EDUCATION AND ATTITUDES TOWARD INTERPERSONAL AND STATE-SANCTIONED VIOLENCE

Landon Schnabel¹

Indiana University, Bloomington

Last Revised: 2017-08-18

Running Head: Education and Attitudes toward Violence

Word Count: 3,814

Tables: 3

Supplement: 2 Figures, 2 Tables

Abstract

The link between education and liberal attitudes is one of the most consistent findings in public opinion research, but the theoretical explanations for this relationship warrant additional attention. Previous work suggested that the relationship is due to education socializing students to the “official culture” of the United States. This study uses the World Values Survey and General Social Survey to further develop this theory and test whether it applies to Americans’ attitudes toward justifiable violence. I find that Americans with more education are less likely to say that interpersonal violence—against women, children, and other individuals—can be justifiable. However, they are more likely to say that state-sanctioned violence—war and police violence—can be justifiable. These patterns are consistent with a modified socialization model of education and social attitudes. I conclude that American education socializes people to establishment culture, identity, and interests, which differentiate between unacceptable interpersonal violence and ostensibly acceptable state-sanctioned violence.

Keywords:

Attitudes; Education; Violence; Interpersonal Violence; Family Violence; Intimate Partner Violence; Corporal Punishment; Police Brutality; War

THIS IS A DRAFT. DO NOT QUOTE OR CIRCULATE WITHOUT AUTHOR
PERMISSION.

¹ The author is grateful to the anonymous reviewers for their comments. Direct correspondence to Landon Schnabel, Department of Sociology, Indiana University, 744 Ballantine Hall, 1020 E. Kirkwood Ave., Bloomington, IN 47405. Email: lpschnab@indiana.edu.

Public opinion research seeks to understand the social forces that shape peoples' attitudes, beliefs, and orientations, and education has long been one of the most used and most consistent predictors of social attitudes (Bobo and Licari 1989; Brooks 2006; Hyman and Wright 1979; Kingston et al. 2003; Page and Shapiro 1992; Schnabel and Sevell 2017; Selznick and Steinberg 1969; Smith 1995; Stouffer 1955; Weakliem 2002; Weil 1985). This study will consider two key theories, development and socialization, that attempt to explain how education shapes social attitudes. I modify and test these competing theories on attitudes toward violence in the United States. In the *personal development model*, education fundamentally changes people and their character so that they are more tolerant, more supportive of democratic values, and less authoritarian (e.g., Adorno et al. 1950). In the traditional *socialization model*, education socializes students to the "official culture" of individualism, libertarianism, and anti-authoritarianism (e.g., Phelan et al. 1995). Yet, acceptance for state violence persists in the U.S. despite increasing levels of education that are thought to promote liberal values and anti-authoritarianism. Although some vocal opponents of police brutality have been highly educated people, we do not know whether the average college-educated American is more likely to oppose police violence than those with less education.

The apparent acquiescence of much of the American public to state violence motivates a test and possible refinement of previous theories. I set forth a refined socialization model, which builds on Jackman's (Jackman 1994; Jackman and Muha 1984) argument that education can promote dominant interests and legitimate injustice at least in the United States. I argue that education does not have a uniform antiauthoritarian effect; instead, American education

socializes students to establishment culture and interests that are both anti-welfare and pro-policing.

Education and Attitudes

Although the education-as-development model for the relationship between education and attitudes was the traditional view held by foundational social psychologists and public opinion researchers (e.g., Adorno et al. 1950; Rokeach 1960; Stouffer 1955), key work has since found greater support for an education-as-socialization model (e.g., Phelan et al. 1995; Selznick and Steinberg 1969; Stubager 2008; Weil 1985). For example, Phelan and colleagues (1995) leveraged a few distinct attitudes toward homelessness to show that, consistent with the socialization model, education is positively associated with tolerance and support for civil liberties for homeless people,¹ but negatively associated with support for economic aid to the homeless. They argued that the “educational system is the primary vehicle through which the ‘official’ or ‘ideal’ culture is transmitted to citizens” (Phelan et al. 1995, 130). According to them, the official culture of the United States emphasizes tolerance, individualism, and the myth of meritocracy.

