations. Fear may be a powerful component of how unpopular autocrats manage to exclude large portions of their populations from mobilizing for regime change.

*Assistant Professor, UC Davis Department of Political Science (leyou@ucdavis.edu, www.laurenelyssayoung.com). My thanks to the data collection team at Voice for Democracy. Thanks to Abhit Bhandari, Graeme Blair, Christopher Blattman, Alexander Coppock, Macartan Humphreys, Albert Fang, Grant Gordon, Donald Green, Kimuli Kasara, Dacher Keltner, Adrienne LeBas, Isabela Mares, John Marshall, Eldred Masunungure, Gwyneth McClendon, Tamar Mitts, Suresh Naidu, Gabriella Sacramone-Lutz, Camille Strauss-Kahn, Thomas Zeitzoff, and seminar participants at CAPERS, WGAPE, NEWEPS, the Yale Institute for Social and Political Studies, APSA, and the Columbia Comparative Politics Seminar for feedback at various stages. Thanks to the U.S. Institute for Peace; the International Peace Research Association Foundation; the Earth Institute Advanced Consortium on Cooperation, Conflict, and Complexity; the Columbia University Graduate School of Arts and Sciences; the Columbia University Department of Political Science; and the National Science Foundation for support for this research. This experiment was pre-registered with EGAP and can be accessed at <http://egap.org/registration/1353>. This research was approved by the Columbia University Institutional Review Board under protocol IRB-AAAP2200. The latest version of the appendix can be accessed here.

1 Introduction

42% of the world's population live in countries where political imprisonment or brutality are common.¹ Citizens in these repressive regimes must make difficult decisions about whether or not to express their dissent – decisions that are difficult not only because the stakes are high, but also because informational signals are infrequent and ambiguous, and decisions must be made in stressful, emotional environments. Coercive violence is often analyzed by political scientists as a signal of the cost of dissent, but it is often perpetrated in a way that seems designed to maximize fear through graphic torture, public spectacle, or violation of norms. Does the emotion of fear play an important role in shaping citizens' willing to dissent in autocracy, and if so, how?

This study tests a theory that emotions influence dissent by shaping how citizens perceive and process information about its risks. I present a simple decision framework that is a function of the strength of citizen preferences for an alternative regime, the repressiveness of the regime, and the number of other people who are expressing dissent. I argue that dissent decisions are affected in systematic ways by citizens' emotional states. Specifically, fear makes citizens more pessimistic in their perceptions of the risk of repression and the likelihood that other opposition supporters will mobilize alongside them, and less accepting of risk. Through these parameters, the emotion of fear reduces dissent.

I test these predictions with a lab-in-the-field experiment carried out in Zimbabwe in the final years of the repressive regime of Robert Mugabe. Identifying the causal effect of fear in observational data is difficult because the emotion of fear is usually induced by a contextual factor such as new information about a threat. When fear is induced by new information about a threat, it is impossible to separate out the effect of the information, which would be expected in a Bayesian framework, from the effect of the emotions induced by that information. To identify the effect of emotions, I induce fear without providing any new information using a technique from experimental psychology called an Autobiographical Emotional Memory Task (AEMT). I then measure beliefs

¹The assessment of state repression is based on living in a country rated 3 or above on the Political Terror Scale based on U.S. State Department reports. Population data is from the United Nations Population Division. Most recent available data is from 2016.

about the risk of repression, beliefs about the behavior of other opposition supporters, risk attitudes, and propensity to dissent using self-reported and behavioral measures.

The evidence shows that fear has a strong negative effect on dissent that may work through pessimism and risk aversion, particularly pessimism about the likelihood that other opposition supporters will also engage in dissent. The fear treatments significantly reduced both the hypothetical and behavioral measures of participation in dissent. The treatments reduced dissent on a low-risk behavioral measure by 14-23%, as well as the self-reported likelihood that participants would engage in six hypothetical acts of higher-risk dissent. These reductions in dissent may be driven by shifts in perceptions and fundamental preferences: the fear treatments caused significant increases in the perceived risk of repression, decreases in the perceived likelihood that other opposition supporters would also participate in dissent, and increases in risk aversion on an incentivized lottery. Mediation analysis suggests that pessimism about the proportion of other opposition supporters who will also engage in dissent may be the most important psychological channel through which fear reduces dissent.

These results are substantively important for several reasons. First, they provide a rigorous empirical test of one of the core debates in the literature on protest. Rational choice models of protest in autocracy have assumed away emotions and emphasized the role of informational signals that citizens use to consistently update their beliefs about the regime's strength or the preferences of other citizens (Kuran, 1991; Lohmann, 1994; Angeletos, Hellwig and Pavan, 2007; Shadmehr and Bernhardt, 2011). On the other hand, many qualitative scholars put emotions at the center of protest (Gurr, 1970; Goodwin, Jasper and Polletta, 2009; Pearlman, 2013). Although there is rich case study evidence documenting the strong emotions felt during moments of protest, I am not aware of another study that addresses this debate by causally identifying the effects of an emotion on dissent in a repressive environment and testing for multiple perception- and preference-based mechanisms. The evidence that fear causes decreases in the perceived proportion of other opposition supporters who will engage in dissent, and that these perceptions of others' behavior may be the key factor driving down participation in dissent, provides an important link between individual-level theories

of emotions in protest, and the game theoretic literature that has emphasized the importance of others' dissent as a strategic complement or substitute for one's own dissent. In addition, these results imply that, at least in highly repressive environments, participation is characterized by the strategic complements of a coordination game rather than the substitution logic of a collective action model.

Second, incorporating emotions into models of citizen dissent has implications for understanding how autocracies persist. Recent research has focused on how citizens are persuaded rather than coerced into supporting autocratic regimes. Some of this work has argued that repression is an undesirable tool for autocrats because building institutions to repress citizens increases the threat of a coup (Svolik, 2012). A 2016 review article argues that “although violence has historically been an important instrument of authoritarian governance, modern dictators rule by ‘velvet fist,’ relying on manipulation of the media and other sources of information to remain in power and pursue policy goals” (Gehlbach, Sonin and Svolik, 2016, 578). The empirical results presented here imply that repression can have a powerful effect on citizen beliefs and behavior, even if the threat is not entirely credible, as long as it induces fear. They also suggest that the growing literature on autocratic propaganda may be overly focused on the credibility and precision of informational signals (see, for example, Egorov, Guriev and Sonin, 2009; Gehlbach and Sonin, 2014; Shadmehr and Bernhardt, 2015; Gehlbach, Sonin and Svolik, 2016). The results presented here suggest that autocrats may even be able to repress dissent by highlighting frightening topics unrelated to state repression such as foreign threats or crime in the media. Ultimately, it may be easier for autocrats to influence citizens through the more emotional channels of propaganda, including fear of repression or anger at a foreign or domestic enemy, than by persuading them to believe false facts.

Finally, this study contributes to a long debate on the implications of emotions for citizenship and accountability. Research in American politics has questioned the common belief that emotions reduce the quality of decision-making. A number of studies in the U.S. have argued that anxiety actually makes people better citizens by increasing information seeking, openness to new ideas, knowledge, and ultimately participation (Marcus and MacKuen, 1993; Marcus, Neuman and

MacKuen, 2000; Brader, 2005; Valentino et al., 2008; MacKuen et al., 2010). This study suggests that this optimistic view of anxiety does not extend to settings where repression weighs heavily in participation decisions. While the effects of fear may make people safer at an individual level in the short term, their welfare effects are decidedly negative as they trap citizens in an equilibrium of predatory authoritarian institutions.

2 A psychological theory of dissent in autocracy

Citizens living under a repressive regime must assess a number of parameters that shape the costs and benefits of dissent, including how many other citizens will join them and the likelihood that they will face repression if they engage in a specific act of dissent. The expected utility of dissent involves weighing the expressive and instrumental benefits of dissent against the costs, including the expected disutility of being repressed, which is a function of the severity and probability of the violence that an individual might face. If the regime has a limited capacity to repress, an individual's personal risk of repression also depends on the number of other people who are expressing dissent. These terms – the expressive benefits, perceived potential for change, and potential repression – must be weighed against each other. At this point citizens' risk attitudes can also influence their decision. Citizens who are risk averse will need the potential benefits of dissent to outweigh the potential costs to compensate for the risk that they are taking on relative to the status quo.

Estimating the risk of repression in an autocracy is not a trivial task. Informational signals such as past repression events, propaganda, threats, and rumors can serve as inputs. For example, a citizen may assess the riskiness of attending a particular protest based on what she knows happened to past protest attendees, and what she has heard state agents say about this particular protest. Many of these informational signals, particularly repression events, also induce fear. As a result, citizens must update their beliefs about the costs and benefits of dissent in highly stressful environments based on rare, noisy, and potentially biased signals (Stern and Hassid, 2012; Stern and O'Brien, 2012).

