

**Authoritarian Leaders Share
Conspiracy Theories to Attack
Opponents, Promote In-Group
Unity, Shift Blame, and Under-
mine Democratic Institutions**

Zhiying (Bella) Ren, Andrew M. Carton, Eugen Dimant, Maurice E. Schweitzer

Impressum:

CESifo Working Papers

ISSN 2364-1428 (electronic version)

Publisher and distributor: Munich Society for the Promotion of Economic Research - CESifo GmbH

The international platform of Ludwigs-Maximilians University's Center for Economic Studies and the ifo Institute

Poschingerstr. 5, 81679 Munich, Germany

Telephone +49 (0)89 2180-2740, Telefax +49 (0)89 2180-17845, email office@cesifo.de

Editor: Clemens Fuest

<https://www.cesifo.org/en/wp>

An electronic version of the paper may be downloaded

- from the SSRN website: www.SSRN.com
- from the RePEc website: www.RePEc.org
- from the CESifo website: <https://www.cesifo.org/en/wp>

Authoritarian Leaders Share Conspiracy Theories to Attack Opponents, Promote In-Group Unity, Shift Blame, and Undermine Democratic Institutions

Abstract

Although many virtuous leaders are guided by the ideal of prioritizing the need and welfare of their subordinates, others advance their self-interest at the expense of the people they purport to serve. In this article, we discuss the relationship between leadership and the spread of conspiracy theories. We propose that leaders spread conspiracy theories in service of four primary goals: 1) to attack opponents; 2) to increase support from their ingroup members; 3) to shift blame and responsibility; and 4) to undermine institution that threaten their power. We argue that populist and conservative leaders are most likely to spread conspiracy theories during periods of instability.

Keywords: conspiracy theories sharing, leadership, authoritarian leaders.

*Zhiying (Bella) Ren**
The University of Pennsylvania,
Wharton School of Business
Philadelphia / PA / USA
bellaren@wharton.upenn.edu

Andrew M. Carton
The University of Pennsylvania
Wharton School of Business
Philadelphia / PA / USA
carton@wharton.upenn.edu

Eugen Dimant
University of Pennsylvania, Center for Social
Norms and Behavioral Dynamics
Philadelphia / PA / USA
edimant@sas.upenn.edu

Maurice E. Schweitzer
The University of Pennsylvania
Wharton School of Business
Philadelphia / PA / USA
schweitz@wharton.upenn.edu

*corresponding author

Click here to view linked references:

<https://www.editorialmanager.com/copsyc/viewRCResults.aspx?pdf=1&docID=1666&rev=0&fileID=11601&msid=0e9519eb-666a-47ae-8eb5-2565eb03fff3>

Conflict of interest: The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

Authoritarian Leaders Share Conspiracy Theories to Attack Opponents, Promote In-Group Unity, Shift Blame, and Undermine Democratic Institutions

Democracy is in danger. Conspiracy theories legitimize false narratives about powerful elites or outgroups who surreptitiously advance their own outcomes at the expense of the innocent and vulnerable. Beliefs in these theories misdirect attention, polarize and even radicalize individuals, and erode democracy (Sternisko et al., 2020). In addition, the spread of conspiracy theories have harmed our ability to address global challenges, ranging from the COVID pandemic to climate change (Pummerer et al., 2022; van der Linden, 2015; Enea et al., 2022*). This trend has motivated scholars to investigate why conspiracy theories are prevalent (e.g., see Van Bavel et al., 2020 and Biddlestone et al., 2021 for a review). This work has found that people share conspiracy theories not only because they believe them (Van Bavel et al., 2020), but also because they are inattentive (Pennycook et al., 2020), motivated to affiliate with their ingroup (Enders & Smallpage, 2018), keen to gain social attention and reactions (Ren et al., 2021), and in some cases are even motivated to promote chaos (Petersen et al., 2020).

The act of disseminating conspiracy theories merits special attention for one class of individuals in particular: leaders. When leaders disseminate conspiracy theories, they have greater influence than average conspiracy theorists because they reach a wider audience than most people (Barbera & Zeitzoff, 2018), their positions lend greater credibility to misleading claims (Umeogu, 2012), and they normalize the spread of misinformation (Spector, 2021).

In this article, we describe the relationship between leadership and the spread of conspiracy theories. We first explain what leaders stand to gain from them, arguing that leaders spread conspiracy theories in service of four primary goals: to attack opponents, increase support from their ingroup members, shift blame and responsibility, and undermine institutions that

threaten their power. Second, we unpack which types of leaders are most likely to generate and popularize conspiracy theories.