The socialization model has proven effective and Stubager (2008, 2009, 2010, 2013) has considered and confirmed it repeatedly in a Scandinavian context. In the process, he applied identity theory (see, for example, Brenner, Serpe, and Stryker 2014; Stets and Serpe 2013; Stryker 2008; Tajfel 1978) and introduced a new focus on socialization into not just “official culture” but also group identity and consciousness. According to Stubager, schooling produces an educated identity characterized by consistent libertarianism and anti-authoritarianism.

In a refinement and new application of the theory, I consider and test whether education can socialize students into not just “official culture” and anti-authoritarian identity, but also

establishment identity, values, and interests. In other words, I examine whether American education may be associated with preference for the educated ruling class, both on issues of redistribution as Phelan and colleagues (1995) demonstrated and on state-sanctioned violence that protects and extends the interests of the ruling class. Therefore, rather than the blanket anti-statism highlighted by Phelan et al. (1995) and anti-authoritarianism highlighted by Stubager (2008), I suggest that education may yield issue-specific and context-specific pro-statism in the interest of the purportedly meritocratic ruling class (Jackman 1994; Jackman and Muha 1984). A subsection of highly-educated Americans have vocally opposed state-sanctioned violence, but what does the average college-educated American think about state-sanctioned violence—such as police brutality against racial minorities, war, and even torture—that does not negatively affect people like them, and which could be seen as upholding their interests? Support for, or at least complacency toward, state-sanctioned violence among the growing college-educated population in the United States could help explain why Americans have not put an end to ethically-problematic state violence such as police brutality and state-sanctioned torture.

To apply this refinement of the socialization model, this study examines attitudes toward different types of violence, namely interpersonal versus state-sanctioned violence (on the importance of testing whether different related attitudes operate differently, see Gibson 2013). Some factors, such as gender, are known to be consistent predictors of attitudes toward violence. As Smith (1984) showed, women are consistently more opposed to violence across surveys and types of violence. Education may reveal a similar pattern in keeping with the developmental model and previous socialization model or, consistent with my refinement of the socialization model, different patterns could emerge:

Developmental Model and Previous Socialization Model: Those with more education will condemn violence by any group, including the state, because schooling promotes

personal development of a consistent ethical frame (developmental model) and promotes libertarianism while countering authoritarianism (previous socialization model).

Proposed Socialization Model: Those with more education will condemn interpersonal violence, but will accept some forms of state-sanctioned violence because schooling socializes people to establishment culture, identity, and interests, and thus legitimates ruling authority and its actions.

Methods

To adjudicate between these possibilities, this study uses U.S. data from the World Values Survey and the General Social Survey. The World Values Survey (WVS) is a cross-national and nationally-representative survey of basic values and beliefs. I use U.S. data from the sixth wave (2010-2014) of the WVS, which provide information on education, key covariates, and attitudes toward interpersonal and state-sanctioned violence. The interpersonal violence measures are preceded by the following directions: “Please tell me for each of the following actions whether you think it can always be justified, never be justified, or something in between.” The response options for these justifiability of violence measures—“for a man to beat his wife, “parents beating children,” and “violence against other people,”—range from 1 (“never justifiable”) to 10 (“always justifiable”). The justifiability of state-sanctioned violence measure asks the following: “Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: Under some conditions, war is necessary to obtain justice.” See Table 1 for descriptive statistics.

[Table 1]

The General Social Survey (GSS), a nationally-representative survey of Americans, is one of the most widely used and trusted surveys in social scientific research (Smith et al. 2015). I use cross-sectional data from the 2010, 2012, and 2014 surveys, which provide information on education, covariates that parallel the WVS data, and measures of interpersonal and state-sanctioned violence. The measure of interpersonal violence asks “Do you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree that it is sometimes necessary to discipline a child with a good,

hard spanking?” The measure of state-sanctioned violence asks, “Are there any situations you can imagine in which you would approve of a policeman striking an adult male citizen?” The response options are yes and no.

Highest degree attained is the key predictor for both the WVS and GSS, and I include covariates drawn from previous research (e.g., Phelan et al. 1995) and available in comparable form in both the WVS and GSS. I present a series of models in which I continue to add relevant covariates that could account for any relationship between education and attitudes. I start with a bivariate model of the impact of education on attitudes, then add key sociodemographic characteristics, then measures of political views and party identification, then family income (measured as self-placement on a ten-point scale in the WVS and as total family income in the GSS), and finally mother’s and father’s education (which are only available in the GSS). These measures are added to consider whether education differences result from education itself or other factors, such as race and SES, highly correlated with education.

