

Available Online

This article in PDF

http://www.gandhipeacefoundation.org/pdf_read.php?fil=Article-5+Oman.pdf

Special issue (entire) on Gandhi and psychology

<http://www.gandhipeacefoundation.org/abstract-list/7#anch>

Other issues of Gandhi Marg

<http://www.gandhipeacefoundation.org/archives.php#anch>



Gandhi Marg Quarterly

35(4): 583–617

© 2013 Gandhi Peace Foundation, New Delhi

<http://gandhipeacefoundation.org/>

Building Nonviolent Self-efficacy to Foster Social Transformation and Health

Doug Oman

ABSTRACT

Among the most practical contributions of modern psychology is the concept of “self-efficacy,” an individual or group’s self-confidence in possessing effective skills. Self-efficacy based approaches have produced effective interventions in practical fields ranging from education and management to healthcare and athletics (Bandura, 1997). We describe how skill in Gandhian nonviolence might be fostered through positive synergies between theory, assessment, and practice that commonly arise from self-efficacy approaches. We draw heavily on Gandhi’s writings to characterize the relevant nonviolent skills, ranging from individual assimilation of ahimsa and fearlessness, to the collective ability to implement a constructive programme and enact nonviolent satyagraha campaigns. Example scale items are provided. We also explain how self-efficacy approaches need not contradict religious perspectives that view nonviolent strength as arising from a spiritual source beyond the individual ego. We advocate self-efficacy approaches as useful for integrating nonviolence into social institutions, and perhaps into new social media. Applications to health promotion are suggested.

Key Words: activism, collective efficacy, nonviolence, self-efficacy, spirituality

Introduction

I have not the shadow of a doubt that any man or woman can achieve what I have, if he or she would make the same effort and cultivate the same hope and faith.

– Mahatma Gandhi, 1936¹

January–March 2014

The history of science is rich in the example of the fruitfulness of bringing two sets of techniques, two sets of ideas, developed in separate contexts for the pursuit of new truth, into touch with one another.

– J. Robert Oppenheimer, 1953²

GANDHI CONSIDERED HIMSELF to be a “practical idealist”,³ and conducted many experiments to adapt modern technical innovations to benefit the masses of ordinary people. Could tools from modern psychology prove similarly useful to modern social movements informed by Gandhi’s achievements? In recent decades, a few intrepid psychologists have inaugurated systematic psychological studies of nonviolence.⁴ In addition, some outputs from modern psychology have been so powerful and flexible that we suggest they merit serious scrutiny and exploration of their practical value for preparing nonviolent campaigns and fostering cultures of nonviolence. In particular, we suggest that the modern psychological construct of *perceived efficacy*, more commonly called *self-efficacy*, merits attention as an aid for cultivating and organizing nonviolence.

Understanding and fostering perceived efficacy has been a major life work of Albert Bandura, the most influential and highly cited living modern psychologist.⁵ In Bandura’s language, self-efficacy refers to an individual’s judgment of his or her “capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances”.⁶ A person’s perceived self-efficacy varies between skill areas, such as the ability to do algebra, drive a car, manage an illness, empathically sense another’s feelings, or respond nonviolently when provoked. People low in one skill area may be high in others.

As developed by the global community of human service professionals over the past 40 years, dozens if not hundreds of self-efficacy scales now exist to measure individual efficacy perceptions in domains of human functioning ranging from education, health promotion, and athletics to organizational management.⁷ Some scales measure facets of a subtype of self-efficacy called *self-regulatory efficacy*, the ability to control one’s own behaviour – such as by regularly adhering to a programme of physical exercise. Importantly, efficacy perceptions are also held by groups, ranging from families and neighbourhoods to organizations and nations. Group-level efficacy perceptions, termed *collective efficacy*, have been found to predict outcomes such as lower crime rates in city neighbourhoods.⁸

The present paper applies perceived efficacy approaches to skills in Gandhian nonviolence. We first review major features of the self-efficacy approach, an approach that may be unfamiliar to most

Gandhian scholars. We emphasize its robust empirical basis as well as the constructive dynamics of its practical application. Understanding these fundamentals will illuminate both the feasibility and potential power of self-efficacy approaches for nonviolence. Next, we begin application to nonviolence by analysing three clusters of skills that comprise Gandhian nonviolence, and generating corresponding perceived efficacy scale items. Finally, we discuss implications and future directions, both scholarly and applied, offering examples from health promotion and other fields. We suggest that the self-efficacy approach could help depolarize and reconcile Gandhian principle-focused approaches with more policy-based approaches to nonviolence.

Self-Efficacy Approaches: Empirical Bases and Dynamics

Decades of empirical and theoretical research by psychologists have identified major sources of efficacy perceptions as well as primary pathways through which efficacy perceptions influence other outcomes of interest – most notably, a group or individual agent’s skill in performing a focal activity of interest. Bandura’s empirically well-supported work has exerted a formative influence on the psychology of perceived efficacy, whose major features are summarized in Table 1. According to Bandura, efficacy beliefs, “whether accurate or faulty”,⁹ are based on four principal sources of information: performance attainments, vicarious experiences of observing the performances of others, social persuasion, and physiological and affective states. When available, performance attainments, sometimes called mastery experiences, are the most effective way of developing a strong and resilient sense of efficacy. Successful performance leads people to believe in their capabilities in a given skill domain. Their beliefs in their capabilities will be more resilient if they have overcome obstacles through perseverance, and have learned to manage failures so that they are informative rather than demoralizing.

Observing other people is a second key source of efficacy beliefs. Competent models convey knowledge, skills, and strategies for managing task demands, and can foster motivation. Seeing perseverance lead to success by others, especially others similar to themselves, can raise observers’ beliefs in their own abilities. Social persuasion can also foster efficacy beliefs, especially by credible persuaders who are knowledgeable and practice what they preach. Finally, perceptions of feelings and physiological states can shape efficacy beliefs. For example, people read tension, anxiety and weariness as signs of personal deficiencies, and are more inclined to

Table 1: Major Features of the Psychology of Perceived Efficacy^a

Feature	Explanation
History ^a	“Self-efficacy” emerged in the research literature in 1977, the year Albert Bandura published an influential article on self-efficacy as a “unifying theory of behavioural change” ^b
Definition	<p>Perceived efficacy may be defined as a person or group’s judgment of their own “capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-efficacy refers to an individual’s perceptions of his/her own capacity; • Collective efficacy refers to a group’s collective perceptions of its own capacity
Measurement	Perceived efficacy items ask about capabilities. Typical items begin “how confident are you that you can...” and are measured on a scale from <i>cannot do at all</i> to <i>certain can do</i> (See Table 2)
Scale development	Each skill domain requires a separate measurement instrument. For a given skill, perceived efficacy may be measured with a single item but is more commonly measured with a summed scale. Scales are developed through conceptual analysis and expert knowledge of what is required for success in the domain
Sources of efficacy beliefs	Major sources of peoples’ efficacy perceptions include experiences of personal accomplishment (sometimes called mastery experiences), observing accomplishments of others (especially those deemed similar to oneself), social persuasion, and experiences of one’s own emotions and feelings
Impact of efficacy beliefs	Beliefs that one is capable of a particular skill tend to correlate positively with objective measures of performance. Perceptions of higher efficacy can cause improved performance through several processes that include greater persistence, optimism, and emotional equanimity

Feature	Explanation
Synergies from employing self-efficacy approaches	Self-efficacy approaches, when adopted in a particular field such as health behaviour change, have often fostered more effective training programmes for skill acquisition. In particular, self-efficacy approaches can foster constructive feedback loops between theories of the required skills, methods of teaching those skills, and tools for measuring perceived efficacy

^aThe *psychology of self-efficacy* is perhaps the most recognizable name for the field of perceived efficacy. Since 1986, Bandura has called his influential variant of self-efficacy theory by the name *social cognitive theory*. In the 1970s, self-efficacy research emerged as part of *social learning theory*. The psychology of perceived efficacy encompasses perceptions at both the individual level (self-efficacy) and collective level (collective efficacy). However, self-efficacy theory has little historical connection with influential Parsonian theories of agency in sociology.

^bAlbert Bandura, "Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change", *Psychological Review*, 84, 2 (1977), pp. 191-215.

expect success when they are not beset by aversive arousal that may undermine performance. Decades of research have documented that many facets of self-efficacy can be raised by effective programmes in education, healthcare, athletics, and many other fields of human functioning.

Efficacy perceptions, in turn, affect major outcomes of interest through a variety of pathways (also called "mediating processes") related to how people think and feel, and what motivates them. Such processes "usually operate in concert, rather than in isolation".¹⁰ For example, self-efficacy perceptions may strongly influence a person's motivation to undertake activities and persevere in the face of difficulties, tendency to think optimistically versus pessimistically, and ability to manage aversive emotions and interpret relevant events as benign versus emotionally perturbing.¹¹ Through such pathways, efficacy perceptions may influence a person's acquisition of specific skills as well as his/her overall life-choices and life-trajectory.

Importantly, when self-efficacy approaches are applied to a particular skill domain, they can catalyse several beneficial spirals and feedback loops that enable people in diverse roles to apply their existing competencies more effectively. Developing a self-report scale to measure the level of perceived self-efficacy is typically an initial step for applying Bandura's approach to a particular skill domain.¹²

Different items are developed to assess different aspects of the skill. For example, a scale to assess self-efficacy for driving an automobile might contain items such as:

- How confident are you that you can drive safely on a residential street?
- How confident are you that you can drive safely in rush hour traffic?
- How confident are you that you can drive safely on a freeway?