This type of low-information social environment is exactly where one would expect cognition to be influenced by emotions. Emotions are specific patterns of chemical and electrochemical processes triggered by the brain in response to a stimulus (Damasio, 1994). Fear is a process in which a threatening stimuli causes the amygdala region of the brain to set off the release of adrenal steroids, which causes changes in bodily functions like heart rate and binds to receptors in many brain regions (LeDoux, 1996, 240-1). Past research in psychology and neuroscience has shown that emotions are associated with significant changes in how the body and brain functions. These include physiological changes that affect the autonomic nervous system including breathing patterns, heart rate, and the central nervous system. Emotions also cause changes in cognitive function including memory, attention (Eysenck, 1982), the distribution of cognitive capacity (Eysenck and Calvo, 1992), the use of heuristics (Park and Banaji, 2000), evaluative judgments (Schwartz and Clore, 1983), appraisals of uncertainty and lack of control (Lerner and Keltner, 2001), and evaluations of risks (Johnson and Tversky, 1983).

Fear is believed to be associated with a bundle of cognitive changes that evolved to help an organism survive an imminent threat. Fear causes people to pay more attention and dedicate more cognitive capacity to threatening stimuli (Gray, 1987; Eysenck and Calvo, 1992). A number of studies in American political psychology have found that fear increases information-seeking and vigilance (Brader, 2005; Valentino et al., 2008). Most importantly for this study, fear leads to more pessimistic perceptions of risks (Johnson and Tversky, 1983; Lerner and Keltner, 2000, 2001; Lerner et al., 2003) and risk aversion (Druckman and McDermott, 2008; Guiso, Sapienza and Zingales, 2013; Cohn et al., 2015).

Qualitative interviews that my research team performed in Zimbabwe in 2015 and 2016 with opposition activists and supporters provide examples of how the cognitive processes described in this psychological theory actually influence repression risk assessments and ultimately dissent behavior in an autocracy. First, the interviews illustrate how decisions about dissent in repressive contexts themselves induce fear, making memories of particularly extreme violence easy to recall. One youth opposition organizer recounted that he assesses the risk of repression at protests based

primarily on past repression events, particularly the most violent period in Zimbabwe's recent history, the 2008 election. In his words, "that one [2008] was a very terrible experience, which always sort of like comes to mind whenever you try to go against the government" (interview, Harare, 7 July 2016). Another organizer similarly reported that "it [the risk of violence] just comes into your mind" (interview, Harare, 27 July 2016). While a Bayesian model would suggest that all past experiences – violent and non-violent – should be used to assess the present risk of repression, these quotes suggest that extreme violent events are much more available to potential participants in dissent, driven by and reinforcing fear at the time of the decision.

Second, the interviews reveal that many opposition supporters and organizers view dissent decisions as intuitive rather than analytical processes. Although there is certainly evidence that organizers carefully analyze signals of the risk of repression such as whether a protest receives police permission and whether similar events have recently been targeted with repression, the way that information is interpreted in the moment is described as instinctual. One organizer said that "you need to feel it when you're at a dangerous place and move away" (interview, Harare, 27 July 2016). Similarly, a former opposition candidate described the importance of using "defensive instincts" when threatened with violence (interview, Harare, 7 July 2016). These interviews suggest that dissent decisions do involve cost-benefit analysis, but this analysis is heavily influenced in the moment by emotional inputs. Finally, some interviewees suggested that fear actually reduces the quality of decisions about dissent. An opposition activist in a high-density area of Harare put it this way: "to be brave makes you mature and get some better tactics to fight" (opposition activist, Harare, 28 Sep 2015). Another activist argued that "fear is vague" and argued that it makes dissidents over-estimate the effectiveness of the security forces: in his words, "after World War II they realized that the Gestapo were nowhere near as effective as they thought it was" (interview, Harare, 9 July 2016). This idea has also been recognized by some previous political scientists studying dissent. According to Scott (1990), "...estimating the intentions and power of the dominant is a social process of interpretation highly infused with desires and fears... the evidence is never entirely unambiguous and that the subjectivity of subordinate groups is not irrelevant to its reading"

(220).

I form specific hypotheses to test quantitatively by applying this view of emotions and cognition to the study of dissent decisions in autocracy. The hypotheses were pre-registered with the EGAP experimental registry:²

1. People in a state of fear will express less dissent.
2. People in a state of fear will be more pessimistic about the risk of repression.
3. People in a state of fear will be more pessimistic in their expectations of whether other opposition supporters will dissent.
4. People in a state of fear will be more risk averse.

The first hypothesis lays out the overall behavioral prediction that fear will cause reductions in dissent. The second and third hypotheses are logically linked by the fact that an individual's own probability of facing repression is a function of the number of other opposition supporters engaged in a particular dissent behavior. The final hypothesis posits that fear will cause increases in general risk aversion.

3 Fear and repression in Zimbabwe

This study was carried out in a political context that is characterized by a long history of repressive violence designed to reduce the political participation of opposition supporters. However, when the study was carried out, active violence against opposition supporters was very low. This created a unique opportunity to study how people living under a repressive regime make decisions about dissent without exposing participants to unjustifiable risks.

Since gaining independence in 1980, Zimbabwe has held regular, contested elections but these have not resulted in any peaceful transitions of power between parties, in part because of

²I also pre-registered a fifth hypothesis that the effects of fear would spill over into economic domains. I do not focus on this hypothesis here in the interest of parsimony, but discuss it and present the results in Appendix J. A sixth, non-substantive hypothesis that the effects of two different versions of the treatment would be the same was also pre-registered. The pre-analysis plan is available at EGAP at <http://egap.org/registration/1353> and reproduced in Appendix L.

the ruling party's use of repression. There are two major periods of repression in Zimbabwe's history, each directed at a potential threat to ZANU-PF's power. First, shortly after independence in the 1980s, ZANU-PF used its armed forces to brutally quash a potential insurgent and electoral challenge from the Ndebele minority group living in Matabeleland (Doran, 2017). As many as 20,000 citizens were killed by the government during this period (Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace in Zimbabwe (CCJPZ), 1997). Second, in 1999 an opposition party called the Movement for Democratic Change (MDC) grew out of the country's major trade union and gained significant public support. Shortly after the unexpected defeat of ZANU-PF's proposed constitution in a referendum, a new wave of violence against these opposition supporters and organizers began. In addition, the government began tacitly encouraging independence war veterans to invade white commercial farms and stopped protecting the farmers, who had been an important source of funding and mobilization for the opposition during the referendum (LeBas, 2006).

Violent repression reached a peak during the 2008 elections, which took place in a context of hyperinflation, deindustrialization and the collapse of public services. Before the first round, violence began to escalate, and was consistently viewed as a strategy of inducing fear and signaling the cost of opposition to the broader mass of opposition supporters. Opposition supporters described one early act of violence as "...aimed at sending 'a message to all ... and there was both fear and revulsion', 'a warning to others' and 'a lesson that authorities can humiliate anybody'" (Sachikonye, 2011, 89). One civil society leader explained that this type of violence was designed to affect election outcomes by intimidating opposition supporters. In his words, violence "is a tool of intimidation. By beating up people like Tsvangirai they are sending the message that no one is safe. And when word gets out into the rural areas that you are not safe, this will have enormous impact" (civil society leader Reginald Matchaba-Hove, quoted in OSISA, 8, 2007).

As the votes in the March 2008 election came in, it became clear that ZANU-PF had lost its parliamentary majority and the office of the presidency. At this point, "the party-state launched a terror campaign of a scope and intensity never before seen in Zimbabwe" (Bratton and Masunungure, 2008, 51). This campaign was centrally controlled under the leadership of the former Defense

Minister (and current president) Emmerson Mnangagwa (HRW, 2008). Violence during this period was marked by public assault and killings, and the increasing use of graphic forms of torture. Sachikonye describes the “widespread but calculated use of torture as an instrument to punish the opposition and cause fear amongst its ranks” by the police, military, and militias (2011, p88).

The violence in 2008 set off a chain of events that ultimately resulted in ZANU-PF winning the 2013 election through a mix of popularity, vote buying, and manipulation of electoral rules (Bratton, Dulani and Masunungure, 2016). After the violent first round of the election, MDC presidential candidate Morgan Tsvangirai pulled out of the run-off. Negotiations brokered by the international community led to the formation of a coalition government with Mugabe remaining as president and Tsvangirai serving as prime minister. Entry into government in 2009 was the beginning of the MDC’s loss of popular support (Bratton and Masunungure, 2012; Booysen, 2012). The MDC, focused on skirmishes over parliamentary procedures and largely dismissive of polls showing that they had lost support, ran an anemic campaign in 2013 (Zamchiya, 2013). By contrast, the ZANU-PF 2013 campaign was “slick, well-funded, united and peaceful” (Tendi, 2013). ZANU-PF won by large margins at the presidential and parliamentary levels in 2013.