The samples are constrained to the cases for which each of the outcome measures and education are all available, and missing data on covariates are handled with multiple imputation. I employ binary logistic regression for the binary outcomes and OLS for the other outcomes. The patterns are not sensitive to the models used: sensitivity analyses with Alternating Least Squares Optimized Scaling (ALSOS—these results are included in the supplement),² ordinal logistic models, and multinomial models yielded equivalent patterns.

Results

U.S. World Values Survey Analyses

Table 2 shows U.S. World Values Survey results on whether interpersonal and state-sanctioned violence can ever be justifiable. Americans with more education are less likely to think that

intimate partner violence, violence against children, and violence against other people can be justifiable.³ However, education is positively associated with the belief that war is sometimes necessary. This pattern of more highly educated people believing in the justifiability of state-sanctioned violence are consistent with a modified socialization model in which people learn to hold establishment values that legitimate state-sanctioned violence.

[Table 2 about here]

The patterns for covariates (not shown) are consistent with previous research. Women are less supportive of violence across measures. Being white has a similar impact to having more education: Blacks, Latinos, and people in the “other race” category are more likely than whites to say that interpersonal violence can be justified, but less likely to believe in necessary war. These patterns suggest further support for a modified socialization model of attitudes in which establishment people (i.e., highly-educated white men) espouse the establishment value of state-sanctioned violence being justifiable.

The general pattern for education persists despite sometimes smaller coefficients as various controls are added to the model. The most notable general attenuation of the impact of education is present in the model that adds sociodemographic covariates, such as gender and race. Politics and family income do not account for the education pattern, and in fact the impact of education is generally similar to the bivariate pattern once family income (measured as self-placement on a subjective ten-point scale of incomes) is in the model. Therefore, the impact of education appears to be operating independent of SES.

U.S. General Social Survey Analyses

Table 3 presents parallel results for the General Social Survey on measures of interpersonal violence (whether corporal punishment can be necessary) and state-sanctioned violence (whether

police violence can be necessary). Similar to the WVS patterns, Americans with more education are less likely to say that parents hitting children is justifiable but more likely to say that police hitting citizens is justifiable. Again, women tend to be against both interpersonal and state-sanctioned violence, and the impact of non-white racial categories are generally the inverse of those for education.⁴ Therefore, it again tends to be highly-educated white men who espouse the establishment value of state-sanctioned violence. The general patterns again persist though are somewhat attenuated as additional covariates are added to the models. Some of these covariates, such as income, are deeply intertwined with education and could be pathways by which education influences attitudes.⁵

[Table 3 here]

In both data sets the impact of more educational degrees is typically ordered, with additional degrees leading people to be increasingly different from those who did not finish high school. However, that is not the case for graduate education and attitudes toward state-sanctioned violence. Whereas more education appears to consistently socialize people into establishment values up through a bachelor's degree, graduate education appears to function somewhat differently and some types of graduate education may promote anti-establishment values.⁶

Some readers may have noted that in both data sets the interpersonal violence variables are ordered measures whereas the state-sanctioned violence measures are binary. I conducted additional analyses in which I dichotomized the ordered measures to better parallel the binary measures and make effect sizes more comparable. In supplemental Figures S1 and S2, I present predicted probabilities with controls held at global means that demonstrate the same pattern of education decreasing support for interpersonal violence and increasing support for state-sanctioned violence—with a dip in support for state-sanctioned violence among those with

graduate degrees. Education tends to have a substantial impact on these attitudes. For example, Americans with less than a high school education are about three times as likely to find wife beating sometimes justifiable (predicted probability of .15) than are those with a graduate degree (predicted probability of .04).

Discussion

This study proposed a modified socialization model for how education shapes attitudes and tested it on Americans' beliefs about what types of violence are justifiable. The development model and previous socialization model both predicted that education would lead people to think that violence by individuals *and* violence by the state is not justifiable. The results are consistent with my modified socialization model, which suggests that not only does education transmit individualistic and meritocratic libertarian values, it can also promote establishment interests (Jackman 1994; Jackman and Muha 1984). Americans with more education are less likely to say that interpersonal violence—against women, against children, and against other Americans—can be justifiable. However, they are more likely to say that state-sanctioned violence—war and police violence—can be justifiable. American education, therefore, appears to promote an establishment politics that differentiates between unacceptable interpersonal violence and ostensibly acceptable state-sanctioned violence.