According to Bandura,¹³ the list of items on a perceived efficacy scale should offer reasonable coverage of the skill domain – thus, for North Americans, items for automobile driving should address both street driving and freeway driving. To assemble such items, Bandura suggests that “researchers must draw on conceptual analysis and expert knowledge of what it takes to succeed in a given pursuit”.¹⁴ He also provides suggestions for such issues as breadth of items, incorporation of obstacles into items, and response scales. Much evidence suggests that responses to self-efficacy assessments are uninfluenced by socially desirable responding.¹⁵ Many self-efficacy scales yield a single overall score produced by summing individual item responses. The possible range for a self-efficacy summary score or item response is typically coded from a low of *cannot do at all* to a high of *certain can do*. Some self-efficacy scales also have coherent subscales, such as subscales for urban and rural driving.

Because it requires input from experts, the process of constructing a self-efficacy scale requires researchers to clarify their ideas about the nature of the skill domain. Sometimes the views of different experts must be reconciled or balanced, a process that may lead to better mutual understanding among experts. Insights from scale construction may help clarify the goals and desirable content of training programmes to raise skill levels. When a self-efficacy scale is administered to trainees or other groups, it yields information about the personal characteristics of people with higher and lower levels of self-efficacy for each relevant subskill. Self-efficacy scores can be compared with more objective measures of performance, with which they are almost always strongly correlated.¹⁶

Importantly, pre-to-post change data from brief or prolonged training regimens can shed light on whether participants have experienced gains in self-perceived skills. Scales also facilitate comparing the impacts of different training methods, thereby encouraging further refinements. For example, researchers have used self-efficacy scales to compare between three methods of teaching medical consultation (traditional, autonomous, online), and between

two methods of teaching computer skills (video, tutorial).¹⁷ Innovations in training may in turn clarify the nature of the needed skills, or suggest improved measures of self-efficacy. Thus, over time, the perceived efficacy approach builds on pre-existing expert knowledge, yet facilitates additional mutually synergistic progress in theory, measurement, and training. Such progress is greatly needed in the field of nonviolence.

Skills for Gandhian Nonviolence: Three Clusters

What skills are needed for nonviolence? As many readers of *Gandhi Marg* are aware, there are diverse ways that the term “nonviolence” has been defined, and each of these implies a somewhat different skill set. Here, we focus on Gandhi’s own approach, discussing three major clusters of required skills: 1) adhering to personal nonviolence, often called *ahimsa*, as a way of life, 2) actively participating in an offering of *satyagraha* to combat injustice, and 3) engaging in activities of constructive programme. These correspond to what Gene Sharp has characterized as the “three main parts” of a comprehensive programme of nonviolent social change, namely, “improvement of individuals in their own lives and ways of living,” “the practice of various forms of nonviolent action against specific social evils,” and “a constructive program to begin building a new social order even as the old one still exists”.¹⁸ Most existing measures of nonviolence have focused on personal *ahimsa*, so our approach substantially broadens the toolkit for measuring components of nonviolence most directly relevant to group action.¹⁹ Later, we discuss the relevance of these skill clusters to other forms of nonviolence, such as selective nonviolence, policy-based nonviolence, and government-facilitated transarmament.

For each cluster, we offer efficacy assessment items for skills needed by both individual and group actors, often called “agents” in self-efficacy theory. These three clusters arguably cover the most characteristic and distinctive features of Gandhian nonviolence.²⁰

For each cluster, we take texts by Gandhi as points of departure for characterizing major requisite skills. In some cases we also discuss common instrumental practices or *means* that an agent might use to cultivate each core cluster of skills in nonviolence. Yet, because Gandhi never claimed to be a systematic thinker, it is possible that other texts or actions by Gandhi might suggest alternative skill sets. Our analyses should therefore be viewed as preliminary and suggestive rather than definitive and comprehensive. Later, we discuss how activists and researchers can adopt our approach to their own situational needs. We also sketch a few ways that perceived efficacy scales, once

developed, might be used, such as to evaluate alternative training methods, or to evaluate a nonviolent group's readiness to function effectively if its leadership were arrested.

1) Skills for Ahimsa as a Way of Life

The very first step in non-violence is that we cultivate in our daily life, as between ourselves, truthfulness, humility, tolerance, loving kindness.... [I]t is not mere policy. Policies may and do change. Non-violence is an unchangeable creed.

– Gandhi, 1938²¹

According to Gandhi, a cornerstone of his nonviolent approach is the practice of ahimsa, a Sanskrit word often translated as “non-hurting,” also possessing rich positive connotations related to compassion and benevolent action. Ahimsa in thought, word, and deed was a creed that Gandhi wanted his close disciples, such as those living at his ashram, to embrace not as a mere slogan, but as an ideal that “you may not harbour an uncharitable thought even in connection with one who may consider himself to be your enemy.... Those who join the Ashram have to literally accept that meaning... It is an ideal which we have to reach.... if we are capable of doing so”.²² Yet Gandhi also held out ahimsa as an ideal to be pursued by the masses, stating that it is a “profound error” or indeed a “blasphemy to say that non-violence can only be practiced by individuals and never by nations which are composed of individuals”.²³

As an individual characteristic, ahimsa holds a number of similarities to character strengths, such as love and kindness, which have recently been catalogued and studied in the emerging field of *positive psychology*.²⁴ However, Gandhian ahimsa is clearly distinctive, and as noted earlier, many scholars have explicitly drawn on Gandhian philosophy to develop self-report measures of individual nonviolence.

From the point of view of Bandurian self-efficacy theory, such measures may offer valuable information that is related to efficacy perceptions. But none of them directly assesses self-efficacy, and such measures are correspondingly less likely to catalyse the assessment/theory/training synergies described earlier. A perceived efficacy scale for nonviolence must target capability, not values. An example item might be “I can refrain from verbally insulting a coworker, even when they have made a costly mistake” (see Table 2, item 1).

Table 2: Example Items to Assess Perceived Individual or Collective Efficacy for Skills Related to Gandhian Nonviolence

#	Agent ^a	Example Item (“How confident are you that..”)
<i>Ahimsa skills</i>		
1	I	...I can refrain from verbally insulting a coworker, even when they have made a costly mistake.
2	I	...I can consistently rely for my livelihood on an occupation that does not involve manufacturing or using weapons.
3	I	...I can live in an ecologically sustainable manner.
4	I	...I can minimize my consumption of products produced by exploiting labour.
5	I	...I can regularly choose to endure suffering myself rather than inflict harm on others.
6	I	...I can regularly recognize in my actions that maintaining my honour does not require retaliation.
7	I	...I can regularly recognize in my actions that maintaining my honour requires upholding the common welfare and my sacred responsibilities.
8	I/A	...I can refrain from mentally insulting a coworker, even when they have made a costly mistake.
9	I/A	...I can regularly engage in activities to develop fearlessness with regard to losing my wealth
10	G	...our group can continue to collectively refrain from violence, even if its main leaders were all arrested.
11	G	...our group can effectively support and motivate almost all its members to divest from businesses based on selling harmful products.
12	G	...our group can refrain from violence, even if provoked by agents of the opponent.
<i>Satyagraha skills</i>		
13	I	...I can act with trust toward an opponent who has previously deceived our group, if our group leaders declare that trust is appropriate.
14	I/A	...I can follow all jail rules, even when very physically demanding, except when they are intended to

- undermine my self-respect.
- 15 I/A ...I can endure blows without retaliating.
- 16 I/L ...as a group leader, I can refrain from prematurely launching a satyagraha campaign involving civil disobedience.
- 17 I/L ...as a group leader, even when members of my own family criticize me, I can maintain the level of purity of life that will give power to my words as a leader.
- 18 G ...our group can make adequate decisions for guiding the satyagraha campaign, even if all the main group leaders are arrested.
- 19^b G ...our group can effectively identify and implement methods to reduce grounds for its members to capitulate to the threats of the opponent group.
- Constructive Programme skills
- 20 I ...I can regularly remember, when engaged in constructive programme activities, that I should be open to learning from people who differ from me in age, ethnicity, economic status, or gender.
- 21 I/L ...as a group leader, I can develop a constructive programme that will help create the social changes we seek, as well as provide on-going opportunities for training our group members in nonviolent character strengths.
- 22 I/L ...as a group leader, I can develop a constructive programme that enacts the principle of trusteeship in ways that are appropriate to our cultural and political context.
- 23 G ...our group can enact a constructive programme that will contribute to the social changes we seek, and also provide on-going opportunities for training our group members in nonviolent character strengths.
- 24 G ...our group, through its collective wisdom and leaders, can enact a constructive programme that will contribute to our group's solidarity during times of struggle.
- 25 G ...our group can enact a constructive programme that is well-managed in its details.
- 26 G ...our group can effectively discern when a new
-

constructive programme is necessary to augment pre-existing constructive efforts.

Spiritual skills

- 27 G ...our group can support our members' engagement with courage-enhancing spiritual practices in ways that respect cultural diversity.

Notes. In Bandura's approach, responses are typically given on a scale from 0 (*cannot do at all*) to 50 (*moderately certain can do*) to 100 (*certain can do*).

^aItems especially appropriate for self-efficacy among all individuals in the movement (I), individuals actively engaging in challenging movement work (I/A), individual leaders of the movement (I/L), or for holistically assessing collective efficacy of the group (G).

^bSuggested by analyses by Gene Sharp.

Both Gandhi's nonviolent approach, and the logic of nonviolence as a technique of struggle, require that leaders should assimilate nonviolence to a greater depth than ordinary movement members. Self-efficacy items pertaining to physical and verbal ahimsa (e.g., Table 2, item 1) may be relevant to everyone, including the general population. Yet for many purposes, there may be value in more demanding items of heightened relevance to leaders or leaders-in-the-making, such as items related to ahimsa *in thought* (e.g., Table 2, item 8).