This study was carried out in the aftermath of the 2013 election, approximately two years before Robert Mugabe was removed from office by his former vice president in a coup. Between 2013 and 2015, both MDC and ZANU-PF were focused on internal battles to decide who would succeed the aging Mugabe and weakened Tsvangirai, who by this point had lost three presidential elections. As both parties purged members, a series of by-elections were held in 2015 that were generally peaceful and handily won by the ruling party (Freedom House, 2015). It is in this context of ruling party popularity and low violence against opposition supporters that this study was carried out.

4 Research design: Identifying the effect of fear

Testing the causal proposition that emotions affect dissent requires isolating the effect of emotions from two primary threats to identification. First, the effect of emotions must be isolated from characteristics of individuals that make them more likely to feel certain emotions. For example, activists who face a higher risk of repression because of their political activities may report lower levels of fear, leading to a spurious positive correlation between fear and activism. Second, the effect of emotions must be isolated from the effect of new information. In the real world, people are likely to feel fear after receiving new information about a threat, making it difficult to disentangle the effects of fear from the effects of the actual threat in observational data.

The research design in this article addresses these two threats to identification by randomly assigning participants to a procedure that induces a mild state of fear during the course of an interview. I use a common emotion induction from experimental psychology in which participants are asked to recall in detail a situation that has made them feel a targeted emotion (Strack, Schwarz and Gschneidinger, 1985; Lerner and Keltner, 2001; Myers and Tingley, 2016). To deal with the first threat to identification, I randomly assign participants into the fear treatment so that the treatment is orthogonal to any individual characteristics. To deal with the second threat, I use an emotion induction technique in which participants receive no new information and simply reflect on information that they already have. Therefore, any differences between the treatment and control groups can be attributed to the effect of the fear treatment itself, and not to differences in information about the risk of repression.

4.1 Treatment: Inducing emotions

The treatment in this study is commonly used in psychology to induce specific emotions, often called an Affective Emotional Memory Task (AEMT). Participants were asked by the enumerator to describe a situation that makes her relaxed (control), or afraid (treatment), in detail and in a way

that would also make another person feel the emotion.³ Compared to other methods of inducing emotions, including videos or situations like interactions with confederates, AEMTs are one of the best ways to induce a specific emotion in a wide range of people. This method is strong enough to cause changes in physical measures of emotional arousal based on cardiovascular, respiratory or electrodermal response (Kriebing, 2010). It has been used in a wide range of contexts, including with violence-affected populations in Afghanistan (Callen et al., 2014) and Colombia (Bogliacino et al., 2017).

Half of the treatment participants were directed to describe fears around politics and elections, while the other half were asked to describe general fears and directed away from experiences related to politics and elections. Randomization was blocked on community, surveyor, and gender. In the general fear condition, participants reflected on things like snakes, witchcraft, and walking in the dark, that have nothing to do with the decision about political risk that they will be asked to make. In the political fear condition, participants reflected on frightening things related to the dissent decision.⁴ While in neither treatment condition are participants receiving any new information, the estimates of the effect of fear based on the general fear treatment are a cleaner test of the effect of fear because in this condition participants are not even reflecting on information about repression that they already have. However, the political fear condition more closely approximates the way that fear may be induced in practice in repressive environments, through memories or stories of brutal violence.

The interview was conducted in private. The surveyor read a list of examples that a similar sample pool had reported made them afraid or relaxed before asking the participant to describe

³A recent validation exercise of this emotion induction technique found that it had little effect on positive emotions (Myers and Tingley, 2016), and another application with a violence-affected population in Colombia found no significant differences across a neutral control and a happy control (Bogliacino et al., 2017). I chose a control focusing on leisure activities to ensure that the control participants, many of whom live in high-stress environments, had a low likelihood of reflecting on things that actually induced stress or fear.

⁴I invited 10% of the participants to let us record their open-ended responses, but all but 21 people refused, including just four in the political fear treatment, presumably because they preferred to remain anonymous. In an earlier round of the study described in Appendix K, enumerators noted down a few words of the participants' responses. Respondents who described non-political fears most commonly talked about death (13%), accidents (13%), apolitical violence (11%), dangerous animals or snakes (11%), or witchcraft (9%). Enumerators coded all political fears as "political violence". Respondents in the relaxation control condition talked about having enough money or food (52%), peace (13%), family (8%), and a happy marriage (7%).

the situation in a way that might make the enumerator herself relaxed or afraid as well. Surveyors were given a list of probes to follow up on the response and were instructed to keep the participant focused on what makes him or her afraid until the surveyor was satisfied that the participant had reflected on a real, relevant fear, and to redirect the participant if she went off topic. The text of the instructions for the emotion induction are shown in Appendix C.

Recounting the response to a surveyor is advantageous for several reasons. First, it enables the inclusion of low-literacy participants. Second, enumerators could use several permitted probes to direct the participant in an interactive way to reflect on precisely the ideas or feelings that trigger the specific emotion, enabling a more potent and directed treatment. Third, it reduced the risk that participants' responses could be traced back to them through a written record.

Although the AEMT is one of the best existing ways to induce a specific targeted emotion, in practice it tends to induce a bundle of positive or negative emotions. Studies that have carried out manipulation checks on multiple emotions in large samples have typically found that the emotional memory tasks targeting one negative emotion like fear in many cases also increase other negative emotions such as anger (Valentino et al., 2011; Banks and Valentino, 2012; Myers and Tingley, 2016).⁵ For this reason, some have recommended that emotion inductions should be primarily analyzed using mediation analysis (Myers and Tingley, 2016; Albertson and Gadarian, 2016), although this relies on strong assumptions of no post-treatment confounding. Ultimately, the most conservative interpretation of the results presented here is that any treatment effects are caused by a bundle of negative emotions induced by thinking about frightening things. This interpretation is based purely on the randomized design. However, to help interpret this result, I use mediation analysis to test whether fear rather than five other post-treatment emotions seem to mediate the differences in the substantive outcomes. If the reader accepts the assumptions required for the mediation analysis, then passing this test would allow these results to be interpreted as the effects of fear itself.

⁵Other past studies conduct a manipulation check with only a handful of subjects (often less than 20) (Lerner and Keltner, 2001), run a manipulation check that only compares two negative emotions rather than comparing both to a control (Lerner and Keltner, 2001; Lerner et al., 2003), or simply do not run a manipulation check (Callen et al., 2014).

4.2 Measurement

After the emotion induction, participants went through a series of modules to measure outcomes.⁶ Five main outcomes were measured. Table 1 breaks these down by whether they measure dissent or the posited psychological mechanisms, and by whether they are behavioral or hypothetical measures.

[Table 1 about here.]

I measure propensity to dissent using both hypothetical and behavioral measures. While hypothetical measures are the only way to measure high-risk acts of dissent without putting participants at unjustifiable risk, including one behavioral measure of a low-risk act of dissent increases confidence that fear has an effect on actual behavior, and not only the way that participants answer survey questions. The main hypothetical measure of dissent is based on an index of twelve questions. I asked participants to assess their propensity to participate in six acts of dissent: wearing an opposition party t-shirt, sharing a funny joke about the president, going to an opposition rally, refusing to go to a rally for the ruling party, telling a state security agent that she supports the opposition, and testifying in court against a perpetrator of violence. They were asked about these six items both for the current (non-election) period and for the period around the next election, when risks are heightened. The items were selected to be contextually relevant and to span a range of risk levels.

For the behavioral measure of dissent, I measured whether participants chose to take a plastic wristband with a pro-democracy slogan on it over an otherwise similar plain wristband as a thank you gift for participating in the study. Although the message was subtle and the band was not affiliated with any particular opposition group, participants were told by the enumerator that the pro-democracy wristband will “show your political beliefs” and read the written text on the band, then shown that the other wristband has no political message. Because the wristbands are otherwise similar in appearance and value, choosing the political wristband can be interpreted as participation

⁶These variables, including the order in which they were collected, are described in detail in Appendix A.

in a low-risk act of dissent.

Pessimism about the risk of repression and about the participation of other opposition supporters in dissent were also measured using twelve-question indices. To measure perceptions of repression risks, participants were asked about six types of repression in two periods: threats, assault, destruction of property, sexual abuse, abduction, and murder. To measure perceptions of other opposition supporters, participants were asked about the proportion of other opposition supporters that would engage in the same six acts of dissent.

Finally, I measured risk attitudes in a financial domain using an incentivized game developed by Eckel and Grossman (2002). In the game, participants play four 50-50 lotteries by choosing from five different bets with increasing spreads, or level of risk. Across the four lotteries, there are two standard conditions, one condition with ambiguity, and one with losses. From these I constructed several measures: risk aversion, ambiguity aversion, and loss aversion. Due to its reliance on 50-50 coin flips, this measure is effective with a participant pool that includes low-numeracy individuals. One of the four rounds was randomly selected to be paid out for a value between 0 and \$1.10.