Table 1

Leaders' Motives for Sharing Conspiracy Theories

Motive	How Conspiracy Theories Help Leaders Achieve This Motive
Attack opponents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conspiracy theories trigger intense emotions, causing followers to become less likely to engage in analytical processing and more likely to engage in impulsive, violent acts.
Promote in-group unity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conspiracy theories depict outgroups as common enemies that threaten the ingroup's welfare. The perceived threat galvanizes ingroup members. • Conspiracy theories create a salient contrast between the virtuous purity of the ingroup and the corrupt nature of the outgroup. The contrast facilitates group cohesiveness.
Shift blame	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conspiracy theories target powerful individuals and are hard to falsify. Therefore, leaders can manufacture a culprit for their followers' problems without providing factual evidence.
Undermine democratic institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaders can use conspiracy theories to discredit institutions (e.g., the free press or democratic elections) that might challenge their power.

Sharing conspiracy theories to attack individual opponents

Leaders often seek to undermine potential competitors (Georgeson & Harris, 2006; Mead & Maner, 2012; Maner & Mead, 2010). To do so, they may derogate opponents by spreading conspiracy theories, guiding followers to focus on a purported (and false) wrongdoing perpetrated by a rival. For example, during the 2016 Republican Party primary race, Donald Trump claimed that Ted Cruz's father, Rafael Cruz, had been actively involved in Lee Oswald's assassination of President John F. Kennedy. By attacking rivals, leaders elicit intense emotions, such as anger and outrage (Smith & Ellsworth, 1985). This may prevent followers from engaging in deliberative processing, causing them to be more vulnerable to believing myths that discredit the integrity or stature of opponents (van Prooijen et al., 2022; Kahneman, 2011). As such, followers are more likely to undermine opponents or even take aggressive action against them without scrutinizing the ethics of their leader's agenda.

Leaders who are adept at using conspiracy theories motivate their followers to build a tight association between the conspiracy and their opponent. This can cause thin slices of information about the opponent — such as images from the news or even the mere mention of their name during a political rally — to elicit strong moral emotions such as disgust (Rozin et al., 1999). Once followers are in a state-of-mind dominated by strong emotions and minimal analytical processing, they are poised to undermine their leader's opponents rather than scrutinize the leader's shortcomings. In this way, leaders can exploit conspiracy theories to mobilize followers toward the denigration of opponents.

Sharing conspiracy theories to foster a stronger sense of ingroup identity

Rather than targeting an individual opponent (e.g., a single rival for power), leaders often spread conspiracy theories to manufacture conflict between groups. By spreading conspiracy

theories, leaders can support two related goals, each of which engenders a stronger sense of ingroup identity. First, conspiracy theories help groups converge their attention, emotion, and energy on a common enemy who threatens the interests of the ingroup. Toward this end, many conspiracy theories depict outgroups engaging in covert activities to harm the welfare of the ingroup (Jolley et al., 2020*). For instance, Palestinian leaders used official news outlets to spread a conspiracy theory that Israel had been using rats to drive Arab families from the Old City of Jerusalem. The ability of conspiracy theories to direct attention and emotion toward a common enemy can be galvanizing. The perceived outgroup threat triggers anger and anxiety (Mashuri & Zaduqisti, 2015), causing ingroup members to band together to fight the outgroup rather than become stifled by intragroup competition (Maner & Mead, 2010). The perceived distinction between “us” and “them” strengthens the ingroup’s cohesiveness and resolve.

Second, conspiracy theories create a sharp contrast between the virtuous purity of the ingroup and the corrupt nature of the outgroup. The conspirators are branded as having warped ends. Further, they are often viewed as Machiavellian, corrupt, surreptitious, and hypocritical (Biddlestone et al., 2021), making their behavior easier to condemn because it is not merely their ends that are problematic, but also the means. Ultimately, this helps preserve the belief that one’s own group is virtuous and functionally led (Douglas, Sutton, et al., 2019; Whitson & Galinsky, 2008; however, see Stojanov & Halberstadt, 2020). This strategy is likely to be sustainable even when group members are confronted by outgroup members who appear to undermine their claim to virtue by casting doubt on their theories: given that followers do not have to worry about their theories being falsified, they can confidently confront outgroup members who express doubt. Accordingly, they can interpret the outgroup members’ skepticism as an affront to their group’s identity. In short, leaders can use conspiracy theories to generate a contrast between a virtuous

ingroup and an outgroup that exhibits unacceptably antagonistic behavior. This inflates their own group's sense of virtuousness.