In addition to nonviolence in interpersonal interactions, Gandhian ahimsa requires ethical lifestyle choices, such as choosing an occupation that is not founded on violence. Gandhi wrote that "whoever believes in ahimsa will engage himself in occupations that involve the least possible violence.... he will not engage in war or war preparations... [or] exploitation or envy of others."²⁵ More generally, "Ahimsa is the attribute of the soul, and therefore, to be practiced by everybody in all the affairs of life... in all departments".²⁶ Self-efficacy items can be constructed to address skills related to implementing this facet of ahimsa (see Table 2, item 2).

Means

How are individuals expected to *cultivate* ahimsa? Perceived self-efficacy for practices to cultivate ahimsa could be useful for leaders, planners, and individuals. Not surprisingly, the practices recommended for cultivating ahimsa have varied by level of commitment, with the

more demanding practices recommended especially for leaders and the most active movement members.²⁷ Two common themes are the cultivation of endurance, and the cultivation of fearlessness (as exemplified in Table 2, item 9). According to Gandhi,

The votary of non-violence has to cultivate the capacity for sacrifice of the highest type in order to be free from fear. He [reckons] not if he should lose his land, his wealth, his life. He who has not overcome all fear cannot practice ahimsa to perfection. This non-violence cannot be learnt by staying at home. It needs enterprise. In order to test ourselves we should learn to dare danger and death, mortify the flesh, and acquire the capacity to endure all manner of hardships.²⁸

Table 2 (item 5) shows an example item on sacrifice. Furthermore, following the Bhagavad Gita and other Hindu scriptures, Gandhi saw fearlessness as arising from non-attachment (e.g., item 9), a construct of emerging interest to psychologists.²⁹ Gandhi viewed spiritual practice and spiritual growth as a means to cultivate fearlessness, stating that “perfect fearlessness can be attained only by him who has realized the Supreme”.³⁰ More will be said about spirituality in a later section.

One important means of cultivating fearlessness is a correct understanding of honour. Gandhi advised giving up false honour,³¹ but repeatedly affirmed the importance of preserving self-respect and authentic honour.³² Gandhi regularly asserted and exemplified the belief that self-respect does not require retaliation. At a deep level, satyagrahis must abandon retaliation-based honour codes, and instead regard a sound foundation for honour as courageously but nonviolently defending one’s sacred responsibilities (e.g., for life of family or nation). Adhering to this view of honour (expressed in Table 2, items 6, 7) may require a deep personal transformation. A particularly dramatic instance of this on a wide scale occurred during the independence struggle in India’s northwest frontier, where more than 100,000 Muslim Pathans abandoned the principle of vengeance embedded in their hereditary cultural code of honour. They swore a vow of complete nonviolence, and maintained it in the face of some of the severest repression faced anywhere in India.³³

Collective Efficacy

Gandhi regarded collective nonviolence as a crucial condition of satyagraha. For example, it is well-known that Gandhi called off the national non-cooperation movement in 1922 after a mob killed almost two dozen police officers at Chauri Chaura. Thus, organizers of nonviolent social capacity must attend not only to individuals, but

also to a group's perceived *collective* efficacy for ahimsa. They might seek to assess a group's perception of its own ability to remain nonviolent if its leaders were arrested (Table 2, item 10), or a group's ability to divest all of its financial resources from businesses deemed violent (e.g., manufacture of weapons or of cigarettes) (Table 2, item 11). Evidence indicates that collective efficacy perceptions share many of the same determinants and effects as individual self-efficacy perceptions – in Bandura's words, the "sociocognitive determinants operate in much the same way at the collective level as they do at the individual level".³⁴

In the Bandurian approach, collective efficacy assessments are computed by aggregating individual appraisals of either a) the group's capability as a whole (holistic assessment), or b) the individual's personal capacity for the specific functions that he or she performs in the group (functional aggregation). These yield alternative measures that are often correlated. Which measure is preferable depends on the nature of the group skill being assessed. For example, in sports, the accomplishment of a gymnastics team is the sum of each individual gymnast's outcomes, suggesting the appropriateness of functional aggregation. In contrast, the accomplishment of a football or soccer team is the result of players working closely together, and the breakdown of any subsystem can potentially produce "disastrous effects" on group performance.³⁵ Thus, holistic assessment will likely be the better predictor of a football team's performance.

Likewise, the optimal approach to measuring perceived collective nonviolent efficacy may vary between facets. Many if not most nonviolent collective skills may require the absence of certain types of breakdowns. An example is the ability to maintain ahimsa when resisting violent provocation by an opponent. The 1922 mob violence mentioned earlier – which occurred in only one location in a vast country – represents just such a breakdown. Thus, holistic assessment may be most appropriate for assessing many facets of nonviolent collective efficacy perceptions (e.g., Table 2, item 12, discussed in the next section). However, some skills encompassed by nonviolence, such as the ability to live in an ecologically sustainable manner, may also be worthwhile to measure by functional aggregation (e.g., Table 2, items 3, 4).

2) Skills for Acting in Satyagraha

The term Satyagraha was coined by me in South Africa to express the force that the Indians there used.... Its root meaning is holding on to truth, hence truth-force.... But on the political field the struggle... mostly consists in opposing error in the shape of unjust laws.... Hence

Satyagraha largely appears to the public as Civil Disobedience or Civil Resistance.

– Gandhi, 1920³⁶

Satyagraha was the method developed by Gandhi for redressing injustices nonviolently by, in the words of Gene Sharp, “taking the initiative in active struggle”.³⁷ Satyagraha typically, but not always, involves some sort of group struggle.³⁸ In his lifetime, Gandhi described skills needed in a satyagraha campaign by individuals with varying degrees of responsibility. For Gandhi, all skill in satyagraha is rooted in the capacity to adhere to ahimsa. However, Gandhi often mentioned specific additional skills beyond ahimsa.³⁹ Thus, some satyagraha self-efficacy items will correspond to previously listed ahimsa items, whereas other items will be new. Importantly, the boundary between skills we discuss as “ahimsa” versus “satyagraha” is at times arbitrary, since many skills represent enactments of ahimsa in situations that seldom arise outside group conflict (e.g., Table 2, items 10, 12, 15).

A useful starting point for cataloguing individual satyagraha skills is Gandhi’s 1939 list of 7 “illustrative” qualifications of a satyagrahi. These qualifications included several types of faith (in nonviolence, human nature, truth, and God), as well as other characteristics related to self-regulation (does not consume intoxicants), and capacity for self-sacrifice (ready and willing to give up one’s life and possessions). The list also mentioned group-struggle-specific qualities, such as the willingness to obey “rules of discipline” that may be promulgated for satyagrahis by their leaders (analogous to military orders), as well as willingness to obey jail rules “unless they are specially devised to hurt his self-respect”.⁴⁰ Each listed satyagrahi qualification can be converted into one or more self-efficacy items. Many are similar to ahimsa items (e.g., Table 2, items 1, 6, 9). However, additional satyagrahi skills that pertain especially to group conflict situations – such as jail behaviours or the capacity to endure blows – generate clearly distinct self-efficacy items (e.g., Table 2, items 14, 15).

Beyond this illustrative list from 1939, Gandhi also enunciated the qualities of a satyagrahi on numerous other occasions. For example, Gandhi stated that because he or she is fearless and has an “implicit trust in human nature”, a satyagrahi is “never afraid of trusting the opponent... if the opponent plays him false twenty times, the Satyagrahi is ready to trust him the twenty-first time”⁴¹ (Table 2, item 13).

Often, Gandhi spoke of the requirements of satyagraha in an abstract way that applied to both individuals and groups. For example, in 1939 he offered as a general principle that satyagraha “excludes

every form of violence, direct or indirect, veiled or unveiled, and whether in thought, word or deed. It is breach of Satyagraha to wish ill to an opponent or to say a harsh word to him or of him with the intention of harming him."⁴² These imply group-level satyagraha skills that are almost indistinguishable from group-level ahimsa skills. But at times, the group conflict situation demands expressions of ahimsa that are distinctive and merit systematic attention (e.g., Table 2, item 12):

The first indispensable condition precedent to any civil resistance is that there should be surety against any outbreak of violence, whether on the part of those who are identified with civil resistance or on the part of the general public. It would be no answer in the case of an outbreak of violence that it was instigated by the State or other agencies hostile to civil resisters.⁴³

Satyagraha therefore requires wise leadership, so that campaigns are not launched prematurely or using inappropriate strategies or tactics. Discerning *boundary conditions* for civil disobedience is therefore a key satyagraha leadership skill (Table 2, item 16). Using a military analogy, Gandhi sometimes referred to the required strategic and tactical leadership as coming from a "Satyagrahi general [who] has to obey his inner voice, for over and above the situation outside, he examines himself constantly and listens to the dictates of the Inner Self".⁴⁴ And since he or she serves in the role of a commander, "There must be power in the word of a Satyagraha general – not the power that the possession of limitless arms gives, but the power that purity of life, strict vigilance, and ceaseless application produce".⁴⁵ These needs for leadership suggest additional items on the level of the group as well as on the individual (Table 2, item 17). In principle, satyagraha leadership could come from a consensus of leaders or all action group members, rather than from a single individual "general". Indeed, if the leaders in planning a satyagraha campaign have been arrested (or killed), the followers must rely on other sources of guidance, suggesting additional collective efficacy items (Table 2, item 18).