As a manipulation check, participants' current emotional states were measured on a four-point scale after the last outcome measure. I included this manipulation check after the substantive measures because there is evidence that asking participants to report their emotional states can reduce the extent to which they actually feel the targeted emotion (Keltner, Locke and Audrain, 1993; Kassam and Mendes, 2013). Measuring emotions after the substantive outcomes also tests whether the emotions were induced throughout the course of all the outcome modules.

The outcome variables used in the main hypothesis tests are mean effects indices based on all of the sub-indicators for the hypothetical measures (Kling, Liebman and Katz, 2007). Within each hypothetical outcome module, the order of the questions was randomly assigned.

4.3 Implementation and ethics

The safety of participants and the research team was a first-order concern in the design and implementation of this study. This section provides a brief overview of the ethical principles that

guided the project, and the procedures that I put in place to try to adhere to them. A more complete description of the ethical considerations and procedures that I used is included in Appendix D.

The experiment was carried out by the Zimbabwean NGO Voice for Democracy (VfD), which conducts research and organizes communities to prevent and respond to political violence. VfD's existing networks and local knowledge were crucial for this study to be carried out safely as the research team could leverage existing social ties to recruit participants and establish trust. Their local reputation also helped reduce the risk of biased data.

Importantly, the threat of violence during this period was low. As discussed in Section 3, the ruling party had a comfortable cushion of popularity and was preoccupied with its own internal politics. Political violence in September 2015 and the preceding months was infrequent and entailed largely low-level acts of intimidation or harassment, much of it perpetrated against ZANU-PF members (Zimbabwe Peace Project, September 2015). Nevertheless, I took a number of steps to protect participants and the survey team from the risks of retribution and re-traumatization.

The primary ethical concern was that participants might be subject to retribution for participating in the study or for their responses through a breach of confidentiality. To minimize this risk, interviews were carried out in private homes. No identifying information was collected, and consent was obtained verbally so that a written consent document would not link participants to their data. Data was collected on password-protected tablets, and immediately after each interview the data was sent to a server and deleted from the tablet. To prevent participation from being tracked, interviewees were recruited by VfD's community-based mobilizers and the VfD team spent no more than a few non-consecutive days at each site. VfD also used its network to monitor whether there was any retribution after their team left, including attempts to track possession of the orange wristbands. We received no reports of breaches of confidentiality, retribution, or attempts to track participation.

A second concern was that participants could become re-traumatized. I judged this risk to be sufficiently low given that the AEMT has been used in numerous studies, including some with participants exposed to political violence in Afghanistan and Colombia (Callen et al., 2014;

Bogliacino et al., 2017), and is similar to established therapeutic practices for anxiety and PTSD (Rothbaum and Schwartz, 2002; Steinman, Wootton and Tolin, 2016). Nevertheless, I set up systems to monitor, prevent, and address re-traumatization. The first way I minimized this risk was by selecting a survey team that had past experience working with survivors of violence and pursued a mission to prevent and mitigate violence. Second, during surveyor training we developed specific, contextually appropriate guidelines for how to recognize and respond to trauma by pausing or stopping the interview, and how to conduct a post-interview debrief to bring participants back to a neutral emotional state. These practices were evaluated and reinforced during surveyor debriefing sessions at the end of each day. Third, surveyors assessed whether or not each participant needed professional counseling as a result of the interview and the team had a plan to refer traumatized participants to a well-respected counseling center. Ultimately, the surveyors did not identify any participants who were so upset during the interview that they needed referral to counseling.

These steps minimized but did not eliminate the risk to participants. To this end, the recruitment and consent processes clearly stated that the interview would cover sensitive political topics that could upset participants, while carrying no direct benefits.

The third set of ethical concerns was around the safety of the research team, which was not explicitly considered during the review by my university's Institutional Review Board. Moving quickly between communities and using local mobilizers to recruit participants also reduced risks to the surveyors. The local mobilizers also assessed the security situation in each community before the surveyors arrived. Finally, the questionnaire asked participants about their party identification early on to identify regime supporters who had mistakenly been recruited into the study. In these cases, surveyors were trained to skip all sensitive questions. Out of the target of 700, three recruited participants ended up being regime supporters, and in all cases the surveyors followed the protocol appropriately.

In addition to these ethics considerations, another implementation challenge in this authoritarian environment was the risk of biased responses. I believe that VfD's local reputation reduced the

under-reporting of sensitive opinions and behaviors.⁷ However, only bias that differentially affects the responses of the treatment and control groups could bias the estimates of the effect of fear reported here. To minimize bias that could be correlated with the emotion induction treatments, I kept the surveyors and team leader blind to my hypotheses, although it was necessary that they understood that the emotion induction was designed to affect participants' behavior. When asked what patterns I expected, they reported that they had no expectations. Keeping participants and surveyors blind to the hypotheses reduced the risk that their behavior could be shaped by desirability bias.

4.4 Participant recruitment and randomization

I recruited 671 participants from six communities in Zimbabwe where Vfd has a network of mobilizers and informants, and which have also been affected by state-sponsored violence since 2000. Half of the participants were recruited in the southern suburbs of the capital city Harare, and half from rural areas in Masvingo and Manicaland provinces in southern and eastern Zimbabwe. Figure 1 displays a map of the study constituencies.

[Figure 1 about here.]

The recruitment strategy produced a mix of opposition activists and sympathizers. The surveyors started by interviewing the activists who were working as Vfd mobilizers so that they understood the sensitive content of the study, and then asked them to recruit opposition supporters, including those who were afraid to openly participate in opposition politics. Ultimately, 15% of the sample reports that they have not attended an opposition rally, and 41% report that they have not volunteered for an opposition party, suggesting that the participant pool has a fairly balanced mix of activists and sympathizers.⁸

⁷In the fourth and fifth rounds of the Afrobarometer in Zimbabwe, almost 40% of respondents reported that they believed the survey was sponsored by the government of Zimbabwe, and several studies have found that Afrobarometer respondents hide sensitive political information after violent events (Garcia-Ponce and Pasquale, 2015; Young, 2016).

⁸Because these variables were collected post-treatment, this analysis is based on the control group data only.

Table 2 presents summary statistics and tests of whether treatment assignment was balanced across important covariates. Just more than half of study participants are female. The median respondent has a high school degree and is 35 years old. There is significant variation in asset ownership: around one in four participants owns a generator, more than one in three owns a smartphone, 34% have electricity in their home, more than one-third own cattle, and almost 60% own chickens. The median monthly income per capita within the participants' households is \$14.29, and the mean is \$27.40. Balance tests do not indicate any randomization failures.

[Table 2 about here.]

The average respondent has experienced significant past repression. Since the year 2000, 83% of the control group reported that, in the context of political violence, they had experienced verbal abuse or threats, 67% withholding of benefits such as food or goods, 43% torture, 41% destruction of property, 40% assault, 21% abduction, 19% arbitrary arrest or detention, 2% sexual violence, and 0% murder.⁹ These numbers suggest an extremely high level of victimization, but evidence suggests that this may not be far from the average experience in Zimbabwe. A nationally representative study carried out in 2009 found similar levels of victimization, including that 70% of Zimbabwean opposition supporters had experienced threats or intimidation, 39% have experienced personal injury, and 44% have experienced property damage (author's own analysis of data in Bratton, 2011).¹⁰

5 Results

5.1 The effect of fear on dissent

This section presents tests of whether the fear treatment reduces participation in dissent. I test this prediction using both the hypothetical index based on how likely participants say it is that they

⁹Surveyors defined "experience" for the respondent as something that happened to you or someone in your household. Because these variables were measured post-treatment, I only report these statistics for the control group.

¹⁰A full comparison of my sample on demographic measures and in terms of past exposure to repression is presented in Appendix I.1.

would take action, and the behavioral wristband measure.¹¹

Table 3 presents the results. In Columns 1 and 2, I present the estimated Average Treatment Effect (ATE) and measures of uncertainty for the General and Political Fear treatments, respectively, on the hypothetical index of propensity to dissent. Columns 3 and 4 present the same for the behavioral measure based on whether a participant took the political wristband. The first row presents the ATE and the second presents estimated standard errors from linear regression. The third row presents *p*-values calculated using randomization inference. Randomization inference tests the sharp null hypothesis of no treatment effect. It uses the actual distribution of the outcome in the data to calculate a test statistic rather than an assumption that the outcome follows a particular distribution. While randomization may always be preferable to methods that rely on the assumption of a particular distribution, in this case because most of the outcomes that I investigate are not normally distributed it is particularly appropriate.

[Table 3 about here.]