The effect that conspiracy theories have on strengthening ingroup identity has beneficial consequences for leaders. During periods of threat, collectives not only become more cohesive, but rally around strong leaders (Baekgaard et al., 2020; Kakkar & Sivanathan, 2017). This is consistent with cultural research, which has established that more tight-knit collectives typically have steeper hierarchies and stronger leaders (Pasa, 2000; Basabe & Ros, 2005). In this way, leaders can use the galvanization of their ingroup's identity as an opportunity to prop up and maintain their own power. Moreover, leaders can channel a collective sense of threat to cement themselves as the protector of their ingroup's traditions and morés. By sharing conspiracy theories, leaders express outrage towards outgroups and create the impression that they are dedicated to protecting the welfare of their ingroups, even at the cost of hurting outgroups. Since individuals have a preference for leaders who are "one of us" and "doing it for us" (Tajfel & Turner, 2004; Sternisko et al., 2020; Van Knippenberg & Hogg, 2003), followers are more likely to endorse leaders who appear to prioritize ingroups' interest, especially during tumultuous times (Halevy et al., 2012; Kakkar & Sivanathan, 2017). In sum, the strengthening effect of conspiracy theories on ingroup identities can help leaders consolidate power.

Sharing conspiracy theories to dodge blame and shift responsibility

Leaders may seek to retain power by using conspiracy theories to shift blame and responsibility. Conspiracy theories often provide people with a clear and convenient explanation for their problems. This is corroborated by the reality that many conspiracy theories clearly attribute blame to an identifiable source, which helps to reduce uncertainty (Douglas et al., 2017; van Prooijen, 2019). By spreading conspiracy theories, leaders suggest that negative and

unexpected events (e.g., a pandemic) can be attributed to other powerful human agents rather than random, uncontrollable factors or to their own, bungling leadership failures. In a classic example of this, in 64 AD Emperor Nero blamed the Christian community for the Great Fire of Rome; this conspiracy theory helped to motivate the Roman Persecution that lasted for centuries.

Accusations embedded in conspiracy theories are often hard to falsify, because they typically attribute blame to human agents who have the power and resources to conduct invidious and surreptitious crimes. Further, evidence that contradicts conspiracy theories can be interpreted as an attempted cover-up by these powerful agents (Douglas et al., 2017; Lewandowsky et al., 2015; Vermeule & Sunstein, 2009; Douglas, Uscinski, et al., 2019). By harnessing the weak falsifiability of conspiracy theories, leaders can manufacture a culprit without providing factual evidence.

Sharing conspiracy theories to undermine democratic institutions

Unbiased electoral systems and the free press can safeguard democracy by ensuring the peaceful transition of power and illuminating corrupt behavior (Brunetti & Weder, 2003). Leaders may use conspiracy theories to undermine the credibility, legitimacy, and authority of these institutions, however, if they perceive these institution to be a threat to their authority. For example, Jair Bolsonaro claimed that the Brazilian media was over-reporting Covid deaths because the media was controlled by covert, malicious agents keen on overriding his authority. This may be an especially effective tactic if their own claim to power is illegitimate or controversial. Moreover, since exposure to conspiracy theories reduces followers' confidence in democratic institutions (Albertson & Guiler, 2020; Berlinski et al., 2021**), leaders may even mobilize followers to engage in violent actions that further undermine these institutions (e.g., disputing an election defeat by initiating riots or mobilizing military forces).

Which leaders are more likely to share conspiracy theories?

Not all leaders will be attracted to conspiracy theories. We argue that the leaders most amenable to the use of conspiracy theories will be those who have a preference for authoritarian leadership (Wood & Gray, 2019**), lead populist groups, and possess Machiavellian traits (Hughes & Machan, 2021). Authoritarian leaders who encounter threats to their status are more likely engage in subterfuge and self-serving behavior during periods of uncertainty and structural change (e.g., elections, economic transitions, pandemics; Norris & Inglehart, 2019). During these times, such leaders face hierarchical instability and status threats (Maner & Mead, 2010) and may privilege gaining and retaining power over other concerns, such as honesty and safeguarding institutions.