Importantly, Gandhi described satyagraha as a "science in the making".⁴⁶ Additional and alternative conceptions of skills for conducting various types of satyagraha might be developed from the experiences of other activists, or from analyses offered by scholars such as Gene Sharp. For example, Sharp argued that in a disobedience campaign,

The ability of the participants to face repression will be very significantly increased if they constantly feel that they are part of a much larger

movement which gives them, personally, support and strength to carry on.... This explains the role of regular mass meetings during strikes. During the Montgomery bus boycott, regular mass prayer meetings were held...⁴⁷

Sharp also suggested a variety of other group-level skills to promote effectiveness, such as generating incentives and reducing grounds for capitulation, suggesting additional items (Table 2, item 19). The relation between Sharp's approach and Gandhi's approach will be discussed at greater length in a later section.

3) Skills for Constructive Programme

Training for military revolt means learning the use of arms ending perhaps in the atomic bomb. For civil disobedience it means the Constructive Programme.

– Gandhi, 1945⁴⁸

A third commonly occurring component of Gandhi's approach is his constructive programme, which in the Indian independence struggle was "designed to build up the nation from the very bottom upward".⁴⁹ It included components such as the revival of village spinning industry, the removal of untouchability, uplift of the status of women, and the establishment of understanding ("communal unity") between the various religious and ethnic groups in India. A 1945 pamphlet by Gandhi listed 17 constructive programme points designed to meet India's needs. Although the precise composition of the programme changed over time, its central component of spinning, sometimes called its "central sun",⁵⁰ had been envisioned by Gandhi as early as 1908.⁵¹ In Gandhi's view, spinning, and the constructive programme in general, served both economic and social functions.

Spinning

has the greatest organizing power in it because it has itself to be organized and because it affects all India. If khaddar [village-spun cloth] rained from heaven it would be a calamity. But as it can only be manufactured by the willing co-operation of starving millions and thousands of middle class men and women, its success means the best organization conceivable along peaceful lines. If cooking had to be revived and required the same organization, I should claim for it the same merit that I claim for Khaddar.

– Gandhi, 1927⁵²

One overarching function of the constructive programme is therefore to stimulate or directly implement desired social and

economic changes in the larger society.

In addition, Gandhi saw a well-designed constructive programme as performing a second vital function: preparation for satyagraha. He advised participation in constructive programme as essential training for active service in satyagraha (see epigram), as it cultivated the appropriate benevolent and nonviolent state of mind:

I must continue to repeat, even though it may cause nausea, that prison-going without the backing of honest constructive effort and goodwill in the heart for the wrong-doer is violence and therefore forbidden in Satyagraha.⁵³

In sum, in the words of Gene Sharp, through implementing a constructive programme

new institutions and social patterns need not wait for the capture of State machinery: far better, they could be initiated immediately.... [Gandhi] believed it helped to train volunteers, to educate the masses, and was a necessary accompaniment to all nonviolent action struggles except in cases of a local specific common grievance.⁵⁴

Cultivating individual and collective perceived efficacy for constructive programme should thus be of interest to Gandhi-inspired leaders adhering to principled nonviolence, as well as those emphasizing nonviolence as a policy (Table 2, items 21, 23, 24). According to self-efficacy theory, low self-efficacy could impede engagement in a constructive programme. And low efficacy seems a real possibility for some components of constructive programme. For example, a worker might have low efficacy for engaging in facets of constructive programme that involve reforming entrenched social patterns related to caste, class, ethnicity, or gender. Such work may require personally difficult changes to long-standing personal habits (Table 2, item 20). Yet such changes may be integral to growth in ahimsa towards all people. Thus, self-efficacy gains for many facets of constructive programme may often be closely intertwined with growth in ahimsa. Similarly, self-efficacy gains for technical facets of a constructive programme, such as using a spinning wheel, may be accompanied by new human relationships that span castes and classes.

One of the most challenging aspects of constructive programme is discerning what should be its proper *content*. Identifying the high and low priority content of constructive programme may be viewed as a group-level skill that in India's case was often delegated to Gandhi, sometimes at his insistence. Assessments of collective self-efficacy for enacting an appropriate constructive programme could include items

that address one or more programme functions, such as the moral and mental training of satyagrahis, the promotion of solidarity within the action group or society, or the establishment of parallel institutions to partly or wholly replace oppressive institutions (see Table 2, item 24). The day-to-day management of constructive programme also requires much skill. For example, “habitual *khadi*-wearer and spinner”⁵⁵ was listed by Gandhi as one of 7 qualities for a satyagrahi. But how should the phrase “habitual” be operationally translated into practice (Table 2, item 25)?

Formulating a constructive programme also requires separating the constructive programme itself from allied principles that are offered as a *means* for enacting the programme. For example, one point in Gandhi’s Constructive Programme, entitled “Economic Equality”, was aimed at “abolishing the eternal conflict between capital and labour”, “levelling down of the few rich”, and “levelling up of the semi-starved naked millions”.⁵⁶ In enunciating this point, Gandhi offered his “doctrine of trusteeship”⁵⁷ as a means to promote economic equality. According to this doctrine, “those who own money now, are asked to behave like trustees holding their riches on behalf of the poor”.⁵⁸ “We have moneyed [Indian National] Congressmen in the organization”, Gandhi wrote in the *Constructive Programme*, and “They have to lead the way.... Every Congressman has to ask himself what he has done towards the attainment of economic equality”.⁵⁹ Gandhi regarded such an attitude of trusteeship, sometimes called stewardship, as emerging from “true religion”.⁶⁰ Yet trusteeship was only one of a variety of principles that Gandhi enunciated to guide movement work, including equitable distribution, non-possession, bread labour (universal sharing of physical labour), and swadeshi (using and serving that which is local, e.g., not imported). Most of these principles were not explicitly mentioned in Gandhi’s *Constructive Programme*.⁶¹ Arguably, the relevance of each principle to future constructive programmes must depend on local issues and circumstances. The degree and manner to best include each principle in a future constructive programme is thus an important discernment skill (e.g., Table 2, item 22).

An important issue is whether or not a particular nonviolent campaign requires the complement of a constructive programme, and if so, how the campaign and programme should be linked. For example, does the campaign for worldwide ecological sustainability require a constructive programme, or can civil disobedience be conducted against polluting industries regardless of the existence of such a programme? If a constructive programme is required – for example, to develop green energy – then are existing green energy

efforts adequate to perform the variety of functions served by a constructive programme? Such considerations suggest additional dimensions of collective efficacy (Table 2, item 26).

Role of Spirituality

[W]hen my courage had all but gone.... I bowed over the kitchen table and prayed aloud.... I experienced the presence of the Divine as I had never experienced Him before.... an inner voice saying: "Stand up for righteousness, stand up for truth; and God will be at your side forever"... My uncertainty disappeared. I was ready to face anything.

– Martin Luther King, 1958⁶²

Gandhi often referred to spiritual and religious qualities as a necessary element of his approach to nonviolent resistance. For example, as noted earlier, Gandhi declared that perfect nonviolence (perfect ahimsa) requires fearlessness, which in turn requires God-realization. Gandhi at times listed faith in God as a qualification for a satyagrahi. Other nonviolent leaders such as Martin Luther King (epigraph) have also attested to drawing courage from faith. Should, therefore, the capacity to believe in God be assessed in scales for perceived efficacy for Gandhian nonviolence? In this section we address this and other religious and spiritual issues in applying self-efficacy approaches to Gandhian nonviolence.

First, should nonviolent perceived efficacy scales incorporate items assessing perceived efficacy for faith or spiritual practices? We argue that the answer depends on how the scales will be used, and especially the cultural beliefs held by the respondents (i.e., the target population). In modernized cultural contexts, we suggest that there may be advantages to assessing spiritual efficacy items in ways that make very clear the rationale for their inclusion, in order to prevent potentially divisive misunderstandings. Indeed, Jonathan Schell pointed out that "Gandhi's asceticism... which he regarded as essential to the practice of satyagraha, seems unlikely to serve as a model for very many", and Schell suggested that the crucial questions are "what it is about religious faith that enables it to serve as a foundation for nonviolence and whether, outside religion, there may be other foundations".⁶³

Gandhi's assertions about the necessity of faith and realization flowed from his view of the *psychology of fearlessness*. Gandhi's psychology of fearlessness corresponds to the perennial spiritual view⁶⁴ that "the moment one has a glimpse of the Imperishable [living presence of God within], one sheds the love of the perishable body".⁶⁵ Yet, while Gandhi often used orthodox religious language, he

respected the diversity of individual pathways. At times, he explained in functional terms that “what I mean by religion [is] the religion which... changes one’s very nature, which binds one indissolubly to the truth within and which ever purifies”.⁶⁶ Gandhi repeatedly affirmed the validity of all major religious traditions,⁶⁷ and could be open to atheism⁶⁸ when he saw it producing equivalent fruit in daily character and conduct.⁶⁹

Huxley has articulated the underlying logic of the traditional view of divine love as the source of fearlessness:

Fear cannot be got rid of by personal effort, but only by the ego’s absorption in a cause greater than its own interests. Absorption in any cause will rid the mind of some of its fears; but only absorption in the loving and knowing of the divine Ground can rid it of all fear. For when the cause is less than the highest, the sense of fear and anxiety is transferred from the self to the cause as when heroic self-sacrifice for a loved individual or institution is accompanied by anxiety in regard to that for which the sacrifice is made. Whereas if the sacrifice is made for God, and for others for God’s sake, there can be no fear or abiding anxiety, since nothing can be a menace to the divine Ground and even failure and disaster are to be accepted as being in accord with the divine will.⁷⁰

Perfect fearlessness through God-realization is the ideal set out by Gandhi, but most traditions regard it as rarely attainable in practice. Thus, Gandhi says that “one can always progress towards this goal [of fearlessness] by determined and constant endeavour and by increasing confidence in oneself”.⁷¹ If the perennial spiritual perspective is correct, then fearlessness may be progressively cultivated through spiritual disciplines such as selfless service, meditation, and repetition of a mantram or holy name,⁷² practices existing in analogous forms in all major religious traditions.⁷³ Indeed, empirical studies have documented that these spiritual practices can reduce fear.⁷⁴ Yet in the context of a nonviolent movement, attempts to propagate or assess perceived efficacy for spiritual practices should proceed cautiously, taking into account both individual and cultural diversity. It might be helpful to conceptualize such sensitivity to diversity as a component of collective nonviolent efficacy (see Table 2, item 27).