Table 3 shows that participants who receive the fear treatment report a lower likelihood of expressing dissent, and are less likely to take the wristband with a pro-democracy slogan. These effects are substantively large and statistically significant.¹² The general and political fear treatments reduced how likely participants said they were to take action on the hypothetical measure by 0.53 and 0.76 standard deviations, respectively. The fear treatments reduced the proportion of respondents who took the political wristband by 11 percentage points in the case of the general fear treatment and 19 percentage points in the case of the political fear treatment. The effect of fear is consistent across the 12 sub-indicators that make up the hypothetical dissent index.¹³

These reductions in dissent are substantively important. To illustrate the substantive changes, Figure 2 shows that the proportion of participants who say that they are “very likely” or “sure”

¹¹Taking the political wristband is strongly correlated with higher propensity to take pro-opposition actions on the hypothetical measure. Appendix B presents a validation of the wristband measure.

¹²The sample size for the study was increased shortly before the study launched, so I was unable to offer a choice between two physical wristbands to all participants. The treatment effects on the wristband outcome are estimated from the subsample of participants who had the choice between two physical wristbands.

¹³Results for all the individual measures are presented in Appendix G.1.

to take the hypothetical political actions during an election period drops by substantively large amounts for participants assigned to the fear condition.

[Figure 2 about here.]

Figure 2 shows that the fear treatment causes large decreases across all six measures. For example, while 28% of people in the control group said they were very likely or sure to share a joke about the president during an election period, just 7-8% of respondents in the fear treatment groups reported the same high propensity to dissent by sharing a joke.¹⁴ This represents a 70-77% reduction in the proportion of respondents who say they are likely to take that action. On the wristband, while 82% are willing to take the political wristband in the control group, only 71% of participants in the general fear condition and 63% of participants in the political fear condition chose the political wristband that they were told would “show their political beliefs” over the plain option. These effects represent reductions of 14% in the case of general fear and 23% in the case of political fear.

5.2 The effect of fear on pessimism and risk aversion

The first results provide strong support for the prediction that the fear treatment has a causal effect on participation in pro-democracy political action. In this section, I test whether the treatment affects the variables that I posited as mechanisms – namely, that fear increases pessimism around the cost of expressing dissent and risk aversion. I test the effect of the fear inductions on three outcomes: the index of expectations about how many other opposition supporters will take pro-democracy action, the index of the perceived risk of repression associated with attending a protest, and the amount of risk that the participant chose to take on the monetary lottery in exchange for a higher expected payoff.

Table 4 shows that fear causes increases in pessimism and risk aversion. In Columns 1 and 2, I present the estimated Average Treatment Effect (ATE) and measures of uncertainty for the

¹⁴Making derogatory statements about the president is a criminal act under Zimbabwe’s Criminal Law (Codification and Reform) Act. The low propensity to participate in this act of dissent probably reflects the general fact that the Mugabe regime was highly personalized. In addition, around the time of this study, rumors were circulating that state security officers were checking citizens’ mobile phones for pictures making fun of Mugabe for tripping.

General and Political Fear treatments, respectively, on the perceived proportion of other opposition supporters who will express dissent. Columns 3 and 4 present the results for the perceived likelihood of repression, and Columns 5 and 6 present the effects on risk attitudes.

[Table 4 about here.]

Table 4 shows that both the political and general fear treatments cause participants to become more pessimistic in their estimation of parameters in the expected cost of expressing dissent, and more risk averse. Columns 1 and 2 show that the general fear treatment reduced the perceived propensity of other opposition supporters to engage in dissent by 0.32 standard deviations, while the political fear index reduced expectations of others by 0.45 standard deviations. In real terms, while 39% of participants in the control group believe that most or all other opposition supporters in their communities would attend an opposition rally, in the general fear treatment group just 30% believe this and in the political fear condition just 20% do.

These treatment effects are larger for assessments of others' actions during election periods and for more contentious actions, although the differences between the treatment effects are not statistically significant. Tables with these results on individual measures are presented in Appendix G.2.

Columns 3 and 4 in Table 4 show that both political and general fear also increase expectations that participants will personally be the victims of repressive violence if they attend an opposition rally. The general fear treatment increased the perceived risk of repression by 0.19 standard deviations, and the political fear treatment increased perceived risk by 0.51 standard deviations. In real terms, 68% of participants in the control group think that it is very likely or sure that they would be beaten up if they attended an opposition rally during an election period compared to 76 and 90% in the treatment groups. These treatment effects are again larger during election periods, and generally slightly larger for acts of repression that people judged to be more probable at an opposition rally, such as threats, assault, and destruction of property. They were lowest for sexual violence, which respondents generally judged unlikely.

Finally, Columns 5 and 6 show that participants in the treatment groups exhibited more risk aversion than participants in the control group, meaning that they chose lotteries with lower level of risk and a lower expected payout. The general and political fear treatments caused increases of 0.21 and 0.35 standard deviations compared to control in the estimated risk aversion of the treatment participants based on the spread of the lottery that respondents chose to play in a 50-50 draw. Almost one in five (17%) of respondents in the control group seem to have no aversion to risk, indicated by the fact that they chose the riskiest lottery with a spread of \$1.10 despite the fact that its expected payout (\$0.55) was equal to that of the second riskiest lottery with a spread of \$0.90. In the general and political fear treatment arms, however, 10% and 12% of respondents chose the lottery with the highest spread, and much larger proportions of respondents chose lotteries with lower expected utilities in exchange for higher sure payouts.¹⁵ If individuals' attitudes towards risk are stable across domains, these results indicate that fearful citizens making decisions about whether or not to participate in dissent would need to perceive that the potential gains of participation actually outweigh the potential losses by a larger amount than citizens not experiencing fear.

5.3 Interpretation: Substantive mediation analysis

The results presented so far based on assignment to the experimental treatment show that the fear treatment caused reductions in dissent and increases in the proposed psychological mechanisms of pessimism and risk aversion. Are the proposed psychological mechanisms actually mediating the relationship between the treatments and dissent? Do some of the psychological mechanisms seem to play a larger role than others? A simple experimental research design with a single treatment does not allow me to conduct a causally-identified test of this mediation effect. However, in this section I use a method developed by Imai and Yamamoto (2013) to estimate the Average Causal Mediation Effect (ACME) of each of the psychological outcomes conditional on other potential observed mediators.

¹⁵Results for other aspect of risk attitudes including uncertainty aversion and loss aversion, are shown in Appendix G.2. These additional analyses are exploratory as I did not have any hypotheses about how fear should affect these parameters. I do not find that fear has any effect on attitudes towards losses or uncertainty.

The Imai and Yamamoto (2013) method enables estimation of the ACME if we accept two identifying assumptions. First, the “sequential ignorability” assumption requires that the treatment, mediator of interest, and alternative mediators are conditionally exogenous. However, the mediator of interest is only assumed to be exogenous after conditioning on the alternative mediators, treatment, and pretreatment confounders. In addition, we must either assume no interaction between the treatment and mediator, or set the correlation between the mediator and the interaction of the mediator and treatment, as well as its standard deviation, by assumption. Imai and Yamamoto (2013) suggest presenting the results assuming that $\sigma = 0$ and assessing the sensitivity of the analysis to a range of values of ρ_t and σ .

With these caveats, Table 5 presents the proportion of the effect on the two dissent outcomes – Propensity to Act and Wristband – that is estimated to be mediated by the three psychological outcomes. The first column of the table presents the estimated proportion mediated for the pooled version of the fear treatment, while the second and third columns present the estimated proportion mediated for the Political Fear and General Fear versions of the treatment separately. A full table with the estimated coefficients for all ACMEs and Average Direct Effects (ADEs) is presented in Appendix E.

[Table 5 about here.]

Table 5 presents suggestive evidence that all three psychological outcomes mediate the changes in dissent. Each of the individual mediation effects is found to mediate between 0 and 32% of the total effect of the treatment. In the pooled version of the treatment, 23% of the variation in the wristband measure and 44% of the variation in the hypothetical index can be explained by the proposed mechanisms.¹⁶ The full table of results, including the estimated ACMEs with confidence intervals, are available in Appendix E.

This analysis suggests that the strongest mediator for both general and political fear is pessimism about how many other opposition supporters will engage in dissent. This effect is in line

¹⁶Because each of the three mediators is calculated conditional on the other two, I calculate the total proportion mediated by summing the proportion mediated by each individual statistically significant mediator.

with findings in the theoretical literature that suggest that small changes in the propensity of some individuals' dissent behavior can have large effects on the level of dissent in the population when participation has strategic complementarities (Kuran, 1991; Little, 2017). Risk aversion is also a significant mediator of the effect of the political fear treatment on both measures of dissent, and is estimated to mediate a similar proportion of the general fear treatment on the dissent outcomes although these mediation effects are not statistically significant. Interestingly, the perceived risk of repression is found to be the weakest mediator in this analysis, holding constant perceptions of other opposition supporters' propensities to participate in dissent and risk aversion. If participants view the risk of repression as the state's propensity to repress averaged over the number of dissenters, this may suggest that the observed increases in the perceived risk of repression are largely driven by pessimism about how many other opposition supporters will coordinate on dissent.