Additionally, authoritarian leaders are more likely to attract followers who are open to conspiracy theories. The nature of conspiracy theories – as instruments that bind a collective around a set of non-falsifiable and often patently implausible beliefs that attribute blame to outsiders (Biddlestone et al., 2021) – suggests that they are more likely to fester among the following: followers who are willing to suspend disbelief for the sake of their collective’s welfare (Sternisko et al., 2021*); people who value loyalty and the preservation of their leader’s stature (Wood & Gray, 2019); and people who are easily repulsed by outgroup members who are deemed to have impure or corrupt motives. These attributes reflect “binding” moral foundations that are emblematic of groups that have conservative belief systems with leaders who use dominance rather than competence to exhibit personal agency and maintain legitimacy (Haidt, Graham, & Joseph, 2009). If a leader has a contingent of loyal followers who are inclined to defer to the leader’s ideology and public narratives, then it will be easier for the leader to persuade followers of non-falsifiable claims.

Additionally, conspiracy theories are more likely to be endorsed by people who feel slighted or wronged by powerful institutions (Mao et al., 2020); people who are skeptical of traditional sources of power; people who hold Unjust World beliefs (Furnham, 2021); people who do not value verifiable and observable evidence for truth claims (Stasielowicz, 2022; Furnham & Grover, 2021; Leman & Cinnirella, 2013); and individuals who have little trust in outgroups. These are common attributes of poorly educated populist groups, especially those that exhibit national narcissism, Xenophobia, and a mistrust of outsiders (Sternisko et al., 2021; Cichocka et al., 2015). Groups with these attributes are typically open to authoritarian leaders because they preserve order, reduce uncertainty, and privilege the ingroup's interests over outside threats.

Conclusion

We postulate that leaders use conspiracy theories as a tool to advance their self-interest, especially when they encounter threats to their status. They use conspiracy theories to damage the reputations of opponents, increase support from their ingroup members, divert blame and responsibility, and undermine institutions. Certain leaders – especially those who lead conservative or populist movements during periods of instability – are especially likely to capitalize on the features that distinguish conspiracy theories from other types of beliefs, including their non-falsifiable nature, the cynical connotations they attach to established institutions, and the belief that powerful forces are corrupt and seek to harm them.

Future research should build on this framework to consider not only how leaders use conspiracy theories, but also how followers experience them and carry the burden of their consequences. For example, when leaders spread conspiracy theories, they can advance their own goals, but often at a significant cost to the welfare of others. As leaders broadcast

conspiracy theories, they harm the ability of others to distinguish fact from fiction. In a similar vein, leaders who make regular use of conspiracy theories may undercut the extent to which their followers are motivated to acquire accurate and complete information over the long-term. Moreover, conspiracy theories can reduce trust and escalate conflict between groups (Jolley, Meleady, & Douglas, 2020). The bedrock of democratic institutions are a set of common values and a common ideology. Conspiracy theories – by undermining opponents, stoking fear, solidifying intergroup tensions, redirecting blame, and attacking the legitimacy of democratic institutions – enable leaders to erode the very basis of this foundation.

References

Albertson, B., & Guiler, K. (2020). Conspiracy theories, election rigging, and support for democratic norms. *Research & Politics*, 7(3), 2053168020959859.

Brunetti, A., & Weder, B. (2003). A free press is bad news for corruption. *Journal of Public Economics*, 87(7-8), 1801-1824.

Baekgaard, M., Christensen, J., Madsen, J. K., & Mikkelsen, K. S. (2020). Rallying around the flag in times of COVID-19: Societal lockdown and trust in democratic institutions. *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration*, 3(2).

*Biddlestone, M., Green, R., Cichocka, A., Sutton, R., & Douglas, K. (2021). Conspiracy beliefs and the individual, relational, and collective selves. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 15(10), e12639.

A theoretical article proposing that belief in conspiracy theories is associated with three selves – the individual, relational, and collective self. People who are driven by the collective self motive use conspiracy theories to defend their social groups and attribute ingroup misfortunes to outgroups.

**Berlinski, N., Doyle, M., Guess, A. M., Levy, G., Lyons, B., Montgomery, J. M., ... & Reifler, J. (2021). The effects of unsubstantiated claims of voter fraud on confidence in elections. *Journal of Experimental Political Science*, 1-16.

An empirical article showing that exposure to unfounded voter fraud claims leads to reduced confidence in the electoral system. Researchers also found that this effect can hardly be mitigated by fact-check tweets.

Basabe, N., & Ros, M. (2005). Cultural dimensions and social behavior correlates: Individualism-Collectivism and Power Distance. *International Review of Social*

Psychology, 18(1), 189-225.