Gandhi’s view that self-efficacy (“self-confidence”) is related to fearlessness is consistent with the *psychology of courage*, a subfield of modern positive psychology. This recently emerging subfield offers a variety of useful concepts, such as distinctions between physical, moral, and psychological courage. Its literature embraces self-efficacy theory, and many of its concepts appear applicable to training for

Gandhian nonviolence. However, few if any of its empirical studies have investigated courage in the context of nonviolent struggle. Until such studies are available, application to nonviolence will require extrapolation beyond the field's limited empirical base.⁷⁵ Furthermore, the modern empirical psychology of courage has largely neglected the role of religious and spiritual factors, although studies do suggest that religious worldviews can offer some protection against the fear of death.⁷⁶

Yet for Gandhi, religion played many roles beyond being a crucial source of fearlessness. It also permeated a significant part of his thinking and communication. At times Gandhi appeared to attribute almost all causal agency to God. For example, Gandhi professed to "know that I have no other recourse as a satyagrahi than the assistance of God in every conceivable difficulty,"⁷⁷ and that God had "saved me often against myself and left me not a vestige of independence".⁷⁸ Does this bring Gandhi's thinking into conflict with scientific approaches, such as self-efficacy theory, which have emerged in largely secular contexts?

In fact, self-efficacy theory is flexibly adaptable to a variety of worldviews, including theistic belief systems. In particular, self-efficacy theory recognizes that people may view their agency in some areas as wholly or partially reliant upon the efforts of one or more third parties, who are called *proxy agents*. Proxy agency is a pervasive feature of everyday life, as marital partners turn to their spouses, supervisors turn to subordinates, and children turn to parents to get what they want.⁷⁹ Consequently, self-efficacy theory recognizes proxy agency – the ability to act through proxy agents – as a third "mode" of agency, alongside collective and unmediated individual agency. Bandura explains that

Successful functioning requires an agentic blend of these different modes of agency. The relative contribution of individual, proxy, and collective modes to the agentic mix may vary cross-culturally. But all of these agentic modes need to be enlisted to make it through the day, regardless of the culture in which one happens to reside. People's efforts to manage their everyday lives cannot be reduced to polarities that arbitrarily partition human agency into individual and collective forms.⁸⁰

For conceptualizing the influence of spirituality, an important subtype of proxy agency is *divine proxy agency*, which occurs when people turn to a divine being for help.⁸¹ Bandura argued that "if divine agency is viewed as a guiding supportive partnership requiring one to exercise influence over events in one's life [such] partnered proxy agency can serve as an enabling belief that strengthens a sense of

personal efficacy".⁸² Thus, for a variety of reasons, self-efficacy theory can be viewed as methodologically "agnostic",⁸³ and compatible with Gandhian nonviolence and other skill sets conceived as reliant upon diverse mixtures of social proxy influence, divine proxy influence, and direct personal influence.⁸⁴

Discussion

In the previous sections, we reviewed major skills for nonviolence as described by Gandhi himself, mapping these skills onto preliminary items for perceived efficacy assessment of both individuals and groups. The resulting set of questions (Table 2) is suggestive rather than definitive: It shows the logic of applying self-efficacy theory to nonviolence, and could be expanded and refined for application to particular cultural, social, and political contexts. To our knowledge, the present paper is the first systematic application to nonviolence⁸⁵ of Bandura's self-efficacy framework, one of the most influential and practical psychological approaches of the past century. The present investigation contributes to several psychology subfields, including the psychologies of nonviolence, perceived efficacy, and courage. It suggests a range of future directions for research and practice that we now describe.

Implications for Activism

First, we hope that these findings may prove useful for activists for peace, justice, health, and global human and environmental well-being. The value of the self-efficacy approach to nonviolence for each socio-political application can ultimately only be discovered through experimentation. However, the track record of the self-efficacy approach across numerous other domains of human functioning gives solid grounds for hope. Applying the self-efficacy approach in particular contexts will require steps that include

- Identifying nonviolent skill dimensions that are relevant to the particular context and application;
- Augmenting the "starter" items in Table 2 to ensure adequate and balanced coverage of the skill dimensions of interest;
- Adapting items, especially abstract items, to the culture and circumstances of the target population using input through methods such as "interviews, open-ended surveys, and structured questionnaires to identify the levels of challenge and impediment".⁸⁶ For example in item 5 (Table 2), supplementary items could replace the phrase "endure suffering" with a concrete form of suffering relevant to the specific context.

Activists could employ perceived efficacy scales for purposes that include

- Evaluating the effectiveness of training programmes in nonviolent skills for prospective nonviolent protesters (e.g., pretest and posttest using questions such as Table 2, items 1-8, 13-15, and perhaps 9);
- Assessing an action group's collective preparedness to maintain nonviolent discipline in the face of violent opposition, thereby harnessing "political jiu-jitsu" (see discussion below) (e.g., movement group aggregated survey using questions such as Table 2, items 10, 12);
- Assessing or fostering within-group dialogue about a nonviolent group's ability to persist in action after its leaders are arrested (e.g., Table 2, items 10, 18);
- Aiding group leadership in evaluating the effectiveness of an evolving constructive programme (e.g., Table 2, items 22-26);
- Applying *new social media* to nonviolent struggle, such as by integrating survey items and algorithms for their scoring and aggregation into new media, such as an already-existing iPod app that has been developed to support and implement Sharp's approaches to nonviolent struggle.⁸⁷

One particular application where scales based on Table 2 might be useful is for addressing the socio-political basis of human health. Evidence indicates that public health is adversely affected by social injustices that range from social inequality⁸⁸ to environmental injustice⁸⁹ to the capture by vested interests of government agencies for health-related purposes such as the provision of healthcare, the regulation of medicines, or general consumer protection.⁹⁰ In recent decades, mass movements have attempted to address health-related injustices ranging from neighbourhood pollution⁹¹ to tobacco advertising⁹² to access to food⁹³ and medicines,⁹⁴ and have been advocated in other situations, such as ensuring adequate medical care for the uninsured.⁹⁵ Many of these movements have not attained complete success. Gandhian self-efficacy perspectives should be explored for methods to refine and improve future campaigns. For example, organizers of campaigns against neighbourhood environmental toxins might refine their strategies and tactics with the assistance of self-efficacy surveys.

Implications for General Education

A second question of general interest is how skill in wielding nonviolent power for positive ends could become more broadly disseminated in societies around the world. From a Gandhian perspective, an appropriate constructive programme is usually a crucial foundation.

Space does not permit a full discussion of the necessary and desirable contents of constructive programmes in various settings. However, one plausible component is often the *better integration of the teaching of nonviolent skills into mass education*. In particular, we suggest that the self-efficacy approach outlined in this paper could in several ways facilitate such educational integration. For example, multidimensional self-efficacy scales could be used to gauge the impact of particular educational initiatives, as well as individual needs and progress in learning nonviolence and satyagraha. Similarly, collective nonviolent efficacy assessments could be used to evaluate the readiness or most pressing skill gaps for groups considering campaigns.

Psychology of Courage: A Fruitful Interchange?

Third, concepts from the emerging psychology of courage should be explored for their usefulness to nonviolence. Researchers have distinguished between physical, moral, and psychological courage, each of which is relevant to Gandhian nonviolence in different ways. Lester and his colleagues have highlighted Bandura's self-efficacy theory and the key learning processes it identifies – such as mastery experiences, vicarious learning, and social persuasion – as useful guidance for fostering courage.⁹⁶ A self-efficacy-based approach converges with Gandhi's view that "one can always progress towards this goal [of perfect fearlessness] by determined and constant endeavour and by increasing confidence in oneself".⁹⁷ Lester's team also suggests fostering courage through processes such as inspirational motivation that have been identified by research on transformational leadership, a type of leadership clearly exemplified by Gandhi.

The emerging psychology of courage suggests that in some cases anger may facilitate courage "when the target of the anger is the true opponent... [but] when the anger is misdirected... resisting the urge to act on this emotion may be what courage requires".⁹⁸ Perhaps the psychology of courage can eventually help to clarify and apply Gandhi's claim that he had "learnt through bitter experience the one supreme lesson to conserve my anger, and as heat conserved is transmuted into energy, even so our anger controlled can be transmuted into a power which can move the world".⁹⁹ Further progress in the psychology of courage might also clarify the relation between the requirements of various types of nonviolent action, and spirituality as a pathway to fearlessness.

