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ABSTRACT

This study extended the current understanding of religious ethnocentrism (RE) towards non-Christians by testing a theoretically and empirically based model in which personality (i.e., right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation), social identity (i.e., Christian orthodoxy, religious group identification), and spiritual (i.e., spiritual transcendence, desecration) variables were related to attitudinal and affective manifestations of RE. Path analysis results based on a sample of 434 participants revealed support for most of the hypothesized relations. Attitudinal and affective RE were found to be related, yet distinct, constructs and possessed varying relationships with the predictor variables. Additionally, spiritual transcendence and desecration were found to be significant and unique predictors of both attitudinal and affective RE when included in a model with other personality and social identity predictors. More specifically, spiritual transcendence possessed a direct and indirect (via social dominance orientation) relationship with attitudinal RE. Desecration possessed a direct relationship and served as a mediator between right-wing authoritarianism and religious fundamentalism with both attitudinal and affective RE. Implications of the findings and directions for future research on religious ethnocentrism are discussed.
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CHAPTER I
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Religious Ethnocentrism

Religious ethnocentrism (RE), a type of religion-based prejudice, is defined as the tendency to create “in-group versus out-group” judgments of others on the basis of religious identification and beliefs” (Altemeyer, 2003, p. 20). Within this study, RE specifically refers to prejudice that individuals who identify as Christian pose towards individuals who do not identify as Christian (e.g., Buddhists, atheists, etc.). RE is manifested by using one’s religious beliefs to justify the rejection of, and even violence towards, individuals and groups based on their differing religious philosophies. RE has historically been a factor in various national and international conflicts such as the terrorist attacks on New York’s World Trade Centers in 2001, the contention between Catholics and Protestants in Ireland, the struggles between Jews and Muslims in the Middle East, and the Sikh-Hindu-Muslim clashes in India (Hunsberger & Jackson, 2005). Despite RE’s relevance to the aforementioned conflicts, little research has been conducted on RE. This seems problematic in that understanding RE would not only shed light on prejudice towards religious out-groups (generally defined), but also on prejudice towards specific groups (e.g., Jews, Muslims, etc.). Furthermore, an understanding of the factors contributing to RE is needed in order to identify and develop interventions to prevent and reduce manifestations of this prejudice, making it an important topic for
psychological research as a whole, and to the field of Counseling Psychology specifically.

Of primary concern to the field of Counseling Psychology (CP) are the values of social justice and diversity (Vera & Speight, 2003). Central to the pursuit of promoting these values is the task of identifying and ameliorating power differentials, mainly those reinforced by prejudice. Prejudice towards religious out-groups works on conscious and unconscious levels, and is often used to justify even the most horrific behaviors in the light of doing “divine work” (Pargament, Magyar-Russell, & Murray-Swank, 2005). Therefore, an increased understanding of RE, with the long-term goal of informing potential interventions to reduce such prejudice, is clearly in line with CP values.

Previously Studied Predictors of Religious Ethnocentrism

Given that RE refers to prejudice towards individuals who identify with a different religion than one’s own, it is important to identify the field’s current conception of religion in order to fully understand the construct of RE. However, the field of psychology remains divided regarding its definitions of religion, and often uses the terms religion and spirituality interchangeably (Zinnbauer & Pargament, 2005). In accordance with the field’s most recent trends, this study considers spirituality to be the broader, more innate, construct defined as “a personal or group search for the sacred” (p. 35), and religion to be a secondary, more socialized, construct defined as “a personal or group search for the sacred that unfolds within a traditional sacred context” (p. 35), which is formed by social traditions and educational experiences (Piedmont, Werdel, & Fernando, 2009).
In comparison to the body of empirical findings bearing on other forms of prejudice, relatively little is known about the predictors of RE. Nevertheless, a small body of psychological literature spanning the past decade has identified a number of individual difference and social identity variables specifically related to RE (e.g., Altemeyer, 2003; 2004; Jackson & Hunsberger, 1999). The most frequently explored individual difference predictors of religion-based prejudice are right-wing authoritarianism (RWA), a dispositional tendency to favor traditional, conservative values and to be submissive to authority figures, and social dominance orientation (SDO), a dispositional tendency to perceive that some individuals are inherently superior to others (Altemeyer, 1998; Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994). Both RWA and SDO have been found to relate positively to RE (Altemeyer, 2003, 2004; Banyasz, Tokar, & Kaut, 2013).

Another variable that has been linked conceptually and empirically with RE is religious fundamentalism (RF), defined as the tendency to view one’s religious beliefs as the fundamental truth about reality and to view those who possess such beliefs as having a privileged relationship with the Divine (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 2004). Religious fundamentalism is conceptualized as a religious orientation, or a set of meta beliefs, through which one evaluates other beliefs and values (Hunsberger, 1995). Studies have indicated a strong, positive relationship between RF and RE (e.g., Altemeyer, 2003, 2004). Furthermore, recent findings have indicated that RF serves as a mechanism through which individual difference (i.e., RWA) and social identity variables (described below) relate to RE (Banyasz et al., 2014).
Two social identity variables that have been found to relate to religious prejudice include Christian orthodoxy (CO), referring to Christian beliefs and doctrines, and religious group identification (RGI), a construct reflecting the extent to which an individual identifies with and gains an enhanced self-concept as a result of associating with a religious group (Hunsberger & Jackson, 2005). CO differs conceptually from RF in that CO reflects a specific content of religious beliefs, whereas RF reflects a particular style of how beliefs are held (Laythe et al., 2002). RGI, the perception of one’s group affiliation which enhances one’s self-esteem, is also conceptually distinct from RF. CO has been found to positively predict prejudice toward religious out-groups such as Muslims (Abu Raiya et al., 2008; Kirkpatrick, 1993; Laythe et al., 2002). RGI has similarly been found to predict prejudice toward religious out-groups including atheists (Jackson & Hunsberger, 1999). More recently, Banyasz et al. (2014) demonstrated that both CO and RGI related significantly and positively, but indirectly (via the mediator of RF), with RE.