Barberá, P., & Zeitzoff, T. (2018). The new public address system: Why do world leaders adopt social media?. *International Studies Quarterly*, 62(1), 121-130.

Cichocka, A., Golec de Zavala, A., Marchlewska, M., & Olechowski, M. (2015). Grandiose delusions: Collective narcissism, secure ingroup identification and belief in conspiracies. In M. Bilewicz, A. Cichocka & W. Soral (Eds.), *The psychology of conspiracy* (pp. 42–61). Routledge.

Douglas, K. M., Sutton, R. M., & Cichocka, A. (2017). The psychology of conspiracy theories. *Current directions in psychological science*, 26(6), 538-542.

Douglas, K. M., Sutton, R. M., & Cichocka, A. (2019). Belief in conspiracy theories: Looking beyond gullibility. In *The Social Psychology of Gullibility* (pp. 61-76). Routledge.

Douglas, K. M., Uscinski, J. E., Sutton, R. M., Cichocka, A., Nefes, T., Ang, C. S., & Deravi, F. (2019). Understanding conspiracy theories. *Political Psychology*, 40, 3-35.

Enders, A. M., & Smallpage, S. M. (2018). On the measurement of conspiracy beliefs. *Research & Politics*, 5(1), 1-4

*Enea, V., Eisenbeck, N., Carreno, D. F., Douglas, K. M., Sutton, R. M., Agostini, M., ... & Leander, N. P. (2022). Intentions to be vaccinated against COVID-19: The role of prosociality and conspiracy beliefs across 20 countries. *Health communication*, 1-10.

An empirical article that surveyed 6697 respondents across countries at the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic. The result shows that generic beliefs in conspiracy theories are negatively correlated with vaccination intentions.

Furnham, A. (2021). Just world beliefs, personal success and beliefs in conspiracy theories. *Current Psychology*, 1-7.

Furnham, A., & Grover, S. (2021). Do you have to be mad to believe in conspiracy theories?

Personality disorders and conspiracy theories. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*.

Georgesesen, J., & Harris, M. J. (2006). Holding onto power: Effects of powerholders' positional instability and expectancies on interactions with subordinates. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 36(4), 451-468.

Haidt, J., Graham, J., & Joseph, C. (2009). Above and below left–right: Ideological narratives and moral foundations. *Psychological Inquiry*, 20(2-3), 110-119.

Halevy, N., Chou, E. Y., Cohen, T. R., & Livingston, R. W. (2012). Status conferral in intergroup social dilemmas: behavioral antecedents and consequences of prestige and dominance. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 102(2), 351.

Hughes, S., & Machan, L. (2021). It's a conspiracy: Covid-19 conspiracies link to psychopathy, Machiavellianism and collective narcissism. *Personality and individual differences*, 171, 110559.

*Jolley, D., Meleady, R., & Douglas, K. M. (2020). Exposure to intergroup conspiracy theories promotes prejudice which spreads across groups. *British Journal of Psychology*, 111(1), 17-35.

An empirical article showing that exposure to conspiracy theories about outgroups (e.g., European immigrants) not only increases prejudice and discrimination against the target outgroups, but also increases prejudice towards secondary outgroups (e.g., Asians).

Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. Macmillan.

Kakkar, H., & Sivanathan, N. (2017). When the appeal of a dominant leader is greater than a prestige leader. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(26), 6734-6739.

Leman, P. J., & Cinnirella, M. (2013). Beliefs in conspiracy theories and the need for cognitive

- closure. *Frontiers in psychology*, 4, 378.
- Lewandowsky, S., Cook, J., Oberauer, K., Brophy, S., Lloyd, E. A., & Marriott, M. (2015). Recurrent fury: Conspiratorial discourse in the blogosphere triggered by research on the role of conspiracist ideation in climate denial. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 3(1), 161-197.
- Mashuri, A., & Zaduqisti, E. (2015). The effect of intergroup threat and social identity salience on the belief in conspiracy theories over terrorism in Indonesia: Collective angst as a mediator. *International Journal of Psychological Research*, 8(1), 24-35.
- Maner, J. K., & Mead, N. L. (2010). The essential tension between leadership and power: when leaders sacrifice group goals for the sake of self-interest. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 99(3), 482.
- Mao, J. Y., Yang, S. L., & Guo, Y. Y. (2020). Are individuals from lower social classes more susceptible to conspiracy theories? An explanation from the compensatory control theory. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 23(4), 372-383.
- Mead, N. L., & Maner, J. K. (2012). On keeping your enemies close: Powerful leaders seek proximity to ingroup power threats. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102(3), 576.
- Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. (2019). *Cultural backlash: Trump, Brexit, and authoritarian populism*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pennycook, G., McPhetres, J., Zhang, Y., Lu, J. G., & Rand, D. G. (2020). Fighting COVID-19 misinformation on social media: Experimental evidence for a scalable accuracy-nudge intervention. *Psychological science*, 31(7), 770-780.
- Pummerer, L., Böhm, R., Lilleholt, L., Winter, K., Zettler, I., & Sassenberg, K. (2022).