This interpretation should be tested using more rigorous methods in subsequent research. As stated above, to the extent that there are unmeasured alternative mediators that are correlated with the treatment, mediators, and outcomes, this analysis does not provide a consistent estimate of the ACME. Nevertheless, the consistency with the theoretical literature highlighting strategic complementarities is worth noting. Subsequent empirical studies should unpack how others' participation, among other factors, affects the perceived risk that an individual will face repression.

5.4 Manipulation check

The procedures that I used to induce emotions asked treatment participants to reflect on a situation in which they felt afraid. However, in practice, emotion inductions often induce multiple emotions of a similar valence. This section presents a manipulation check that tests the extent to which the reflection tasks induced fear and five other primary emotions. Table 6 show that the treatments induced high levels of fear, and to a lesser extent increased other negative emotions and decreased happiness.

[Table 6 about here.]

Because the manipulation checks show that the fear treatments increased not only fear but also other negative emotions, and decreased happiness, the treatment should be interpreted as a bundle of negative emotions, of which fear is the strongest. This finding that emotions in general matter for high-risk political participation is in itself important given the focus of much of the current rational choice literature and lack of previous empirical tests. In addition, the effect of a bundle of negative emotions induced by reflecting on something frightening is a very close approximation of the way that fear is actually induced in authoritarian regimes. As a result, these effects are substantively interesting even if we cannot precisely attribute them to fear rather than anger, sadness, or other emotions.

Nevertheless, it is substantively interesting to assess the extent to which fear specifically is driving the observed effects. To provide a suggestive test of whether the emotion of fear is driving the observed changes in dissent and psychological parameters relevant to the dissent decision, I again use the Imai and Yamamoto (2013) methodology. This method depends on the assumption that all other potential mediators are measured and included in the analysis. While this assumption is generally quite strong, in this case, considering that the research design has eliminated the possible effects of new information or selection into emotions based on personal characteristics, it may be plausible that the only potential alternative mediators are the five other primary emotions that I measure and include as conditioning variables in my estimation of the ACME of fear.

Assuming there are no unmeasured alternative mediators, the analysis finds that fear mediates between 52 and 76% of the relationship between the pooled treatment assignment and the beliefs, preferences, and behaviors of interest. In the case of the political fear treatment, this analysis finds that fear is a statistically significant mediator of all of the changes in the substantive outcomes besides risk aversion. In the case of the general fear treatment, this analysis finds that fear is a statistically significant mediator of the effects on the hypothetical dissent measure and risk aversion. However, given that even when the ACME of fear is not statistically significant, the proportion of the treatment effect that it is estimated to mediate is still quite large, varying from 43 to 83% of the ATE.

By contrast, tests of whether other emotions mediate the relationship between the treatment and

the outcomes of interest largely fail to find significant or substantively large effects. There is some evidence that sadness may mediate the effect of the treatment on dissent, but it is found to explain 15% of the total effect in comparison to 75% for fear, and does not seem to mediate the effects on the psychological outcomes. There is no evidence that anger, disgust, surprise, or happiness can explain the observed effects, and in a few cases may even work against the observed relationships. Overall, these results strongly suggest that fear induced by the treatments is responsible for a large majority of the treatment effects, and that other emotions explain very little or none of the effects. Full results of this analysis are presented in Appendix F.

6 Conclusion

This article argues that incorporating an understanding of emotions and cognition into a theory of participation in dissent can shed light on why citizens participate in pro-democracy protest. The empirical tests based on a lab-in-the-field experiment, conducted with 671 citizens with anti-regime preferences in urban and rural Zimbabwe, provide strong support for the view that the emotions associated with frightening experiences like repression make citizens more pessimistic about the risk of repression and the actions of other citizens, and more risk averse.

Qualitative scholars have long argued that emotions play a critical causal role in dissent through a number of different channels. However, most of the theoretical work that currently dominates the study of participation in protest and other forms of dissent assumes that citizens rationally update their beliefs about the costs and benefits of protest based on informational signals. This is, to my knowledge, the first identified empirical test of the causal effects of emotions on high-risk dissent and on psychological mechanisms that might mediate the relationship between emotions and dissent. The results suggest that emotions do play an important causal role. However, emotions do not seem to overwhelm strategic considerations in dissent decisions, in contrast to common perceptions. Instead, they change behavior by affecting the parameters that enter into cost-benefit decisions about dissent, including the perceived risk of repression, risk aversion, and strategic

considerations such as beliefs about the number of other opposition supporters who will engage in dissent. These findings imply that theories of dissent based on emotions and strategic considerations are complements rather than exclusive alternatives. In addition, they suggest that in highly repressive environments, participation in dissent is characterized by strategic complementarities: the more other citizens participate in dissent, the more likely an individual is to decide that the potential costs are outweighed by the potential benefits.

A handful of existing models provide promising ways forward and suggest that incorporating emotions and other psychological dynamics into protest models does in fact change the equilibrium predictions. Little (2017) shows that the existence of just a small number of non-strategic citizens can have large equilibrium effects in a coordination game between citizens and a regime. In a 2009 model, Lupia and Menning show that modeling fear as temporarily making citizens non-strategic has implications for the type of issues and contexts in which citizens can be manipulated into supporting a regime that they otherwise would oppose. Finally, in related work I show how the three psychological mechanisms identified in this experiment can be added into a global game (self-citation). These models begin to bridge the gap between individual-level psychological explanations for citizen behavior in autocracy, and equilibrium models where citizen dissent is a strategic complement or substitute. They show that incorporating more realistic assumptions about cognition into formal models can have important implications for understanding when mass dissent will emerge.

This research also has implications for the study of autocratic persistence. A growing strand of the autocracy literature argues that autocrats persuade citizens to offer genuine support rather than coerce them to falsify their preferences (Gehlbach, Sonin and Svobik, 2016). A formal literature that explicitly focuses on the role of propaganda and censorship as tools of persuasion largely focuses on how Bayesian citizens update their beliefs based on potentially biased information (Egorov, Guriev and Sonin, 2009; Gehlbach and Sonin, 2014; Shadmehr and Bernhardt, 2015). The evidence presented here that even non-political forms of fear can reduce dissent suggests that the emotional valence of the media rather than the informational content might be an important active ingredient

in an autocrat's media strategy. A recent empirical literature provides some corroborating evidence that the way that events are covered in the media in autocratic regimes may play an important role in autocratic media manipulation. These studies focus not only on information but on the valence of language or causal attributions with which events are discussed as mechanisms through which autocratic media might affect citizen dissent (Carter and Carter, 2016; Rozenas and Stukal, 2017). Additional research should consider how foreign or internal threats are covered in authoritarian medias, as well as on the symbolic politics emphasized in some of the qualitative literature on autocracy (Arendt, 1951; Wedeen, 1998).

Finally, these findings have implications for the study of repression itself. Much of the existing literature on the effects of repression has aggregated forms of violence that vary widely in their severity and targeting into a single independent variable, often based on the frequency or severity of violent events in a particular period (Francisco, 1995; Moore, 1998; Carey, 2006, 2009). However, it is likely that some forms of violence induce more fear than others. Extremely brutal, public, or counter-normative forms of repression may be more likely to induce fear than imprisonment or lower-level violence. Indiscriminate violence may induce more fear than targeted forms, which may help explain why violence against civilians is used despite its apparently low value as a deterrent. Studies that have disaggregated repression into discriminate versus indiscriminate forms, or by levels of severity (Khawaja, 1993; Rasler, 1996; Young, 2017), to examine whether repression with different characteristics might have different effects on dissent, suggest a promising way forward. Finally, given the significant variation in beliefs about the risk of repression that this project measures, more empirical work should be done that actually measures the effect of repressive threats on citizen beliefs about the cost of dissent.