This brief study provides support for Phelan et al. (1995) and others who have argued that education socializes people to an “official culture,” but suggests that the American official culture is not purely libertarian and that education is more than a medium for the transmission of a set of ruling class values. As Stubager (2008, 2009, 2013) has suggested, it is also an identity-building process. Breaking slightly from Stubager, however, I found that Americans with more education take on the values *and* interests of the educated class who gain from libertarian

economics and government intervention to protect their interests (Jackman 1994; Jackman and Muha 1984).

Although attitudes toward violence were the specific case for a broader question in this article, these attitudes are timely and important in their own right. Based on popular assumptions, one might assume that American support for police brutality against citizens is most pronounced among certain uneducated groups (e.g., uneducated white men). But in fact belief in the justifiability of police violence extends to and appears to be especially strong among those with higher levels of education (and especially college-educated white men). Therefore, it appears to be those higher-class people most insulated from the risk of experiencing police violence, or having to go to war themselves, appear to be most likely to say that in some cases such state-sanctioned violence might be necessary. Future research should further examine the particular conditions under which people of different education levels would consider police violence and war justifiable.⁷

Just as Phelan and colleagues (1995) improved on previous research by differentiating between social and economic values to substantiate a socialization model of education, this empirical test differentiated between interpersonal and state-sanctioned violence to refine the socialization model. Although social scientists typically think of education as challenging authority and debunking inequality-legitimizing myths such as racism and sexism, it can also legitimate stratification and some forms of authority. Research has shown that people will accept actions they would otherwise perceive as unjust if such actions are carried out by a legitimate authority (Johnson et al. 2016), and so the legitimization of stratification and state-sanctioned violence has important real-world consequences. The results reported in this study suggest that

new approaches and target audiences may be needed in attempts to address acceptance of and complacency toward police brutality in the United States.

REFERENCES

- Adorno, Theodor, Else Frenkel-Brunswik, Daniel Levinson, and R. Nevitt Sanford. 1950. *The Authoritarian Personality*. Oxford, England: Harpers.
- Bobo, Lawrence, and Frederick C. Licari. 1989. "Education and Political Tolerance." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 53(3): 285–308.
- Brenner, Philip S, Richard T Serpe, and Sheldon Stryker. 2014. "The Causal Ordering of Prominence and Salience in Identity Theory: An Empirical Examination." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 77(3): 231–52.
- Brooks, Clem. 2006. "Voters, Satisficing, and Policymaking: Recent Directions in the Study of Electoral Politics." *Annual Review of Sociology* 32: 191–211.
- DeLeeuw, Jan, Forrest W. Young, and Yoshio Takane. 1976. "Additive Structures in Qualitative Data, an Alternating Least Squares Method with Optimal Scaling Features." *Psychometrika* 41(4).
- Gibson, James L. 2013. "Measuring Political Tolerance and General Support for pro-Civil Liberties Policies." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 77(S1): 45–68.
- Gross, Neil, and Ethan Fosse. 2012. "Why Are Professors Liberal?" *Theory and Society* 41(2): 127–68.
- Hyman, Herbert, and Charles Wright. 1979. *Education's Lasting Influence on Values*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Jackman, Mary R. 1994. *The Velvet Glove: Paternalism and Conflict in Gender, Class, and Race Relations*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Jackman, Mary R., and Michael J. Muha. 1984. "Education and Intergroup Attitudes: Moral Enlightenment, Superficial Democratic Commitment, or Ideological Refinement?" *American Sociological Review* 49(6): 751–69.