In the only known study of its type, Banyasz et al. (2014) simultaneously examined the aforementioned individual difference, religious orientation, and social identity variables in a model predicting RE. They found SDO, RWA, RF, CO, and RGI to each relate significantly and positively with RE, with the combination of predictors accounting for 60% of the variance in RE. While RF and SDO each had a unique (i.e., direct) relationship with RE, RWA had both a direct and an indirect relationship with RE via the mediator of RF. Finally, relations of CO and RGI to RE were completely indirect, via the mediator of RF. Banyasz et al.’s (2014) findings are noteworthy for several reasons. First, they indicate that both individual difference and social identity variables
contribute importantly to and account for a substantial proportion (though certainly not all) of the variance in RE. Second, they suggest that the effects of social identity variables (i.e., CO and RGI) on RE are transmitted through RF. Finally, they suggest that personality/individual difference variables (i.e., RWA and SDO) account for unique variance in RE beyond that explained by RF. Thus, future investigations of RE should consider additional, conceptually related individual difference constructs.

One potentially fruitful avenue to explore is the inclusion of numinous, or spiritual, variables. No study to date has included numinous individual differences, leaving the question of how the “spiritual component” of religion-based prejudice is potentially manifested unanswered. More specifically, it is currently unknown if exclusively spiritual variables predict unique variance in RE above and beyond that accounted for by previously demonstrated individual difference and social identity predictors. Thus, an investigation that includes numinous variables serves as the next important step in understanding RE.

**Numinous Predictors of Religious Ethnocentrism**

Recent calls in the psychological literature have encouraged the inclusion of uniquely numinous, or spiritual, constructs in the prediction of a wide array of psychosocial phenomena. Piedmont (2001) posited that spiritual constructs need to be included with other personality and social variables to “construct multi-variable models that link together in meaningful ways constellations of constructs that will maximize our understanding of the [psychosocial] phenomenon” (p. 11). Spirituality as a whole has received significantly less attention in the psychological literature when compared to other psychosocial, secular-type constructs (Pargament et al., 2013). Furthermore, it is
estimated that research on religious and spiritual topics is approximately 30 years behind the rest of the field in terms of methodology and statistical sophistication (Hill et al., 2000). Therefore, a focus on spiritual, or numinous, constructs in relation to important psychosocial outcome variables, including prejudice, is long overdue.

The recommendation to include numinous variables in the prediction of psychological outcomes is based on the assumption that spirituality serves as a core dimension of the human experience. Pargament’s (2007) spiritual theory of coping identifies spirituality as a basic human motivation and process, while Piedmont (1999) argues that spiritual constructs represent a distinct domain of individual differences, akin to the personality traits of the five-factor model. Indeed, empirical evidence supports these suppositions in that numinous variables, specifically the constructs of spiritual transcendence and desecration (see below), have been found to predict unique variance in a multitude of psychosocial variables, with desecration predicting prejudice towards specific religious groups (Dy-Liacco et al., 2009; Pargament et al., 2007; Piedmont, 1999). This empirical evidence suggests that these numinous variables will likely be predictive of RE as well.

In addition to being a significant and unique aspect of the human experience, spiritual variables possess a unique reference point when compared to other psychosocial variables: the sacred (Pargament & Mahoney, 2002). Through their association with the sacred or Divine, spiritual variables often take on an enhanced and even eternal significance, which has been found to increase the commitment and energy that individuals allot to their religious identities, beliefs, and endeavors (Mahoney et al., 1999; Swank, Mahoney, & Pargament, 1999; Pargament & Mahoney, 2002). Therefore, it
seems reasonable that spiritual variables would contribute uniquely to the prediction of RE due to the likelihood that they elicit increased devotion and commitment to prejudice, above and beyond that accounted for by other previously mentioned individual difference and social identity variables.

One specific numinous variable, the construct of spirituality, as measured by Piedmont’s (1999) Spiritual Transcendence Scale (STS), has been found to predict unique variance above and beyond that explained by the five-factor model of personality in multiple psychosocial outcome variables, including attitudes toward abortion, internal health locus of control, vulnerability to stress, perceived social support, sexual attitudes, pro-social behavior, altruism, self-actualization, worldview, materialism, and alcohol related behaviors (Burris, Sauer, & Carlson, 2011; Dy-Liacco et al., 2009; Piedmont, 1999). Even so, spiritual transcendence (ST) construct has never been studied in relationship with the construct of RE specifically. Given its predictive power with a multitude of other psychosocial constructs that possess a morality/values component (e.g., attitudes toward abortion and sexuality), it is likely that including ST in a model predicting RE, a variable also inherently possessing a morality/values component, would not only contribute additional unique variance to RE, but may further clarify spirituality’s relations to other demonstrated predictors of RE (i.e., RWA, SDO, RF, CO, RGI).