Implications for non-Gandhian forms of Nonviolence

Finally, we suggest that a self-efficacy approach holds implications not only for Gandhian nonviolence, but for other methods of policy-

based as well as principled nonviolence.¹⁰⁰ Gene Sharp's scholarship has greatly advanced the social scientific understanding of the dynamics of nonviolent action pursued as a policy.¹⁰¹ Sharp's short book *From Dictatorship to Democracy* (1994) has also gone "viral" among resistance movements worldwide and has been translated into more than 30 languages, perhaps because it offered a potent collection of ideas for raising collective nonviolent efficacy.¹⁰² Notwithstanding the on-going philosophical disagreements between adherents to various forms of nonviolence, there is considerable overlap in the skill sets that are required. Thus, many perceived efficacy assessment items may be relevant to multiple types of nonviolence. Such items represent tools for finding and acting upon common ground,¹⁰³ as well as for encouraging policy-based group nonviolence in settings where it is the only feasible alternative to violence. For example, perceived efficacy assessments could play a key role in institutionally managing the progressive integration of nonviolent sanctions into national defence, a process sometimes called "transarmament".¹⁰⁴

More broadly, we hope that perceived efficacy approaches might help depolarize tensions between those adhering to policy-based versus principled approaches to nonviolence. Sharp's social scientific analyses clearly document the importance to nonviolence of what he calls "political jiu-jitsu", a process distinctive to nonviolence¹⁰⁵ whereby an opponent's violence rebounds against him, throwing him "off balance politically",¹⁰⁶ and resulting in far greater gains for the nonviolent group than if it had met violence with violence.¹⁰⁷ The basis for catalysing such political jiu-jitsu is the nonviolent group's capacity to adhere to collective nonviolent discipline (e.g., Table 2, items 10, 12). How is the capacity for such discipline to be cultivated and assessed over time? This issue, often far from resolved in practice, is of paramount practical importance. By focusing collective attention on the *practical* task of cultivating collective skills, self-efficacy approaches could lead to factional depolarization and to positive synergies between theory and practice of nonviolence, as they have in so many other domains of human endeavour.

Survey Invitation

To begin exploring and testing the nonviolent efficacy approach outlined in the paper, we hereby invite readers of this article and their associates and acquaintances to complete a linked survey. This anonymous online survey focuses on nonviolent efficacy perceptions and their relation to each other as well as variables ranging from individual demographics to group objectives and nonviolent philosophy. Readers are also encouraged to invite their friends and

acquaintances to complete the survey, which we expect to leave open at least until July 2014. Those who complete the survey will have an opportunity to register to be notified when findings become available. We hope to publish a follow-up report in this journal or elsewhere that describes patterns of respondents' nonviolent efficacy perceptions. Please visit the survey online at <http://NonviolentEfficacy.org>.

Conclusions

This paper has proposed the application of self-efficacy theory to nonviolence, sketching the requisite first steps and plausible outcomes, including enhanced effectiveness in nonviolent conduct (ahimsa), constructive programme, and satyagraha. We do not know how Gandhi would have viewed using questionnaires as a method for organizing and learning.¹⁰⁸ Perhaps he would have regarded using questionnaires as a transitional tool that would no longer be necessary once the truths of nonviolence had been fully culturally assimilated. What we can say is that Gandhi was a life-long innovator across many fields of human activity. Martin Luther King identified Gandhi as "probably the first person in history to lift the love ethic of Jesus above mere interaction between individuals to a powerful and effective social force on a large scale".¹⁰⁹ We hope that the ideas presented here may assist anyone seeking to follow in Gandhi's innovative footsteps.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is grateful to Tim Flinders, S. Leonard Syme, the issue editor, and to an anonymous referee for helpful comments on earlier versions of this manuscript.

Notes and References

1. M. K. Gandhi, R. K. Prabhu, et al., *The mind of Mahatma Gandhi* (Ahmedabad, India: Navajivan, 1967), pp. 13-14 (originally *Harijan*, 3 October 1936; dates hereafter abbreviated 3-10-1936).
2. J. Robert Oppenheimer, *Science and the common understanding* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1954), p. 96 (based on the 1953 Reith lectures).
3. *Mind*, p. 23 (*Young India*, 11-8-1920).
4. See Vinod K. Kool, *Nonviolence: Social and psychological issues*, 1993, and Daniel M. Mayton, *Nonviolence and peace psychology: Intrapersonal, interpersonal, societal and world peace* (New York: Springer, 2009).
5. Albert Bandura, "Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change", *Psychological Review*, 84, 2 (1977), pp. 191-215,

- Albert Bandura, *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control* (New York: W. H. Freeman, 1997); for rating of Bandura as most eminent living psychologist, see Steven J. Haggblom, Renee Warnick, et al., "The 100 most eminent psychologists of the 20th century", *Review of General Psychology*, 6, 2 (2002), pp. 139-152.
6. Albert Bandura, *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1986), p. 391.
 7. *Self-efficacy* and Albert Bandura, "Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales", in F. Pajares & T. C. Urdan, eds., *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents* (Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, 2006), pp. 307-337.
 8. R. J. Sampson, S. W. Raudenbush, et al., "Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy", *Science*, 277, 5328 (1997), pp. 918-924.
 9. *Social foundations*, p. 399.
 10. *Self-efficacy*, p. 116.
 11. *Ibid.*
 12. Bandura, "Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales".
 13. *Self-efficacy* and Bandura, "Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales".
 14. *Self-efficacy*, p. 43.
 15. In *Self-efficacy*, p. 46, Bandura cites evidence that self-efficacy judgments are uninfluenced "by a responding bias to appear socially desirable, regardless of whether the domain of activity involves sexual behavior, alcohol consumption, smoking, dietary practices, or self-management of diabetes". Nor do standard perceived efficacy assessment methods incorporate reverse-coded items for addressing acquiescent responding biases. Whether or not freedom from socially desirable responding generalises to perceived nonviolent efficacy is a question that will benefit from empirical investigation.
 16. *Ibid.*
 17. See Leen Aper, Jan Reniers, et al., "Impact of three alternative consultation training formats on self-efficacy and consultation skills of medical students", *Medical Teacher*, 34, 7 (2012), pp. e500-e507 (who reported that alternative methods each possessed advantages); Marilyn E. Gist, Catherine Schwoerer, et al., "Effects of alternative training methods on self-efficacy and performance in computer software training", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 6 (1989), pp. 884-891.
 18. Gene Sharp, *Gandhi as a political strategist* (Boston, MA: Porter Sargent, 1979), p. 81.
 19. See reviews of existing nonviolence measures in Vinod K. Kool, *Psychology of nonviolence and aggression* (Basingstoke [England] ; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008) and *Nonviolence and peace psychology: Intrapersonal, interpersonal, societal and world peace*; many measures were designed for adolescent populations. A 7-item self-efficacy scale for coping responses by teens that reflected a self-perceived ability "to control anger and resolve potential conflicts in

- nonviolent ways” was also recently published, but makes no reference to Gandhian philosophy (Albert D. Farrell, David B. Henry, et al., “Normative beliefs and self-efficacy for nonviolence as moderators of peer, school, and parental risk factors for aggression in early adolescence”, *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 39, 6 (2010), pp. 800-813 (cited p. 805)). For attempts to address group-action dimensions of nonviolence, see the non-Gandhian but conceptually related Just Peacemaking Inventory (Steve Brown, Kevin S. Reimer, et al., “A particular peace: Psychometric properties of the just peacemaking inventory”, *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 14, 1 (2008), pp. 75-92).
20. See *Political strategist*, pp. 220-221.
 21. *Mind*, p. 114.
 22. From speech on ashram vows at Madras YMCA on February 16, 1916. Quoted in Joan V. Bondurant, *Conquest of violence: The Gandhian philosophy of conflict* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1965), pp. 25-26, and in Mohandas K. Gandhi & Indian Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, *The collected works of Mahatma Gandhi (electronic book)* (New Delhi: Publications Division Government of India, 1999), pp. 168-169, v. 115.
 23. *Mind*, pp. 114, 128.
 24. Christopher Peterson & Martin E. P. Seligman, *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification* (Washington, DC and New York: American Psychological Association and Oxford University Press, 2004). Mayton writes that “The notion of a profile that encompasses the qualities of the typical peaceful person fits nicely into the framework of the fairly new field of positive psychology” (*Nonviolence and peace psychology: Intrapersonal, interpersonal, societal and world peace*, p. 68).
 25. *Mind*, p. 265 (*Harijan*, 1-9-1940).
 26. *Ibid.* p. 24 (*Harijan*, 2-3-1940).
 27. Gene Sharp distinguishes between the general population that supports an action, the nonviolent “actionists” (i.e., action group), and their leaders (Gene Sharp, *The politics of nonviolent action* (Boston: Porter Sargent, 1973), p. 115).
 28. *Mind*, p. 126 (*Harijan*, 1-9-1940).
 29. *Ibid.* p. 60, where Gandhi wrote that “Fear has no place in our hearts when we have shaken off the attachment for wealth, for family and for the body. ‘Tena tyaktena bhunjithah’ is a noble commandment.... The wealth, the family and the body.... Are not ours but God’s.... The Upanishad, therefore, directs us... [to] be interested... not as proprietors but only as trustees” (*Young India*, 11-9-1930). Gandhi is quoting and paraphrasing verse 1 of the *Isha Upanishad*. In psychology, see a 30-item non-attachment scale by Baljinder Kaur Sahdra, Philip R. Shaver, et al., “A scale to measure non-attachment: A Buddhist complement to western research on attachment and adaptive functioning”, *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 92, 2 (2010), pp. 116-127.