- Jacoby, William G. 1999. "Levels of Measurement and Political Research: An Optimistic View." *American Journal of Political Science* 43(1): 271–301.
- . 2014. "Is There a Culture War? Conflicting Value Structures in American Public Opinion." *American Political Science Review* 108(4): 1–18.
- Johnson, Cathryn, Karen A Hegtvedt, Nikki Khanna, and Heather L Scheuerman. 2016. "Legitimacy Processes and Emotional Responses to Injustice." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 79(2): 95–114.
- Kingston, Paul W. et al. 2003. "Why Education Matters." *Sociology of Education* 76(1): 53–70.
- Lewis, Gregory B., Marc A. Rogers, and Kenneth Sherrill. 2011. "Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Voters in the 2000 U. S. Presidential Election." *Politics & Policy* 39(5): 655–77.
- Makowsky, Michael D., and Stephen C. Miller. 2014. "Education, Intelligence, and Attitude Extremity." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 78(4): 832–58.
- Page, Benjamin I., and Robert Y. Shapiro. 1992. *The Rational Public: Fifty Years of Trends in Americans' Policy Preferences*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Phelan, Jo, Bruce G. Link, Ann Stueve, and Robert E. Moore. 1995. "Education, Social Liberalism, and Economic Conservatism: Attitudes Toward Homeless People." *American Sociological Review* 60(1): 126–40.
- Rokeach, Milton. 1960. *The Open and Closed Mind: Investigations into the Nature of Belief Systems and Personality Systems*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schnabel, Landon, and Eric Sevell. 2017. "Should Mary and Jane Be Legal? Americans' Attitudes toward Marijuana and Same-Sex Marriage Legalization, 1988-2014." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 81(1): 157–72.
- Schneider, Simone M, and Juan C Castillo. 2015. "Poverty Attributions and the Perceived Justice

- of Income Inequality: A Comparison of East and West Germany.” *Social Psychology Quarterly* 78(3): 263–82.
- Selznick, Gertrude J., and Stephen Steinberg. 1969. *The Tenacity of Prejudice*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Smith, Tom W. 1984. “The Polls: Gender and Attitudes Toward Violence.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 48(1): 384–96.
- . 1995. “Some Aspects of Measuring Education.” *Social Science Research* 24(3): 215–42.
- Smith, Tom W, Peter Marsden, Michael Hout, and Jibum Kim. 2015. *General Social Surveys, 1972-2014 [Machine-Readable Data File]*. Chicago, IL: National Opinion Research Center.
- Stets, Jan E., and Richard T. Serpe. 2013. “Identity Theory.” In *Handbook of Social Psychology*, eds. J. DeLamater and A. Ward. New York, NY: Kluwer-Plenum, 31–60.
- Stouffer, Samuel. 1955. *Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties: A Cross-Section of the Nation Speaks Its Mind*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Stryker, Sheldon. 2008. “From Mead to a Structural Symbolic Interactionism and Beyond.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 34(1): 15–31.
- Stubager, Rune. 2008. “Education Effects on Authoritarian-Libertarian Values: A Question of Socialization.” *British Journal of Sociology* 59(2): 327–50.
- . 2009. “Education-Based Group Identity and Consciousness in the Authoritarian-Libertarian Value Conflict.” *European Journal of Political Research* 48(2): 204–33.
- . 2010. “The Development of the Education Cleavage: Denmark as a Critical Case.” *West European Politics* 33(3): 505–33.
- . 2013. “The Changing Basis of Party Competition: Education, Authoritarian–Libertarian Values and Voting.” *Government and Opposition* 48(3): 372–97.

- Tajfel, Henri. 1978. "Social Categorization, Social Identity and Social Comparison." In *Differentiation between Social Groups: Studies in the Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, ed. Henri Tajfel. London: Academic Press.
- Weakliem, David L. 2002. "The Effects of Education on Political Opinions: An International Study." *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 13(2): 141–57.
- Weil, Frederick D. 1985. "The Variable Effects of Education on Liberal Attitudes: A Comparative- Historical Analysis of Anti-Semitism Using Public Opinion Survey Data." *American Sociological Review* 50(4): 458–74.
-

ENDNOTES

¹ See Schneider and Castillo (2015) for more recent findings in which education is positively associated with some positive views toward poor people even while higher income is negatively associated with these same issues. This pattern highlights the importance of controlling for income to determine whether patterns for education are a result of schooling or SES.

² ALSOS is a method for estimating models without making arbitrary and ultimately unjustifiable assumptions about category spacing for ordinal outcomes (DeLeeuw, Young, and Takane 1976; Jacoby 2014). ALSOS provides best-fitting estimates of value points and individual vectors and thus transforms categorical data with unequal spacing into linear data (Jacoby 1999, 2014). Coefficients for this method can be interpreted similarly to how OLS estimates would be interpreted because ALSOS transformation retains the original means and standard deviations of the untransformed variables. The optimal scaling procedure was conducted using Armstrong's ALSOS R package.