A second numinous construct that may be important for understanding RE is desecration. Desecration is defined as the perception that “a sacred aspect of life has been violated or threatened” (Abu-Raiya, Pargament, Mahoney, & Trevino, 2011, p. 461). In the prediction of prejudices toward specific religious out-groups (e.g., anti-Semitism, anti-Muslim attitudes, and anti-LGB attitudes), desecration has contributed
additional variance beyond that explained by constructs including RWA, RF, CO and exposure to prejudicial messages (i.e., Abu-Raiya et al., 2011; Pargament, Trevino, Mahoney, & Silberman, 2007; Trevino, Desai, Lauricella, Pargament, & Mahoney, 2010). Additionally, these previous studies have found that RWA and RF—two consistent predictors of RE—uniquely and positively predict perceptions of desecration.

Despite its unique relation to various types of religiously oriented prejudices, no research to date has been conducted on the relationship between desecration and RE, and no research has examined the combined and unique contributions of individual difference predictors to both desecration and RE in the same model. Given that individual difference variables known to predict RE (i.e., RWA, RF) have also positively predicted perceptions of desecration, and that desecration has been shown to be a consistent and robust predictor of prejudice towards specific religious out-groups, it is reasonable to speculate that desecration may be a transmitter, or mediator, through which more trait-like individual differences variables have their effect on RE. The possibility that desecration mediates the relationship between individual difference variables and RE has yet to be empirically explored; however, conceptual arguments support such a mediated relation. For instance, individuals possessing high levels of RWA are theoretically predisposed to perceive out-groups as “dangerous” because such out-groups are believed to pose a threat to in-group values. Intuitively, then, it seems that part of RWA’s relationship with RE is being transmitted through the perception that religious out-groups are posing a threat to high-RWA individuals’ values (i.e., perceptions of desecration). In a similar vein, persons high in RF perceive out-groups as being inferior for not possessing the specialized knowledge of and/or accompanying privileged relationship
with the Divine that they possess. It seems probable, then, that a fundamentalist worldview may predispose high-RF individuals to perceive religious out-groups as desecrators of their one, “true” faith. Furthermore, given that desecration is a situational/socialized-type variable, it seems likely that endorsement of fundamentalist metabeliefs would prime individuals to be defensive of their religion (i.e., desecration). Without a more thorough understanding of the pathways through which the aforementioned predictor variables relate to RE, potential preventative and reactionary interventions to reduce the negative manifestations of RE are difficult to develop.

**Measurement of Religious Ethnocentrism**

In addition to clarifying the relationships among the various predictors of RE, the measurement of RE continues to remain a limitation in the literature. More specifically, while the RE components of attitudes and behavioral intentions have been measured in past research (e.g., Altemeyer, 2003, 2004; Banyasz et al., 2014), typically via Altemeyer’s (2003) Religious Ethnocentrism Scale, the affective components of RE have yet to be explored. Therefore, no study heretofore has measured both the attitudinal and behavioral components of RE simultaneously. Doing so would be important in understanding how RE-related attitudes and affect are associated. Furthermore, differentiating the various emotions (e.g., fear, disgust, anger) that arise from and/or contribute to prejudicial attitudes is also necessary in terms of informing future prejudice-reduction interventions, especially in light of the fact that affective and attitudinal components of prejudice potentially have differential relationships to prejudicial behaviors and intergroup contact (Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2007; Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005).
The Present Study

The purpose of the current study is to respond to calls in the current literature (Pargament, 2007; Pargament & Mahoney, 2002; Piedmont, 2001) to explore uniquely spiritual constructs in the prediction of psychosocial phenomena. More specifically, this study will consider whether the numinous constructs of spiritual transcendence and desecration predict unique variance in RE beyond that accounted for by previously established individual difference and social identity predictors. This endeavor seems especially relevant to the prediction of RE, a variable inherently possessing a morality and/or values component, in that spiritual variables will likely “tap into” this component. It is reasonable to suspect that spiritual variables will predict unique variance in RE that is not accounted for by less spiritually oriented predictors (e.g., RWA, RGI). Recall that previous studies have shown that both ST and desecration explained unique variance in a variety of psychosocial constructs that possess a morality/values component, with desecration specifically predicting unique variance in religion-based prejudice, above and beyond that accounted for by individual difference and social identity variables (Piedmont, 1999, 2001; Pargament et al., 2007). In addition to potentially accounting for incremental variance in RE, including ST and desecration in a model predicting RE may also clarify the mechanisms through which previously studied variables relate to RE.

This study will replicate and expand upon the RE model proposed by Banyasz et al. (2014) by examining whether spiritual predictors possess unique explanatory power in the prediction of RE above and beyond that accounted for by the previously demonstrated predictors of SDO, RWA, RF, CO, and RGI. Additionally, the current study intends to add to the current literature on RE by simultaneously measuring both its
attitudinal and affective components, thus providing a more comprehensive assessment of the construct. An understanding of the spiritual predictors of RE, as well as the attitudinal and affective manifestations of this variable, has important implications for the prevention and reduction of RE. The reader is referred to Figure 1 (p. 12) for a visual depiction of the proposed path model.