30. *Mind*, p. 59 (*Young India*, 11-9-1930).
31. "Those alone can follow the path of passive resistance who are free from fear, whether as to their possessions, false honour, their relatives, the government, bodily injuries, death" (Mahatma Gandhi, *Nonviolent resistance* (New York: Schocken, 1951/1961), p. 55) (originally in *Hind Swaraj*, 1910).
32. For Gandhi, it was "manly enough to defend one's property, honour, or religion at the point of the sword," but it was "manlier and nobler to defend them without seeking to injure the wrong-doer" *Collected works*, pp. 93, v. 33 (*Young India*, 15-10-1925). He similarly stated that "where there is only a choice between cowardice and violence, I would advise violence....But I believe that nonviolence is infinitely superior to violence" *Mind*, p. 142 (*Young India*, 11-8-1920).
33. Mukulika Banerjee, *The Pathan unarmed: Opposition & memory in the north west frontier* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 160-161.
34. *Self-efficacy*, p. 482.
35. *Ibid.* p. 480.
36. *Nonviolent resistance*, pp. 6-7.
37. *Political strategist*, p. 14. Sharp noted that in Gandhian satyagraha, "a link was forged between a means of mass struggle and a moral preference for nonviolent means, although for participants this preference was not necessarily absolutist in character" (p. 14).
38. Gandhi affirmed that as a general technique, satyagraha could be "offered against one's wife or one's children, against rulers, against fellow citizens, even against the whole world..." *Nonviolent resistance*, p. 78 (*Young India*, 27-2-1930).
39. Diverse statements by Gandhi on skills for satyagraha are contained in the section "Discipline for Satyagraha" in *ibid.* pp. 37-101. Gandhi offered numbered lists of 19 items (1930, pp. 79-81), 7 items (1939, p. 88), 9 items (1938, pp. 89-90), and 6 items specifically for prison conduct (1924, p. 65).
40. *Mind*, pp. 171-172. In addition, quality #4 reflects constructive programme: "He must be a habitual Khadi-wearer and spinner. This is essential for India" (p. 171). (*Harijan*, 25-3-1939).
41. *Ibid.* p. 170 (*Satyagraha in South Africa*, 1928).
42. *Ibid.* p. 167 (*Harijan*, 15-4-1933).
43. *Ibid.* p. 166 (*Harijan*, 18-3-1939; Also in *Collected works*, p. 174, v. 75). Gandhi added that "It should be obvious that civil resistance cannot flourish in an atmosphere of violence. This does not mean that the resources of a satyagrahi have come to an end. Ways other than civil disobedience should be found out."
44. *Nonviolent resistance*, p. 98 (*Harijan*, 10-6-1939).
45. *Ibid.* p. 97 (*Harijan*, 23-7-1938). Gandhi added that "This is impossible without the observance of *brahmacharya*".
46. *Mind*, p. 168 (*Harijan*, 24-9-1938).
47. *The politics of nonviolent action*, p. 575.

48. M. K. Gandhi, *Constructive programme: Its meaning and place* (Ahmedabad, India: Navajivan, 1945), p. 5.
49. *Ibid.*
50. *Mind*, p. 408 (*Harijan*, 21-7-1946).
51. *Ibid.* p. 406 (*Harijan*, 22 9-1946).
52. Gandhi, quoted in *Conquest*, p. 181 (*Young India*, 17-3-1927).
53. *Nonviolent resistance*, p. 307 (*Harijan*, 1-6-1940).
54. *The politics of nonviolent action*, p. 797.
55. *Nonviolent resistance*, p. 88 (*Harijan*, 25-3-1939).
56. *Constructive programme*, p. 20. With regard to trusteeship, Gandhi argued that “no other theory is compatible with nonviolence” (*Mind*, p. 259; *Harijan*, 16-12-1939).
57. *Constructive programme*, p. 21.
58. *Mind*, p. 260 (*Modern Review*, 10-1935).
59. *Constructive programme*, p. 21. Although usually emphasizing the role of individual example, Gandhi also pointed out ways that legislation could be used to support, disseminate, mandate, and regulate trusteeship – see, for example, *Mind*, pp. 262-263 (*Harijan*, 25-10-1952). After his death, Gandhi’s trusteeship approach inspired India’s “Land Gift” (*Bhoodan Yajna*) movement, in which ownership of more than 4 million acres was voluntarily given to the poor. See Narayan Hazary & Buddhapriya Sanghamitra, *Immortal sarvoday [papers presented at the national seminar on Acharya Vinoba Bhave and Sarvoday]* (New Delhi: A.P.H. Publishing, 2007).
60. *Mind*, p. 111 (*The Hindu*, 19-9-1945).
61. Additional non-economic principles discussed by Gandhi included vegetarianism, *brahmacharya* (continence), and the concept of *Ramarajya* (the Kingdom of God). Such concepts are mentioned only extremely rarely by scholars such as Gene Sharp who focus on satyagraha as a technique. Bondurant suggests that “the concept of satyagraha... does not make requisite those aspects of Gandhian teaching which specify rules of individual self-living” (*Conquest*, p. 12).
62. Martin Luther King, *Stride toward freedom: The Montgomery story* (New York: Harper and Row, 1964/1958), pp. 114-115.
63. Jonathan Schell, *The unconquerable world: Power, nonviolence, and the will of the people* (New York: Henry Holt, 2003), pp. 117-118.
64. A converging biblical view is that “perfect love casteth out fear” (1 John 4:18, KJV).
65. *Mind*, p. 126 (*Harijan*, 1-9-1940).
66. *Ibid.* p. 64 (*Young India*, 12-5-1920).
67. Gandhi concluded “after prayerful search and study and discussion with as many people as I could meet, that all religions were true and also that all had some error in them” because “everything that the human hand touches, by reason of the very fact that human beings are imperfect, becomes imperfect” (*ibid.* pp. 67, 66) (*Young India*, 19-1-1928 and 22-9-1927).

68. For Gandhi, "Everyone has faith in God though everyone does not know it. For, everyone has faith in himself and that multiplied to nth degree is God" *Collected works*, pp. 215-216, v. 75 (*Harijan*, 3-6-1939).
69. Near the end of his life, Gandhi planned a series of conversations with G. R. Rao (known as Gora), a committed atheist, in order to discover their common ground. Impressed by Gora's commitment to the work of community uplift, Gandhi reportedly told him "I can neither say that my theism is right nor your atheism is wrong. We are seekers after truth..... I will help you, though your method is against mine", quoted in Goparaju Ramachandra Rao, *An atheist with Gandhi* (Ahmedabad, India: Navajivan, 1951), p. 44. Unfortunately, Gandhi was assassinated shortly before an extended series of conversations that he had planned with Gora in February, 1948 (p. 25). Rao wrote that "The assassination of Gandhiji meant a terrible loss to civilization; it is as much a loss to atheism" (p. 56).
70. Aldous Huxley, *The perennial philosophy* (New York: Harper & Row, 1945/1970), p. 163. Huxley is articulating the underlying logic from the point of view of the "perennial philosophy", the mystical perspective that can be found in all major religious traditions. For recent neuroscientific support of perennialist perspectives, see Jason N. Blum, "The science of consciousness and mystical experience: An argument for radical empiricism", *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 82, 1 (2014), pp. 150-173.
71. *Mind*, p. 59 (*Young India*, 11-9-1930).
72. Gandhi himself practiced mantram repetition, which he called Ramanama (*ibid.* pp. 80-83). For Gandhi's meditative use of devotional prayers and hymns, see Cynthia Snodgrass, *The sounds of satyagraha: Mahatma Gandhi's use of sung-prayers and ritual* (PhD thesis). Stirling, UK: University of Stirling, 2007; Eknath Easwaran, *Gandhi the man: How one man changed himself to change the world* (Tomales, CA: Nilgiri Press, 2011). For Gandhi, "True meditation consists in closing the eyes and ears of the mind to all else except the object of one's devotion" in *Mind*, p. 88 (*Harijan*, 18-4-1946).
73. See Doug Oman, "Similarity in diversity? Four shared functions of integrative contemplative practice systems", in T. G. Plante, ed., *Contemplative practices in action: Spirituality, meditation, and health* [foreword by Huston Smith] (Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2010), pp. 7-16; Doug Oman & Joseph D. Driskill, "Holy name repetition as a spiritual exercise and therapeutic technique", *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 22, 1 (2003), pp. 5-19; Daniel Goleman, *The meditative mind: The varieties of meditative experience* (New York: Tarcher, 1988).
74. Juliane Eberth & Peter Sedlmeier, "The effects of mindfulness meditation: A meta-analysis", *Mindfulness*, 3, 3 (2012), pp. 174-189.
75. For an overview of the field, see Cynthia L. S. Pury & Shane J. Lopez, *The psychology of courage: Modern research on an ancient virtue* (Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 2010), based

- on a 2007 special issue of *Positive Psychology*. Chapter 10 by Paul B. Lester et al. addresses interventions to foster courage, offering a Bandura-based approach driven by self-efficacy theory, but it notes a lack of an empirical research base. The field is further impeded by a lack of measures of courage, and an additional obstacle is that “the most prototypical courageous actions involve levels of risk and importance of action that exceed typical ethical boundaries for laboratory work” (Chapter 12, by Pury et al., p. 235).
76. Melissa Soenke, Mark J. Landau, et al., “Sacred armor: Religion’s role as a buffer against the anxieties of life and the fear of death”, in K. I. Pargament, J. J. Exline, et al., eds., *APA handbook of psychology, religion, and spirituality*, Vol. 1 (Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 2013), pp. 105-122.
 77. *Mind*, p. 34 (*Harijan*, 11-3-1939).
 78. *Ibid.* p. 33 (*Harijan*, 6-5-1933).
 79. Albert Bandura, “On the psychosocial impact and mechanisms of spiritual modeling”, *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 13, 3 (2003), pp. 167-173.
 80. Albert Bandura, “Social cognitive theory in cultural context”, *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 51, 2 (2002), pp. 269-290 (cited p. 270).
 81. As when Gandhi advised workers to “go to Him [God] in all your nakedness, approach Him without fear or doubts as to how He can help.... and you will find that every one of your prayers will be answered. I am telling this out of my personal experience. I have gone through the purgatory”, or when Gandhi advised that “He [God] is always at your beck and call, but on His terms, not on your terms” *Mind*, pp. 85-86 (*Young India*, 4-4-1929); *Collected works*, pp. 401, v. 53 (*The Guildhouse*, 23-9-1931).
 82. Bandura, “Spiritual modeling” (cited pp. 172–173).
 83. Douglas V. Porpora, “Methodological atheism, methodological agnosticism and religious experience”, *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 36, 1 (2006), pp. 57-75.
 84. In technical language, everyday self-reports of efficacy perceptions assess respondents’ holistic appraisals that integrate information on the availability of diverse types of direct and proxy modes of influence (see discussion in Doug Oman, Carl E. Thoresen, et al., “Spiritual modeling self-efficacy”, *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 4, 4 (2012), pp. 278-297). For a non-reductionist view of how the same mental events, and hence the corresponding agentic capacity, may be attributed either to the self or to God, see T. M. Luhrmann, *When God talks back: Understanding the American evangelical relationship with God* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2012).
 85. However, the consequences of perceiving nonviolent strategies in general as efficacious were recently examined in a dissertation by Rim Saab, *Developing efficacy and emotion routes to solidarity-based and violent collective action* (Psychology PhD thesis). University of Cardiff,