³ The overall levels of support for the justifiability of family violence—12 percent said beating a wife and 22 percent said beating children could ever be justifiable—skewed the distribution to the “never justifiable” response. Checks using alternative measurement and modelling strategies yielded similar patterns.

⁴ Coefficients for covariates available upon request.

⁵ I conducted additional analyses to consider the cognitive sophistication explanation for the effect of education on social attitudes (e.g., Bobo and Licari 1989). The WORDSUM variable available in the GSS—employed by Makowsky and Miller (2014) and others to proxy intelligence—accounts for some of the relationship between education and attitudes, but

substantive and significant education effects persist. Therefore, “cognitive sophistication” appears to play a role in the relationship between education and attitudes, but, as Phelan and colleagues (1995) have argued, not as large a role as socialization.

⁶ These patterns are consistent with Gross and Fosse’s (2012) discussion of professors and political liberalism. Whereas college appears to socialize students into the dominant American culture, some types of graduate education—like acculturation into a sexual minority identity (Lewis, Rogers, and Sherrill 2011)—socialize people into a subcultural identity and related subcultural values. I found confirmatory patterns for an additional item, the death penalty, which included a number of cases with “don’t know” responses that if dropped would have decreased the sample size for the primary measures. Support for the death penalty is lowest among those with less than a high school education and among those with a graduate degree.

⁷ As in most research, the measures used in this study were imperfect and the nature of the data only allow me to test whether the patterns are consistent with the theory rather than definitively test the theory. Therefore, future research should examine the legitimization of state-sanctioned violence in more detail and further test this refined socialization model.

TABLES

Table S1: Descriptive Statistics for Key Measures

	Description	Mean	SD	Range ^a
<i>World Values Survey U.S. Data (N=2,147)</i>				
Beating Wife Ever Justifiable	For a man to beat his wife: Never justifiable=1 to always justifiable=10	1.45	1.47	1-10
Beating Children Ever Justifiable	Parents beating children: Never justifiable=1 to always justifiable=10	1.80	1.83	1-10
Violence Against Other People Ever Justifiable	Violence against other people: Never justifiable=1 to always justifiable=10	2.05	1.92	1-10
War Ever Justifiable	Under some conditions, war is necessary to obtain justice=1	0.74		
Education				
Less Than High School	< HS=1	0.11		
High School	HS=1	0.51		
Associate/Junior College	Associate/Junior College =1	0.09		
Bachelor's Degree	Bachelor's=1	0.17		
Graduate Degree	Graduate=1	0.12		
<i>General Social Survey (N=2,121)</i>				
Spanking Children Justifiable	Strongly disagree=1 to strongly agree=4 it's sometimes necessary to discipline child with a good hard spanking	2.81	0.86	1-4
Police Striking Citizen Justifiable	Ever approve of police striking citizen=1	0.65		
Education				
Less than High School	< HS=1	0.14		
High School	HS=1	0.49		
Associate/Junior College	Associate/Junior College=1	0.08		
Bachelor's Degree	Bachelor's=1	0.18		
Graduate Degree	Graduate=1	0.10		

^a The range shows the highest and lowest values from the alternate least squares optimized scaling. The individual point values are updated to better match the real distance between categories, but the mean and standard deviation remain the same as the pre-optimized measures.

Table 2: Education Predicting Justifiability of Violence, U.S. World Values Survey