First, it is hypothesized that the relationships of individual difference (i.e., RWA, SDO, RF) and social identity (i.e., CO and RGI) variables with RE, that were identified by Banyasz et al. (2014), will be replicated in this study. Specifically, it is predicted that SDO and RF will have direct and positive relations with RE, CO and RGI will have indirect (via RF) positive relations with RE, and RWA will have both direct and indirect (via RF) positive relations with RE.

Secondly, it is predicted that ST will have both a direct and indirect negative relationship with RE, with part of the relation mediated through RWA and SDO. A direct (but inverse) relationship between ST and RE is hypothesized based on empirically demonstrated relationships between ST and similar value-oriented psychosocial constructs (e.g., attitudes toward abortion, prosocial behavior, worldview; Dy-Liacco et al., 2009; Piedmont, 1999). In addition to the direct relation between ST and RE, an indirect relationship is also predicted, through both SDO and RWA. This prediction is based on the conceptualization of ST as a basic, or core, personality trait, akin to the dimensions of the five-factor model (Piedmont, 1999). Previous research has shown that RWA and SDO, conceptualized herein as characteristic adaptations (McCrae & Costa, 1999), or expressions of more basic personality traits, fully mediated the relationships between the Big Five personality traits and multiple types of prejudice (Ekehammar,
Akrami, Gylje, & Zakrisson, 2004). Extrapolating from these initial findings, RWA and SDO are anticipated to similarly account for a portion of the relationship of ST with RE. No empirical literature exists to inform predictions regarding the relationships of ST with CO and RGI; therefore, no hypotheses involving relationships among these variables are included in the current study.

Additionally, given past evidence regarding the positive relationship between desecration and prejudice towards specific religious out-groups (Abu-Raiya et al., 2011, Pargament, Trevino, Mahoney, & Silberman, 2007; Trevino, Desai, Lauricella, Pargament, & Mahoney, 2010), it is hypothesized that desecration will have a direct positive relationship with RE, a construct capturing prejudice towards all religious out-groups. It is further hypothesized that RWA and RF will positively predict desecration. This hypothesis is based on previous research relating higher RWA and RF to greater perceptions of desecration towards specific groups (e.g., Jews, Muslims, LGB persons), as well as conceptual arguments depicting how individuals high in RWA and RF are prone to view out-groups as potentially threatening and contaminating to sacred in-group values and beliefs (i.e., desecration; Abu-Raiya et al., 2011; Pargament et al., 2007; Trevino et al., 2010). Finally, it is hypothesized that the positive relations of RWA and RF with RE will be partially mediated via desecration. Such mediated relations are consistent with the pattern of relationships involving RWA, RF, and perceptions of desecration by and prejudice toward specific religious out-groups (e.g., Abu-Raiya et al., 2011; Pargament et al., 2007; Trevino et al., 2010). Moreover, it stands to reason that persons higher in RWA and RF are more likely than their lower-RWA and lower-RF counterparts to perceive religious out-groups as desecrators, and that such perceptions
may be the mechanism through which RWA and RF transmit their effect on RE. While little to no current empirical studies exist to inform predictions regarding the relationships between desecration with RGI and CO, it nonetheless remains possible that the latter two variables may also positively relate to and/or be mediated by desecration in their relation to RE (albeit, ideas that are beyond the scope of the current study).

Finally, it is hypothesized that the attitudinal and affective components of RE will be significantly and positively related, but not to the extent that they measure the same underlying construct. The rationale for this prediction is based on previous research, which has demonstrated significant and positive, but only moderate, relations between attitudinal and affective components of other types of prejudice (e.g., Miller et al., 2004; Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005). If this hypothesis is supported, then the model proposed herein will be tested separately for the attitudinal and affective components of RE. If, however, RE is shown to be a general construct composed of both attitudinal and affective components, then the model will be tested only once, using a latent attitudinal/affective RE construct.
Figure 1. Hypothesized partial mediation model. ST = Spiritual Transcendence, RF = Religious Fundamentalism, RE = Religious Ethnocentrism, RWA = Right-Wing Authoritarianism, SDO = Social Dominance Orientation, RGI = Religious Group Identity, CO = Christian Orthodoxy, DC = Desecration
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The following chapter proposes an integrated theoretical framework for the current study and provides a review of the literature on religious ethnocentrism and its associated predictors. Given that no single theory exists which provides a comprehensive rationale for the multiple predictors of religious ethnocentrism, the current study will integrate the contributions of personality theory (Costa & McCrae, 1992; Piedmont, 1999), social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), spiritual coping theory (Pargament, 2007), and intergroup emotions theory (IET; Smith 1993, 1999) to explain the complex interplay of individual difference, social identity, and spiritual predictors as they relate to religious ethnocentrism. First, individual difference theories, along with individual difference predictors of religious ethnocentrism, will be reviewed. Second, social identity theory and social identity predictors of religious ethnocentrism will be reviewed. Third, a theoretical and empirical justification for including spiritual transcendence and desecration in the current model will be provided. Finally, specific research questions for the current study will be presented.

Paradox of Religion and Prejudice

Religion has historically possessed a paradoxical relationship with prejudice. On the one hand, religion has been consistently identified in the literature as a predictor of various types of prejudice toward marginalized and minority groups, including racism,
sexism, and homophobia. (e.g., Allport & Ross, 1967; Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 2004; Backstrom & Bjorklund, 2007; Laythe, Finkel, Bringle, & Kirkpatrick, 2002; Rowatt, LaBouff, Johnson, Froese, & Tsang, 2009). In a review of pertinent studies completed between 1940 and 1990, 37 out of 47 findings revealed a positive relationship between religiosity and prejudice, with only two studies indicating a negative relationship (Batson, Schoenrade, & Ventis, 1993). Additionally, more recent research has demonstrated a positive relationship between religiosity and prejudice towards specific religious out-groups, such as Muslims and atheists (Jackson & Hunsberger, 1999; Rowatt, Franklin, & Cotton, 2005).