2011. Saab reported evidence that respondents who perceived nonviolent strategies as efficacious for Palestinians were less likely to endorse violence. However, in what Saab termed a “nothing to lose” phenomenon (p. 137), when both nonviolent and violent struggle were perceived as inefficacious, respondents continued to endorse violence. These effects appeared in a cross-sectional survey (Study 4, protesters), and also in an experimental manipulation (Study 5, students), in which high perceptions of the efficacy of nonviolent struggle were produced through a narrative largely centred on the likely potency of political jiu-jitsu (without using the term itself).
86. Expert information should be “supplemented with interviews, open-ended surveys, and structured questionnaires to identify the levels of challenge and impediment” (*Self-efficacy*, p. 43).
 87. According to a review by Angel Avila, “Developing apps for conflict resolution, peacebuilding and nonviolence movements is a growing trend”. An iPad app that supports Sharp’s approaches is entitled “How to Start a Revolution”, after a film by the same name about Sharp’s work. The app allows viewing this film as well as biographies of revolutionary leaders and other key figures in struggles around the world, four of Sharp’s full-length books, “certain places (such as Tahrir Square), things (such as specific weapons), ideas (such as Sharp’s 198 methods of nonviolent action), institutions... wars... people... movements... and many more”. A feature called the “Revolution Monitor... is a map of the world with dots that mark the locations of revolutions in real time. By clicking on a dot, users will see the live Twitter feeds relating to that particular revolution. This function also gives users the option to re-tweet any messages or add their own that will contribute to the feed.” Source: Angel J. Avila [Angel Storm] (2012, November 18). “PCDN review of the How to Start a Revolution iPad app”. Peace and Collaborative Development Network (PCDN) (<http://www.internationalpeaceandconflict.org/forum/topics/pcdn-review-of-the-how-to-start-a-revolution-ipad-app>, accessed 21 November 2013).
 88. Salvatore J. Babones, “Income inequality and population health: Correlation and causality”, *Social Science and Medicine*, 66, 7 (2008), pp. 1614-1626.
 89. Robert J. Brulle & David N. Pellow, “Environmental justice: Human health and environmental inequalities”, *Annual Review of Public Health*, 27 (2006), pp. 103-124.
 90. John Abraham & Rachel Ballinger, “Science, politics, and health in the brave new world of pharmaceutical carcinogenic risk assessment: Technical progress or cycle of regulatory capture?”, *Social Science and Medicine*, 75, 8 (2012), pp. 1433-1440.
 91. Nicholas Freudenberg & Carol Steinsapir, “Not in our backyards: The grassroots environmental movement”, *Society & Natural*

- Resources*, 4, 3 (1991), pp. 235-245.
92. Simon Chapman, "Civil disobedience and tobacco control: The case of BUGA UP", *Tobacco Control*, 5, 3 (1996), pp. 179-185.
 93. Nik Heynen, "Cooking up non-violent civil-disobedient direct action for the hungry: 'Food not bombs' and the resurgence of radical democracy in the US", *Urban Studies*, 47, 6 (2010), pp. 1225-1240.
 94. Mark Heywood, "South Africa's treatment action campaign: Combining law and social mobilization to realize the right to health", *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, 1, 1 (2009), pp. 14-36.
 95. Robert Macauley, "The hippocratic underground: Civil disobedience and health care reform", *Hastings Center Report*, 35, 1 (2005), pp. 38-45.
 96. Paul B. Lester, Gretchen R. Vogelgesang, et al., "Developing courage in followers: Theoretical and applied perspectives", in C. L. S. Pury & S. J. Lopez, eds., *The psychology of courage: Modern research on an ancient virtue* (Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 2010), pp. 187-207
 97. *Mind*, p. 59 (*Young India*, 11-9-1930).
 98. Cynthia L. S. Pury, Shane J. Lopez, et al., "The future of courage research", in C. L. S. Pury & S. J. Lopez, eds., *The psychology of courage: Modern research on an ancient virtue* (Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 2010), pp. 229-235 (quotation from p. 231).
 99. *Mind*, p. 16 (*Young India*, 15-9-1920).
 100. See "Types of Principled Nonviolence" in *Political strategist*, pp. 201-234.
 101. Sharp was widely cited as a leading contender for the 2012 Nobel Peace Prize; Sharp's most influential works include *The politics of nonviolent action* (1973) and *From dictatorship to democracy* (1994/2003).
 102. CNN stated that *From Dictatorship to Democracy* had "spread like a virus," calling it a "viral pamphlet" (Mairi Mackay, 2012, June 23. Gene sharp: A dictator's worst nightmare, Cable Network News. <http://www.Cnn.Com/2012/06/23/world/gene-sharp-revolutionary/index.html>, accessed 25 Aug. 2013). Sharp stated that when the book was first written, "although no efforts were made to promote the publication for use in other countries, translations and distribution of the publication began to spread on their own.... We usually do not know how awareness of this publication has spread from country to country" (Gene Sharp, *From dictatorship to democracy: A conceptual framework for liberation*, 4th US edition, East Boston, MA: Albert Einstein Institution, 2010, pp. 88-89).
 103. As distillations of required skill sets, self-efficacy assessments could also be potentially useful for respectfully clarifying differences between various forms of nonviolence. For example, Gandhian satyagraha is very different than Saul Alinsky's purely tactical nonviolence, although it is only the latter that is given extensive

- discussion in Bandura's *Self-efficacy*, pp. 500-501.
104. Gene Sharp, *Making Europe unconquerable: The potential of civilian-based deterrence and defence* [with a foreword by George F. Kennan] (Cambridge, MA: Ballinger, 1985).
 105. Although distinctive to nonviolence, the jiu-jitsu process is not uncommonly recognized as important in mainstream media. A recent example appeared in the *Economist*: Anonymous. (2013, September 28). Street protests - the weapon of choice: Bloodshed sometimes helps autocrats stay in power - it rarely benefits protesters (<http://www.economist.com/news/international/21586842-bloodshed-sometimes-helps-autocrats-stay-power-it-rarely-benefits-protesters-weapon>, accessed 28 October 2013).
 106. See chapter 12, "Political Jiu-Jitsu", in *The politics of nonviolent action*, pp. 657-703 (quotation from p. 658). Sharp acknowledges the earlier use of a similar term, "moral jiu-jitsu", by Richard B. Gregg, *The power of nonviolence* (New York: Schocken, 1966; original edition 1935). Sharp argues that political jiu-jitsu is a "much broader process" (p. 698) because, at least in its original usage, moral jiu-jitsu "referred [only] to the moral or psychological effects of nonviolent persistence on the people carrying out the repression themselves" (p. 698). In contrast, when political jiu-jitsu occurs, "public opinion may turn against the opponent, members of his own group may dissent, and more or less passive members of the general grievance group may shift to firm opposition... [and] positive sympathy in favor of the nonviolent actionists and their cause is also likely to develop" (pp. 657-8, emphasis in original).
 107. For other types of research documenting the effects of political jiu-jitsu, see Maria J. Stephan, & Erica Chenoweth, "Why civil resistance works: The strategic logic of nonviolent conflict", *International Security*, 33, 1 (2008), pp. 7-44. These authors test a variety of hypotheses about the dynamics of nonviolence using statistical regression in a dataset of 323 violent and nonviolent resistance campaigns from 1900 to 2006. Among campaigns facing regime crackdowns, those that were nonviolent were more than six times as likely to achieve full success.
 108. At least once, Gandhi completed a questionnaire: In July 1925, he completed a 12-item questionnaire sent to various political leaders by the *Bombay Chronicle* (*Collected works*, pp. 129-131, v. 32).
 109. *Stride toward freedom*, p. 79.

DOUG OMAN is Associate Adjunct Professor, School of Public Health, 50 University Hall #7360, *University of California, Berkeley*, CA 94720-7360, USA.

Email: dougoman@post.harvard.edu

January–March 2014

GANDHI MARG
Statement of Ownership and
Other Particulars

Place of Publication	New Delhi
Periodicity of Publication	Quarterly
Printer's Name	Surendra Kumar
Nationality	Indian
Address	221 & 223 Deen Dayal Upadhyaya Marg New Delhi 110 002
Publisher's Name	Surendra Kumar
Nationality	Indian
Address	221 & 223 Deen Dayal Upadhyaya Marg New Delhi 110 002
Editor's Names	John Moolakkattu M.P. Mathai
Address	221 & 223 Deen Dayal Upadhyaya Marg New Delhi 110 002
Name and Address of Individuals who Own the Journal	The Journal is owned by the Gandhi Peace Foundation, 221 & 223 Deen Dayal Upadhyaya Marg New Delhi 110 002

I, Surendra Kumar, hereby declare that the particulars given above are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Surendra Kumar
Publisher