Conspiracy theories and their societal effects during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 13(1), 49-59.

Petersen, M.B., Osmundsen, M., & Arceneaux, K. (2020). The “Need for Chaos” and Motivations to Share Hostile Political Rumors. <https://osf.io/6m4ts/download?format=pdf>

Pasa, S. F. (2000). Leadership influence in a high power distance and collectivist culture. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 21(8): 414–426.

Rozin, P., Lowery, L., Imada, S., & Haidt, J. (1999). The CAD triad hypothesis: a mapping between three moral emotions (contempt, anger, disgust) and three moral codes (community, autonomy, divinity). *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 76(4), 574.

Ren, Z. B., Dimant, E., & Schweitzer, M. E. (2021). Social motives for sharing conspiracy theories. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3919364>

*Sternisko, A., Cichocka, A., Cislak, A., & van Bavel, J. (2020). Collective narcissism predicts the belief and dissemination of conspiracy theories during the COVID-19 pandemic. *PsyArXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/4c6av>

An empirical article using two large scale across-countries studies to show that national narcissism, the tendency to exaggerate the positive image of one’s own group and be hypersensitive to criticism about one’s own group, positively predict tendency to believe and disseminate COVID-19 related conspiracy theories.

Sternisko, A., Cichocka, A., & Van Bavel, J. J. (2020). The dark side of social movements: Social identity, non-conformity, and the lure of conspiracy theories. *Current opinion in psychology*, 35, 1-6.

- Stojanov, A., & Halberstadt, J. (2020). Does lack of control lead to conspiracy beliefs? A meta-analysis. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 50*(5), 955-968.
- Spector, B. A. (2021). Norm-based leadership and the challenge of democratically elected authoritarians. *Leadership, 17*(2), 230-239.
- Smith, C. A., & Ellsworth, P. C. (1985). Patterns of cognitive appraisal in emotion. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 48*(4), 813.
- Stasielowicz, L. (2022). Who believes in conspiracy theories? A meta-analysis on personality correlates. *Journal of Research in Personality, 104*229.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. *Psychology of Intergroup Relations, 5*, 7–24.
- Umeogu, B. (2012). Source credibility: a philosophical analysis. *Open journal of philosophy, 2*(02), 112.
- Vermeule, C. A., & Sunstein, C. R. (2009). Conspiracy theories: causes and cures. *Journal of Political Philosophy, 17*, 2-27
- Van Knippenberg, D., & Hogg, M. A. (2003). A social identity model of leadership effectiveness in organizations. *Research in organizational behavior, 25*, 243-295.
- Van Bavel, J. J., Harris, E. A., Pärnamets, P., Rathje, S., Doell, K., & Tucker, J. A. (2020). Political psychology in the digital (mis) information age: A model of news belief and sharing. *Soc. Issues Policy Rev. 15*, 84–113 (2021)
- van Prooijen, J. W. (2019). An existential threat model of conspiracy theories. *European Psychologist, 25*(1), 16–25.
- van Prooijen, J. W., Ligthart, J., Rosema, S., & Xu, Y. (2022). The entertainment value of conspiracy theories. *British Journal of Psychology, 113*(1), 25-48.

Van der Linden, S. (2015). The social-psychological determinants of climate change risk perceptions: Towards a comprehensive model. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 41*, 112-124.

Whitson, J. A., & Galinsky, A. D. (2008). Lacking control increases illusory pattern perception. *science, 322*(5898), 115-117.

**Wood, M. J., & Gray, D. (2019). Right-wing authoritarianism as a predictor of pro-establishment versus anti-establishment conspiracy theories. *Personality and Individual Differences, 138*, 163-166.

An empirical article that clarifies how right-wing authoritarianism (RWA) is differentially associated with beliefs in pro-establishment conspiracy theories, which protect existing social order from external threats, and anti-establishment conspiracy theories, which seek to undermine existing social order. The article shows that RWA is more strongly correlated with pro-establishment conspiracy theories.