On the other hand, it seems counterintuitive for religion to be related to prejudice in that most religions promote dogmas of love and acceptance of others. Early research on this subject found that individuals with high religious attendance evidenced lower levels of prejudice than individuals who were affiliated with a religious tradition but did not regularly practice (Allport, 1950). This finding led to the first potential explanation of the seemingly contradicting relationship between religion and prejudice, namely that it mattered “how” an individual was religious. The current study is specifically interested in the variables that help explain the relationship between how individuals are spiritual/religious and religious ethnocentrism.

**Religious Ethnocentrism**

Prejudice is often used as a broad term encompassing a wide range of potential stereotypes, emotional responses, symbolic beliefs, and behavioral intentions (Hunsberger & Jackson, 2005). As stated in chapter I, religious ethnocentrism (RE), a specific type of religion-based prejudice, is defined as the tendency to create “‘in-group
versus out-group’ judgments of others on the basis of religious identification and beliefs” (Altemeyer, 2003, p. 20). RE is a general evaluation of all religious out-groups, defined here as individuals who adhere to a different religious doctrine than one’s own. The construct of RE was chosen as the outcome variable for this study based on the generalized prejudice issue which states that different types of prejudice have been shown to be substantially correlated (Adorno et al., 1950; Allport, 1954; Bierly, 1985; Ekehammar & Akrami, 2003). As originally noted by Allport (1954, p. 68), “people who reject one out-group will tend to reject other out-groups. If a person is anti-Jewish, he is likely to be anti-Catholic . . . anti any out-group.” Therefore, by exploring RE, a construct reflecting prejudice towards all religious out-groups, the current study improves upon past studies which have focused on prejudice towards one specific religious out-group at a time.

In an attempt to measure the construct of RE, Altemeyer (2003) developed The Religious Ethnocentrism Scale to “solicit attitudes and behavioral intentions toward atheists and persons of ‘other religions’” (p. 21), with Christians serving as the “in-group.” Altemeyer (2003; 2004) found that RE was highly related to, yet distinct from, other similar constructs such as religious fundamentalism and right-wing authoritarianism.

**Individual Difference Perspectives on RE**

In his early work, Allport (1950) viewed spirituality as the “portion of personality that arises at the core of the life and is directed toward the infinite . . . the region of mental life that has the longest-range intentions and for this reason is capable of conferring marked integration upon personality” (p. 142). Allport was perhaps the first to
view one’s predisposition toward spirituality and religion as an individual difference factor. He was also a pioneer in exploring the relationship between religiosity and prejudice, specifically ethnic prejudice. In one of the first studies to examine this relationship, Allport (1954) found that while, on average, church attenders seemed to be more prejudiced than non-attenders, a significant minority of church attenders were actually less prejudiced. This finding led Allport (1954) to distinguish between those who practiced “institutionalized religion” or who evidenced an extrinsic religious orientation, from those who practiced “interiorized religion” or evidenced an intrinsic religious orientation. The extrinsic religious orientation characterized individuals who were motivated to use their religion to achieve social recognition or personal security. Extrinsic individuals, also more likely to conform to popular social trends such as prejudice, were conceptualized as being less tolerant. In contrast, the intrinsic religious orientation characterized individuals who were motivated to participate in religion as an end in itself and to practice maturity in terms of devotion. Intrinsic individuals, also more likely to live out religious teachings regarding brotherhood and acceptance, were conceptualized to practice tolerance towards out-groups.

While the idea of religious orientation as a motivating variable for “how” individuals practice their religion was groundbreaking at the time, mixed empirical evidence exists to support the extrinsic/intrinsic distinction (Batson et al., 1993). Additionally, concerns regarding the conceptualization and psychometric properties of the scales measuring these constructs have made intrinsic and extrinsic distinctions insufficient on their own in differentiating between religious individuals who are prejudiced or not (Batson et al., 1993; Hunsberger, 1995; Hunsberger & Jackson, 2005).
Currently, the most commonly cited and researched religious orientation, having supplanted the intrinsic/extrinsic distinction, is religious fundamentalism.

**Religious Fundamentalism and Prejudice**

In addition to the aforementioned predictions regarding the associations of the intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientations with prejudice, Allport and Ross (1967) identified an additional discriminating factor. They found that a cognitive style (at the time, unnamed) existed which predisposed individuals to be indiscriminately pro-religious, and that this predisposition predicted high levels of prejudice. This early finding seems to have foreshadowed what would become the most extensively researched religious orientation: religious fundamentalism. Religious fundamentalism (RF) is the perspective that one set of religious teachings exists which contains the ultimate truth about humanity and God and that those who adhere to these fundamental teachings have an exceptional relationship with God (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992). Typically measured by the Revised Religious Fundamentalism Scale (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 2004), RF is conceptualized as a religious orientation or a set of “meta-beliefs” dictating how specific orthodox beliefs are organized, interpreted, and even used to create judgments of others. Serving as one of the most commonly studied predictors of religiously oriented prejudice (e.g., Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992; Hunsberger, Owusu, & Duck, 1999; Rowatt & Franklin, 2004; Ysseldyk, Matheson, & Anisman, 2010). RF is not specific to one particular religion, but is evidenced in people from various religious backgrounds (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 2005). Research indicates that individuals high in RF are also apt to express a number of secular prejudices toward various out-groups, including African Americans, women, communists, and gay men (Altemeyer &
Hunsberger, 1992; Kirkpatrick, 1993; McFarland, 1989). Several studies have demonstrated, however, that individuals high in RF tend to hold the most negative attitudes toward religious out-groups specifically (Altemeyer, 2003; Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 2004; Jackson & Hunsberger, 1999).