References

- Albertson, Bethany and Shana Kushner Gadarian. 2016. "Did that scare you? Tips on creating emotion in experimental subjects." *Political Analysis* 24(4):485–491.
- Angeletos, George-Marios, Christian Hellwig and Alessandro Pavan. 2007. "Dynamic global games of regime change: Learning, multiplicity, and the timing of attacks." *Econometrica* 75(3):711–756.
- Arendt, Hannah. 1951. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt, Inc.
- Banks, Antoine J. and Nicholas A. Valentino. 2012. "Emotional Substrates of White Racial Attitudes." *American Journal of Political Science* 56(2):286–297.
- Bogliacino, Francesco, Gianluca Grimalda, Pietro Ortoleva and Patrick Ring. 2017. "Exposure to and recall of violence reduce short-term memory and cognitive control." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 114(32):8505–8510.
- Booysen, Susan. 2012. Change and 'New' Politics in Zimbabwe: Interim Report of a Nationwide Survey of Public Opinion in Zimbabwe: June-July 2012. Technical report Freedom House.
- Brader, Ted. 2005. "Striking a responsive chord: How political ads motivate and persuade voters by appealing to emotions." *American Journal of Political Science* 49(2):388–405.
- Bratton, Michael. 2011. "Violence, partisanship and transitional justice in Zimbabwe." *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 49(03):353–380.
- Bratton, Michael, Boniface Dulani and Eldred Masunungure. 2016. "Detecting manipulation in authoritarian elections: Survey-based methods in Zimbabwe." *Electoral Studies* 42:10–21.
- Bratton, Michael and Eldred Masunungure. 2008. "Zimbabwe's long agony." *Journal of Democracy* 19(4):41–55.
- Bratton, Michael and Eldred Masunungure. 2012. "Voting intentions in Zimbabwe: A margin of terror?" *Afrobarometer Briefing Paper* 103.
- Callen, Michael, Mohammad Isaqzadeh, James D Long and Charles Sprenger. 2014. "Violence and risk preference: Experimental evidence from Afghanistan." *The American Economic Review* 104(1):123–148.
- Carey, Sabine C. 2006. "The dynamic relationship between protest and repression." *Political Research Quarterly* 59(1):1–11.
- Carey, Sabine C. 2009. *Protest, Repression and Political Regimes: An Empirical Analysis of Latin America and Sub-Saharan Africa*. London: Routledge.
- Carter, Brett L and Erin Baggott Carter. 2016. "Propaganda and protest: Evidence from post-Cold War Africa." Working paper, USC.
- Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace in Zimbabwe (CCJPZ). 1997. *Report on the 1980s disturbances in Matabeleland and the Midlands*.
- Cohn, Alain, Jan Engelmann, Ernst Fehr and Michel André Maréchal. 2015. "Evidence for countercyclical risk aversion: an experiment with financial professionals." *The American Economic Review* 105(2):860–885.

- Damasio, Antonio. 1994. *Descartes' Error: Emotion, Reason and the Human Brain*. New York: Putnam.
- Doran, Stuart. 2017. *Kingdom, power, glory: Mugabe, Zanu and the quest for supremacy, 1960-1987*. Sithatha Media.
- Druckman, James N and Rose McDermott. 2008. "Emotion and the framing of risky choice." *Political Behavior* 30(3):297–321.
- Eckel, Catherine C and Philip J Grossman. 2002. "Sex differences and statistical stereotyping in attitudes toward financial risk." *Evolution and Human Behavior* 23(4):281–295.
- Egorov, Georgy, Sergei Guriev and Konstantin Sonin. 2009. "Why resource-poor dictators allow freer media: A theory and evidence from panel data." *American Political Science Review* 103(4):645–668.
- Eysenck, Michael W. 1982. *Attention and Arousal*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Eysenck, Michael W and Manuel G Calvo. 1992. "Anxiety and performance: The processing efficiency theory." *Cognition and Emotion* 6(6):409–434.
- Francisco, Ronald A. 1995. "The relationship between coercion and protest: An empirical evaluation in three coercive states." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 39(2):263–282.
- Freedom House. 2015. *Freedom in the World*. Technical report Freedom House.
- Garcia-Ponce, Omar and Ben Pasquale. 2015. "How political violence shapes trust in the state." Working paper, UC Davis. http://omargarciaponce.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/07/GarciaPonce_and_Pasquale_2014.pdf.
- Gehlbach, Scott and Konstantin Sonin. 2014. "Government control of the media." *Journal of Public Economics* 118:163–171.
- Gehlbach, Scott, Konstantin Sonin and Milan W Svobik. 2016. "Formal models of nondemocratic politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 19:565–584.
- Goodwin, Jeff, James M. Jasper and Francesca Polletta. 2009. *Passionate Politics: Emotions and Social Movements*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Gray, Jeffrey. 1987. *The Psychology of Fear and Stress*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Guiso, Luigi, Paola Sapienza and Luigi Zingales. 2013. "Time varying risk aversion." *NBER Working Paper* (19284).
- Gurr, Ted Robert. 1970. *Why Men Rebel*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- HRW. 2008. "Bullets for Each of You" State-Sponsored Violence since Zimbabwe's March 29 Elections. Technical report Human Rights Watch.
- Imai, Kosuke and Teppei Yamamoto. 2013. "Identification and sensitivity analysis for multiple causal mechanisms: revisiting evidence from framing experiments." *Political Analysis* 21(2):141–171.
- Johnson, Eric J. and Amos Tversky. 1983. "Affect, generalization, and the perception of risk." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 45(1):20–31.

- Kassam, Karim S and Wendy Berry Mendes. 2013. "The effects of measuring emotion: Physiological reactions to emotional situations depend on whether someone is asking." *PLOS ONE* 8(6):e64959.
- Keltner, Dacher, Kenneth Locke and Paul C. Audrain. 1993. "The influence of attributions on the relevance of negative feelings to personal satisfaction." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 19(1):21–29.
- Khawaja, Marwan. 1993. "Repression and popular collective action: Evidence from the West Bank." *Sociological Forum* 8(1):47–71.
- Kling, Jeffrey R, Jeffrey B Liebman and Lawrence F Katz. 2007. "Experimental analysis of neighborhood effects." *Econometrica* 75(1):83–119.
- Kriebing, Sylvie. 2010. "Autonomic nervous system activity in emotion: A review." *Biological Psychology* 84:394–421.
- Kuran, Timur. 1991. "Now Out of Never: The Element of Surprise in the East European Revolution of 1989." *World Politics* 44(1):7–48.
- LeBas, Adrienne. 2006. "Polarization as craft: Party formation and state violence in Zimbabwe." *Comparative Politics* 38(4):419–428.
- LeDoux, Joseph. 1996. *The emotional brain: The mysterious underpinnings of emotional life*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Lerner, Jennifer S. and Dacher Keltner. 2000. "Beyond valence: Toward a model of emotion-specific influences on judgement and choice." *Cognition and Emotion* 14(4):473–493.
- Lerner, Jennifer S. and Dacher Keltner. 2001. "Fear, anger, and risk." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 81(1):146–159.
- Lerner, Jennifer S., Roxana M. Gonzalez, Deborah A. Small and Baruch Fischhoff. 2003. "Effects of fear and anger on perceived risks of terrorism: A national field experiment." *Psychological Science* 14(2):144–150.
- Little, Andrew T. 2017. "Propaganda and credulity." *Games and Economic Behavior* 102:224–232.
- Lohmann, Susanne. 1994. "The dynamics of informational cascades: The Monday demonstrations in Leipzig, East Germany, 1989–91." *World Politics* 47(1):42–101.
- Lupia, Arthur and Jesse O Menning. 2009. "When can politicians scare citizens into supporting bad policies?" *American Journal of Political Science* 53(1):90–106.
- MacKuen, Michael, Jennifer Wolak, Luke Keele and George E Marcus. 2010. "Civic engagements: Resolute partisanship or reflective deliberation." *American Journal of Political Science* 54(2):440–458.
- Marcus, George E and Michael B MacKuen. 1993. "Anxiety, enthusiasm, and the vote: The emotional underpinnings of learning and involvement during presidential campaigns." *American Political Science Review* 87(3):672–685.
- Marcus, George E, W Russell Neuman and Michael MacKuen. 2000. *Affective Intelligence and Political Judgment*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Moore, Will H. 1998. "Repression and dissent: Substitution, context, and timing." *American Journal of Political Science* 42(3):851–873.

- Myers, C. Daniel and Dustin Tingley. 2016. "The Influence of Emotion on Trust." *Political Analysis* 24(4):492–500.
- OSISA. 2007. "We Have Degrees in Violence": A Report on Torture and Human Rights Abuses in Zimbabwe. Technical report Open Society Initiative for Southern Africa and Open Society Institute and Bellevue/NYU Program for Survivors of Torture.
- Park, Jiahyun and Mahzarin R Banaji. 2000. "Mood and heuristics: The influence of happy and sad states on sensitivity and bias in stereotyping." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 78(6):1005–1023.
- Pearlman, Wendy. 2013. "Emotions and the Microfoundations of the Arab Uprisings." *Perspectives on Politics* 11(2):387–409.
- Rasler, Karen. 1996. "Concessions, repression, and political protest in the Iranian revolution." *American Sociological Review* 61(1):132–152.
- Rothbaum, Barbara Olasov and Ann C Schwartz. 2002. "Exposure therapy for posttraumatic stress disorder." *American Journal of Psychotherapy* 56(1):59–75.
- Rozenas, Arturas and Denis Stukal. 2017. "How Autocrats Manipulate Economic News: Evidence from Russia's State-Controlled Television." Working paper, New York University.
- Sachikonye, Lloyd. 2011. *When a State Turns on Its Citizens: 60 Years of Institutionalized Violence in Zimbabwe*. African Books Collective.
- Schwartz, Norbert and Gerard L. Clore. 1983. "Mood, misattribution, and judgments of well-being: Informative and directive functions of affective states." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 45:513–523.
- Scott, James C. 1990. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Shadmehr, Mehdi and Dan Bernhardt. 2011. "Collective action with uncertain payoffs: Coordination, public signals, and punishment dilemmas." *American Political Science Review* 105(4):829–851.
- Shadmehr, Mehdi and Dan Bernhardt. 2015. "State censorship." *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics* 7(2):280–307.
- Steinman, Shari, Bethany Wootton and David F. Tolin. 2016. Exposure Therapy for Anxiety Disorders. In *Encyclopedia of Mental Health*, ed. Howard Friedman. Vol. 2 Oxford, UK: Elsevier pp. 186–191.
- Stern, Rachel E and Jonathan Hassid. 2012. "Amplifying silence uncertainty and control parables in contemporary China." *Comparative Political Studies* 45(10):1230–1254.
- Stern, Rachel E and Kevin J O'Brien. 2012. "Politics at the Boundary Mixed Signals and the Chinese State." *Modern China* 38(2):174–198.
- Strack, Fritz, Norbert Schwarz and Elisabeth Gschneidinger. 1985. "Happiness and reminiscing: The role of time perspective, affect, and mode of thinking." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 49(6):1460.
- Svolik, Milan W. 2012. *The Politics of Authoritarian Rule*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tendi, Blessing-Miles. 2013. "Robert Mugabe's 2013 Presidential Election Campaign." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 39(4):963–970.