	Bivariate	With Demographics	With Politics	With Family Income
<i>Beating Wife Ever Justifiable (OLS)</i>				
Less than High School	—	—	—	—
High School	-0.56*** (0.10)	-0.44*** (0.11)	-0.42*** (0.11)	-0.46*** (0.11)
Associate/Junior College	-0.74*** (0.14)	-0.63*** (0.14)	-0.61*** (0.14)	-0.68*** (0.14)
Bachelor's Degree	-0.80*** (0.12)	-0.68*** (0.13)	-0.64*** (0.13)	-0.79*** (0.13)
Graduate Degree	-0.83*** (0.13)	-0.65*** (0.13)	-0.59*** (0.13)	-0.84*** (0.14)
<i>Beating Children Ever Justifiable (OLS)</i>				
Less than High School	—	—	—	—
High School	-0.48*** (0.13)	-0.31* (0.13)	-0.28* (0.13)	-0.32* (0.13)
Associate/Junior College	-0.75*** (0.18)	-0.57** (0.18)	-0.55** (0.18)	-0.62*** (0.18)
Bachelor's Degree	-0.74*** (0.15)	-0.54** (0.15)	-0.50** (0.15)	-0.64*** (0.16)
Graduate Degree	-0.75*** (0.16)	-0.53** (0.16)	-0.48** (0.16)	-0.71*** (0.17)
<i>Violence Against Other People Ever Justifiable (OLS)</i>				
Less than High School	—	—	—	—
High School	-0.36** (0.14)	-0.36** (0.14)	-0.36** (0.14)	-0.40** (0.14)
Associate/Junior College	-0.58** (0.19)	-0.59** (0.19)	-0.59** (0.19)	-0.67*** (0.19)
Bachelor's Degree	-0.54*** (0.16)	-0.57*** (0.16)	-0.54*** (0.16)	-0.70*** (0.17)
Graduate Degree	-0.75*** (0.17)	-0.69*** (0.17)	-0.63*** (0.17)	-0.87*** (0.18)
<i>War Ever Justifiable (Logistic Regression)</i>				
Less than High School	—	—	—	—
High School	0.78*** (0.15)	0.39* (0.16)	0.32* (0.16)	0.31† (0.16)
Associate/Junior College	0.91*** (0.22)	0.46* (0.23)	0.40† (0.23)	0.37 (0.24)
Bachelor's Degree	1.14*** (0.19)	0.66*** (0.20)	0.63** (0.21)	0.57** (0.21)
Graduate Degree	1.00*** (0.20)	0.52* (0.21)	0.53* (0.22)	0.44† (0.23)
<i>N</i>	2,147	2,147	2,147	2,147

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6 (2010-2014)

Standard errors in parentheses

Note: Demographics model adds gender, race/ethnicity, age, region, marital status, and parental status. Politics adds (all previous covariates are retained when covariates are added to sequential models) political views and party identification, and income adds self-placement on a ten-point income scale.

† $p < 0.1$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table 3: Education Predicting Justifiability of Violence, U.S. General Social Survey

	Bivariate	With Demo- graphics	With Politics	With Family Income	With Parents' Education
<i>Spanking Children Justifiable (OLS)</i>					
Less than High School	—	—	—	—	—
High School	0.03 (0.06)	0.01 (0.06)	-0.01 (0.05)	0.00 (0.06)	0.02 (0.06)
Associate/Junior College	0.01 (0.08)	-0.01 (0.08)	-0.03 (0.08)	-0.01 (0.08)	0.02 (0.08)
Bachelor's Degree	-0.20** (0.06)	-0.20** (0.07)	-0.20** (0.07)	-0.17* (0.07)	-0.11 (0.07)
Graduate Degree	-0.39*** (0.08)	-0.39*** (0.08)	-0.34*** (0.08)	-0.30*** (0.08)	-0.23** (0.08)
<i>Police Striking Citizen Justifiable (Logistic Regression)</i>					
Less than High School	—	—	—	—	—
High School	1.05*** (0.13)	0.86*** (0.15)	0.82*** (0.15)	0.78*** (0.15)	0.73*** (0.15)
Associate/Junior College	1.25*** (0.21)	1.11*** (0.22)	1.08*** (0.22)	1.03*** (0.22)	0.94*** (0.23)
Bachelor's Degree	1.98*** (0.18)	1.71*** (0.19)	1.68*** (0.19)	1.58*** (0.20)	1.42*** (0.21)
Graduate Degree	1.62*** (0.20)	1.37*** (0.21)	1.39*** (0.22)	1.24*** (0.23)	1.03*** (0.24)
<i>N</i>	2,121	2,121	2,121	2,121	2,121

Source: General Social Survey, 2010-2014

Standard errors in parentheses

Note: All models include binaries for survey year. Demographics model adds gender, race/ethnicity, age, region, marital status, and parental status. Politics adds (all previous covariates are retained when covariates are added to sequential models) political views and party identification, income adds inflation-adjusted family income, and parents' education adds mother's and father's education.

† $p < 0.1$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

SUPPLEMENT

Figure S1: Predicted Probabilities of Education on Support for Justifiability of Violence, U.S. World Values Survey

Bars indicate 95% confidence intervals.

Note: This figure presents predicts probabilities of support for violence by education controlling for gender, race/ethnicity, age, region, marital status, and parental status. Each measure that was on a scale from never justifiable=1 to always justifiable=10 dichotomized at 1/2=0 and 3/10=1.