In a study examining college students and their parents (Altemeyer, 2003), RF was found to be strongly correlated with RE ($r = .82$ and $.78$, respectively). RF’s correlation with RE exceeded its correlations with other prejudices including racial prejudice ($r = .25$ and $.30$) and prejudice towards LGB individuals ($r = .61$ and $.52$). Therefore, while religious fundamentalists tend to hold prejudices toward multiple out-groups, it seems that their strongest bias is towards those of a different religion. Despite the high correlations observed between RE and RF, each construct is intended to be conceptually distinct, with RE reflecting attitudes and behavioral intentions toward religious out-groups, and RF representing the lens through which individuals perceive and think about such attitudes and behaviors. Therefore, it could be reasoned that individuals who possess high levels of both RF and RE would be likely to view their religiously ethnocentric beliefs as truth about humanity and Deity, and that possessing such truth provides them with a uniquely close relationship with the Deity.

Jackson and Hunsberger (1999) also explored the relationships between RF and attitudes towards both religious out-groups, (i.e., non-believers and atheists), and religious in-groups, (i.e., as believers and Christians). Results of ANOVAs indicated that individuals high in RF rated non-believers and atheists significantly lower than they did believers and Christians. In contrast, individuals low in RF did not evidence significant differences in their ratings of the four groups. In fact, individuals low in RF tended to
rate all groups relatively favorably. Therefore, high levels of RF predicted positive attitudes towards one’s in-group and negative attitudes, or prejudice, towards individuals who did not identify with one’s Christian faith. While providing useful information regarding the relationship of RF and prejudice towards religious out-groups, this study is limited by only focusing on prejudice towards “atheists” and “non-believers” instead of a more generalized in-group vs. out-group judgment based on religion (i.e., RE).

While a limited number of studies have assessed the relationship between RF and religion-based prejudice (including RE) specifically, information can be gleaned from comparable research in which RF has been found to predict prejudices that inherently contain a value/moral component (e.g., prejudice towards LGB individuals), given that such prejudices are often associated with and/or prescribed by certain religious beliefs. A review of the literature indicates that RF has consistently been found to account for more variance in value-oriented prejudices than strictly secular ones (e.g., racism; Dudley & Mulvey, 2009; Laythe, Finkel, Bringle, & Kirkpatrick, 2002). For instance, Dudley and Mulvey (2009) found that, in a sample of white heterosexual participants, RF differentially predicted prejudice towards different types of out-groups. While individuals high in RF actually reported tolerance of African Americans, they reported intolerance toward LGB persons. Dudley and Mulvey (2009) surmised that RF’s stronger relation to LGB prejudice reflects the fact that many religions profess values of disapproval toward the LGB lifestyle. Another possible explanation is that those who are members of religious-in groups (in this case, high-RF persons) may perceive LGB persons to be less similar to themselves and therefore to violate their group’s religious beliefs.
Several studies have attempted to clarify RF’s seemingly differential relationships with varying types of prejudice (i.e., toward secular versus value violating out-groups). In one such study conducted with college students from a Midwestern university, Laythe et al. (2002) found that the relationship of RF with ethnic prejudice was largely accounted for by right-wing authoritarianism (defined as a tendency to favor traditional values and be submissive to authority [Altemeyer, 1998]; see below for a more in-depth discussion) and Christian orthodoxy (defined as explicit religious belief content [Hunsberger, 1992]; see below). The results of multiple regression analyses demonstrated that when all three variables were entered together in the analysis, RF did not uniquely predict ethnic prejudice. However, RF was uniquely and positively related to ethnic prejudice when only Christian orthodoxy was controlled, and RF was uniquely and negatively related to ethnic prejudice when only right-wing authoritarianism was controlled. Therefore, it seems that the variance that RF shares with Christian orthodoxy may predict tolerance toward ethnic minorities, based on the religious beliefs that encourage such attitudes. In contrast, the variance shared between RF and right-wing authoritarianism seems to predict intolerance of ethnic out-groups, especially those out-groups that are perceived as a threat. Finally, the finding that RF was unrelated to ethnic prejudice when both RWA and CO were controlled may be due to the fact that these variables, having competing associations with ethnic prejudice, “canceled” one another out.

Laythe et al. (2002) found a very different picture when they related RF, right-wing authoritarianism, and Christian orthodoxy to prejudice toward LGB individuals, which they conceptualized as a type of religious out-group prejudice. Specifically, Laythe
et al. found that RF uniquely and positively predicted prejudice towards LGB individuals ($\beta = .33, p < .01$) when right-wing authoritarianism ($\beta = .44, p < .01$) and Christian orthodoxy ($\beta = -.25, p < .01$) were statistically controlled; collectively, the three variables accounted for 37% of the variance in LGB prejudice. Therefore, RF accounts for unique variance in the prediction of LGB prejudice, which contains a religious/value-violating component, above and beyond its overlap with RWA and CO beliefs.