- Valentino, Nicholas A, Ted Brader, Eric W Groenendyk, Krysha Gregorowicz and Vincent L Hutchings. 2011. "Election night's alright for fighting: The role of emotions in political participation." *The Journal of Politics* 73(01):156–170.
- Valentino, Nicholas A, Vincent L Hutchings, Antoine J Banks and Anne K Davis. 2008. "Is a worried citizen a good citizen? Emotions, political information seeking, and learning via the internet." *Political Psychology* 29(2):247–273.
- Wedeen, Lisa. 1998. "Acting "As If": Symbolic Politics and Social Control in Syria." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 40(3):503–523.
- Young, Lauren E. 2016. "Preying on the poor: The impact of repressive violence on citizen behavior." Working paper, Columbia University.
- Young, Lauren E. 2017. "Psychological characteristics and variation in reactions to repressive violence." Presented at APSA 2017.
- Zamchiya, Phillan. 2013. "The MDC-T's (Un) Seeing Eye in Zimbabwe's 2013 Harmonised Elections: A Technical Knockout." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 39(4):955–962.
- Zimbabwe Peace Project. September 2015. Monthly Monitoring Report. Technical report <https://www.zimpeaceproject.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Sept-2015-MMR.pdf>.

Tables

Table 1: Hypothetical and behavioral outcome variables

	Hypothetical	Behavioral
Dissent	Index of propensity to participate in high-risk dissent	Selected political wrist-band
Pessimism	Index of perceived risk of repression Index of expectations of others	
Risk Attitudes		Spread of chosen lottery (Eckel and Grossman, 2002)

Table 2: Summary statistics and balance on baseline covariates

	<i>Mean</i>			<i>Difference</i>		<i>p-value</i>	
	<i>C</i>	<i>T_{GF}</i>	<i>T_{PF}</i>	<i>T_{GF} - C</i>	<i>T_{PF} - C</i>	<i>T_{GF} - C</i>	<i>T_{PF} - C</i>
Female	0.53	0.51	0.51	0.02	0.02	0.72	0.71
Education (4-pt scale)	1.74	1.65	1.74	0.09	-0.00	0.18	0.98
Age	37.74	37.92	37.95	-0.18	-0.21	0.89	0.87
Assets: Generator	0.20	0.18	0.21	0.02	-0.01	0.63	0.76
Assets: Smartphone	0.38	0.31	0.38	0.07	-0.00	0.10	0.97
Assets: Electricity	0.41	0.41	0.46	0.00	-0.05	1.00	0.33
Assets: Bicycle	0.22	0.23	0.21	-0.01	0.01	0.83	0.78
Assets: Chickens	0.51	0.54	0.45	-0.03	0.06	0.55	0.20
Assets: Cattle	0.33	0.31	0.28	0.02	0.05	0.60	0.24
Income (USD) per HH member	27.67	24.78	29.43	2.89	-1.75	0.35	0.66
Closeness to Opposition	2.52	2.43	2.41	0.09	0.10	0.30	0.22

C refers to the Control group, *T_{GF}* to the General Fear treatment, and *T_{PF}* to the Political Fear treatment.

Table 3: The fear treatments reduce dissent

	Hypothetical		Behavioral	
	General Fear	Political Fear	General Fear	Political Fear
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
ATE ¹	-0.545	-0.773	-0.104	-0.189
SE ²	(0.077)	(0.080)	(0.050)	(0.053)
RI <i>p</i> -value ³	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.035	< 0.001
<i>N</i>	484	486	329	326
Sample	All		Wristband ⁴	

¹ The first row presents the estimated Average Treatment Effects (ATEs) of the general and political fear treatments on the hypothetical measure of propensity to dissent in Columns 1-2, and the behavioral measure in Columns 3-4. ATEs are calculated based on assignment to treatment and weighted by inverse propensity scores by block.

² Robust standard errors (SEs) from linear regression analysis.

³ The *p*-value is based on a two-tailed test using randomization inference.

⁴ Because the sample size was increased shortly before the study was implemented, there were not enough wristbands for the entire sample. The estimate of the treatment effect on the wristband measure comes from the subset of the sample who were offered a choice between two real wristbands. Results are similar in the full sample.

Table 4: The fear treatments increase pessimism and risk aversion

	Propensity of Others to Dissent		Perceived Risk of Repression		Risk Aversion	
	General Fear	Political Fear	General Fear	Political Fear	General Fear	Political Fear
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
ATE ¹	-0.323	-0.447	0.206	0.511	0.21	0.347
SE ²	(0.092)	(0.085)	(0.087)	(0.083)	(0.091)	(0.095)
RI <i>p</i> -value ³	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.025	< 0.001	0.025	< 0.001
<i>N</i>	485	487	484	485	496	502
Sample	All					

¹ The first row presents the estimated Average Treatment Effects (ATEs) of the general and political fear treatments on beliefs about the likelihood that other opposition supporters will engage in dissent in Columns 1-2, on the perceived likelihood of repression in Columns 3-4, and on risk aversion in Columns 5-6. ATEs are calculated based on assignment to treatment and weighted by inverse propensity scores by block.

² Robust standard errors (SEs) from linear regression analysis.

³ The *p*-value is based on a two-tailed test using randomization inference.

Table 5: Pessimism and risk aversion mediate the effects on dissent

Mediator	Outcome	Estimated Proportion Mediated		
		Fear (Pooled) (1)	Political Fear (2)	General Fear (3)
Perceived Repression Risk	Propensity to Act	0.07**	0.08**	0.02
	Wristband	-0.1	-0.18	-0.06
Others' Participation	Propensity to Act	0.3**	0.32**	0.32**
	Wristband	0.23**	0.26**	0.26**
Risk Aversion	Propensity to Act	0.07**	0.06**	0.06
	Wristband	0.13	0.12	0.1

** indicates 95% confidence intervals for the ACME do not include zero.

The estimated proportion of the effect mediated is presented in the table.

The first column presents the results from a mediation analysis where the treatment variable indicates that the participant received either fear treatment. The second column presents the results of a mediation analysis on the General Fear treatment compared to control, and the last two column presents the same for the Political Fear treatment.

Table 6: The fear treatments increase fear by more than other negative emotions

	Fear		Anger		Sadness	
	General Fear	Political Fear	General Fear	Political Fear	General Fear	Political Fear
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
ATE ¹	0.875	1.259	0.361	0.643	0.406	0.641
SE ²	(0.078)	(0.070)	(0.091)	(0.089)	(0.091)	(0.090)
RI <i>p</i> -value ³	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
<i>N</i>	496	502	496	501	496	502

	Disgust		Surprise		Happiness	
	General Fear	Political Fear	General Fear	Political Fear	General Fear	Political Fear
	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
ATE ¹	0.396	0.701	0.104	0.352	-0.858	-1.173
SE ²	(0.091)	(0.089)	(0.093)	(0.095)	(0.083)	(0.075)
RI <i>p</i> -value ³	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.274	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
<i>N</i>	496	502	496	502	496	502

¹ The odd columns present the estimated Average Treatment Effects (ATEs) of the general fear treatment, and the even columns of the political fear treatment. Columns 1-2 present the results for the outcome of Fear, 3-4 for Anger, 5-6 for Sadness, 7-8 for Disgust, 9-10 for Surprise, and 11-12 for Happiness. ATEs are calculated based on assignment to treatment and weighted by inverse propensity scores by block.

² Robust standard errors (SEs) from linear regression analysis.

³ The *p*-values are based on a two-tailed test using randomization inference.

Figures

Figure 1: Map of constituencies included in study



Figure 2: The fear treatments cause substantively large increases in the proportion of respondents who are very likely or sure to dissent during an election period