Figure S2: Predicted Probabilities of Education on Support for Justifiability of Violence, General Social Survey

Bars indicate 95% confidence intervals.

Note: This figure presents predicts probabilities of support for violence by education controlling for survey year, gender, race/ethnicity, age, region, marital status, and parental status. Spanking is dichotomized as agree and strongly agree with spanking to discipline child=1 and disagree and strongly disagree=0.

Table S1: Education Predicting Justifiability of Violence Using ALSOS, U.S. World Values Survey

	Bivariate	With Demographics	With Politics	With Family Income
<i>Beating Wife Ever Justifiable</i>				
Less than High School	—	—	—	—
High School	-0.58*** (0.10)	-0.46*** (0.11)	-0.44*** (0.11)	-0.48*** (0.11)
Associate/Junior College	-0.74*** (0.14)	-0.62*** (0.14)	-0.61*** (0.14)	-0.68*** (0.14)
Bachelor's Degree	-0.85*** (0.12)	-0.71*** (0.12)	-0.68*** (0.13)	-0.83*** (0.13)
Graduate Degree	-0.85*** (0.13)	-0.67*** (0.13)	-0.61*** (0.13)	-0.85*** (0.14)
<i>Beating Children Ever Justifiable</i>				
Less than High School	—	—	—	—
High School	-0.45** (0.13)	-0.26* (0.13)	-0.24† (0.13)	-0.27* (0.13)
Associate/Junior College	-0.73*** (0.18)	-0.52** (0.18)	-0.50** (0.18)	-0.57*** (0.18)
Bachelor's Degree	-0.71*** (0.15)	-0.49** (0.15)	-0.45** (0.15)	-0.58*** (0.16)
Graduate Degree	-0.68*** (0.16)	-0.44** (0.16)	-0.39* (0.16)	-0.60*** (0.17)
<i>Violence Against Other People Ever Justifiable</i>				
Less than High School	—	—	—	—
High School	-0.41** (0.14)	-0.42** (0.14)	-0.42** (0.14)	-0.45*** (0.14)
Associate/Junior College	-0.63** (0.19)	-0.65*** (0.19)	-0.65*** (0.19)	-0.72*** (0.19)
Bachelor's Degree	-0.60*** (0.16)	-0.63*** (0.16)	-0.60*** (0.16)	-0.75*** (0.16)
Graduate Degree	-0.79*** (0.17)	-0.73*** (0.17)	-0.67*** (0.17)	-0.91*** (0.18)
<i>N</i>	2,147	2,147	2,147	2,147

Source: World Values Survey, Wave 6 (2010-2014)

Standard errors in parentheses

Note: Demographics model adds gender, race/ethnicity, age, region, marital status, and parental status. Politics adds (all previous covariates are retained when covariates are added to sequential models) political views and party identification, and income adds self-placement on a ten-point income scale.

† $p < 0.1$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table S2: Education Predicting Justifiability of Violence Using ALSOS, U.S. General Social Survey

	Bivariate	With Demo- graphics	With Politics	With Family Income	With Parents' Education
<i>Spanking Children Justifiable</i>					
Less than High School	—	—	—	—	—
High School	0.04 (0.06)	0.01 (0.06)	-0.00 (0.05)	0.01 (0.06)	0.03 (0.06)
Associate/Junior College	0.01 (0.08)	-0.01 (0.08)	-0.03 (0.08)	-0.01 (0.08)	0.02 (0.08)
Bachelor's Degree	-0.19** (0.06)	-0.19** (0.07)	-0.19** (0.07)	-0.16* (0.07)	-0.11 (0.08)
Graduate Degree	-0.37*** (0.08)	-0.38*** (0.08)	-0.33*** (0.08)	-0.28*** (0.08)	-0.22** (0.08)
<i>N</i>	2,121	2,121	2,121	2,121	2,121

Source: General Social Survey, 2010-2014

Standard errors in parentheses

Note: All models include binaries for survey year. Demographics model adds gender, race/ethnicity, age, region, marital status, and parental status. Politics adds (all previous covariates are retained when covariates are added to sequential models) political views and party identification, income adds inflation-adjusted family income, and parents' education adds mother's and father's education.

† $p < 0.1$, * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$