Interestingly, Laythe et al. (2002) also noted that RWA and CO for 60% of the variance in RF, with each variable contributing unique variance to the prediction of RF. The significant relations of RWA and CO to RF, coupled with the unique, positive relation between RF and LGB prejudice, are consistent with the possibility that RWA and CO exert at least part of their effects on value-violating-type prejudices (including RE) through RF. Such mediated (i.e., transmitted) effects are consistent with current conceptualizations of both RWA and CO. For example, Hunsberger (1995) and Altemeyer and Hunsberger (2004) posited that RWA is a personality trait that predisposes individuals to RF, with RF serving as a “religious manifestation” (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 2004, p. 49) of RWA. In a similar vein, while CO has been found to predict tolerance, it is plausible that if one’s beliefs are interpreted as Divine truth and used to create distinctions between groups (i.e., interpreted via the lens of RF) such an interpretation would predict RE.

Overall, the current body of literature indicates that RF is a strong and positive predictor of religiously oriented prejudices, particularly RE. Additionally, both individual difference (i.e., right-wing authoritarianism) and social learning (i.e., Christian orthodoxy) variables have been shown to positively predict RF. This set of findings,
coupled with theoretical speculation (e.g., Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 2004; Hunsberger, 1995), suggest the possibility that RF may serve as a mediator variable through which more distal variables transmit their effect to RE. Future research examining such a possibility seems warranted.

**Right-Wing Authoritarianism and Prejudice**

As previously mentioned in the discussion of RF, right-wing authoritarianism (RWA; Altemeyer, 1981, 1988, 1996) is defined as an individual difference construct based on the original concept of the “authoritarian” or “prefascist” personality developed by Adorondo and colleagues (Adorando, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950). Conceptualized as a unitary social attitudinal dimension, it is comprised of the three interrelated core facets of conventionalism (tendency to favor traditional and conservative values and practices), authoritarian submission (tendency to submit to authorities), and authoritarian aggression (tendency to be aggressive toward targets endorsed by authority or society), and typically is measured by Altemeyer’s (1981, 1998) Right Wing Authoritarian Scale. Individuals high in RWA “tend to favor traditional values, are submissive to authority figures, are highly ethnocentric, and can be expected to act aggressively toward out-groups” (Altemeyer, 1998, p. 465). High levels of RWA are thought to predispose individuals to see the world as a dangerous place and, therefore, motivate them to be prejudiced towards groups that threaten social order, stability, and security (Asbrock, Sibley, & Duckitt, 2010). Multiple studies have documented the relationship of RWA with prejudice toward various ethnic and gender-based out-groups including African Americans (e.g., Lambert & Chastenn, 1997), LGB persons (e.g., Altemeyer, 1998), women (e.g., Altemeyer, 1998), Jews (McFarland et al., 1993),
Turkish immigrants (e.g., Verkuyten & Hagendoorn, 1998), Asians and aboriginals in Australia (Heaven & St. Quintin, 2003). RWA has also been found to positively relate to RE specifically (Altemeyer, 2004).

In samples of college students and their parents, Altemeyer (2004) identified a positive relationship between RWA and RE. Results of ANOVAs indicated that individuals who reported high levels of RWA also scored significantly higher on a measure of RE when compared to their low RWA counterparts. Additionally, high-RWA persons also scored higher on a measure of RF when compared to their low-RWA counterparts. Therefore, it seems that RWA is a positive predictor of both RE and RF, in addition to serving as a well-documented predictor of numerous other prejudices. While serving as an extensively explored predictor of prejudice, the literature still remains somewhat divided regarding the precise conceptualization of RWA.

RWA has historically been referred to as a personality dimension in past literature due to evidence of RWA’s relationship to early temperament and moderate heritability (McCourt, Bouchard, Lykken, Tellegen, & Keyes, 1999). More recently, Ekehammar et al. (2004) conceptualized RWA as a characteristic adaptation, or expression, of more biologically based dispositions. According to McCrae and Costa’s (1999) Five-Factor Theory (FFT) of personality, characteristic adaptations are defined as psychological features that develop from the interaction of more biologically based basic tendencies (e.g., the Big Five personality traits) and external/environmental influences. Within this structure, basic traits affect characteristic adaptations, which in turn affect specific thoughts, feelings, and behaviors. Characteristic adaptations, therefore, are considered composites of inherited dispositions that are shaped by environmental influences and
include a variety of psychological constructs such as personal strivings, attitudes, beliefs, and preferences.

The conceptualization of RWA as a characteristic adaptation bridges the gap between the personality literature and the somewhat competing social psychology literature that views RWA as a socialized, intergroup phenomenon. For instance, research has found that social learning factors, such as parental influence and weekly church attendance, may shape RWA (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992). In fact, Altemeyer and Hunsberger (1992) found that individuals who were raised with no religion tended to have lower levels of RWA than those who were raised in religious families. Overall, labeling RWA as a characteristic adaptation integrates the somewhat contending views which dichotomize RWA as either a personality or a social learning variable. Furthermore, McCrae and Costa’s (1999) FFT posits that characteristic adaptations, not traits themselves, are responsible for directly influencing individual experiences and behaviors (e.g., prejudice). (Traits/basic tendencies are assumed to exert their influence on experience and behavior indirectly, through characteristic adaptations.) Therefore, it seems that RWA may be best conceptualized as a characteristic adaptation that has a more proximal relationship with prejudice than do the Big Five factors, serving as a medium through which such factors relate to RE. Indeed, empirical evidence supports this conceptualization.

Ekehammar et al. (2004) examined several path models in order to clarify the relationships among the Big Five personality factors (i.e., neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness), RWA, social dominance orientation (SDO; see below) and generalized prejudice, operationalized as a latent variable
composed of racism, sexism, LGB prejudice, and prejudice toward individuals with mental disabilities. In a sample of university students, three causal models were explored. In the first hypothesized model, the Big Five factors elicited their influence on generalized prejudice through the mediators of RWA and SDO. In the second alternative model, the Big Five factors preceded generalized prejudice, which in turn preceded RWA and social dominance orientation. In the third alternative model, though theoretically unlikely, RWA and SDO preceded the Big Five factors which preceded generalized prejudice.

The first model, as hypothesized, was found to have the best fit with the data ($\chi^2(8) = 8.02, p = 0.43$, SRMR = 0.027, RMSEA = 0.004, CFI = 1; Ekehammar et al., 2004). Furthermore, consistent with McCrae and Costa’s (1999) personality theory, none of the Big Five factors had direct relationships with generalized prejudice. Rather, all effects were indirect and mediated through RWA and SDO. More specifically, the direct paths from Conscientiousness ($\beta = .22, p < .05$), Extraversion ($\beta = .21, p < .05$), and Openness to Experience ($\beta = -.34, p < .05$) to RWA, and the direct path from RWA ($\beta = .30, p < .05$) to generalized prejudice, were all statistically significant. Additionally, the paths from Agreeableness to SDO ($\beta = -.42, p < .05$), and from SDO to generalized prejudice ($\beta = .65, p < .05$) were also significant. Tests of indirect effects revealed that Conscientiousness, Extraversion, and Openness had significant indirect effects on prejudice via RWA, whereas Agreeableness had a significant indirect effect on prejudice via SDO.

Overall, Ekehammar et al. (2004) provided empirical support for conceptualizing RWA and social dominance orientation as characteristic adaptations that serve as more
proximal and robust influences on prejudice than do the Big Five personality traits. Consistent with this idea, the authors noted that the direct effects of the personality factors on RWA and SDO, as well as the indirect effects of personality on prejudice, though statistically significant, were weak when compared with the direct effects of RWA and SDO on prejudice. Ekehammar et al. also noted that, although significant, the moderate proportion of variance in generalized prejudice explained by their model “leaves room for other influencing factors, such as the more genuine social psychological factors based on, for example, social identity [Tajfel & Turner, 1986]” (p. 478). Therefore, a model that contains both personality-related and social psychological variables would likely account for a greater amount of variance in generalized prejudice. A similar argument could be made for a model specifically predicting RE as well.

Other research on the relationship between RWA and religion-based prejudice (in this case prejudice toward LGB individuals) has conceptualized RWA in a similar fashion as Ekehammar et al. (2004). Although describing RWA as being analogous to “measures of cognitive rigidity” (p. 851) (versus a personality-type variable, per se), Johnson et al. (2011) framed RWA as a characteristic adaptation of basic tendencies that is shaped by religiosity. In their study of 289 undergraduate psychology students, support was established for a model in which both RWA and RF completely mediated the relationship between general religiosity and prejudice towards LGB individuals, with RWA accounting for 9% and RF accounting for 35% of the variance in LGB prejudice. This study demonstrated that both RWA and RF uniquely contributed to the prediction of LGB prejudice when included in the same model. Therefore, it appears that both variables would be important to include in future research predicting RE. Additionally,
the positioning of religiosity--measured in this study as a latent variable composed of intrinsic religiosity, religious behaviors, and general religiosity--as a precursor of RWA and RF may also inform future research. On one hand, this sequencing seems counterintuitive given that RWA has been found to be closely related to the more stable Big-Five factors and, therefore, should conceptually precede religiosity in a causal model. On the other hand, conceptualizing religion as a generalized, stable (i.e., trait-like) phenomenon that causally precedes RWA challenges researchers to consider the possibility that RWA is a transmitter variable, i.e., a mechanism through which more basic dispositional tendencies might exert their influence on prejudice. Clearly, such a proposition requires further empirical investigation.

Overall, the evidence to date suggests that RWA may serve as a characteristic adaptation that mediates the relationships between stable personality factors (as well as “religiosity”) and value-oriented types of prejudice. Furthermore, preliminary research (i.e., Altemeyer, 2004) has shown that RWA is a positive and direct predictor of RE specifically, with further research being needed to replicate this finding. Finally, although RWA is positively related to RF (Altemeyer, 2004; Laythe et al., 2002), both variables appear to contribute uniquely to value/religion-based (i.e., LGB) prejudice (Johnson et al., 2011). Extrapolating from these findings, future investigators of factors contributing to RE are encouraged to include both RWA and RF (and perhaps social identity-related variables [see Ekehammar et al., 2004]) in their models. In addition to RWA as a strong and positive predictor of RE, the prediction of RE has been further clarified by research that has included RWA’s individual-difference counterpart, social dominance orientation.
Social Dominance Orientation and Prejudice

Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) refers to the tendency to prefer that intergroup relations be hierarchical, not egalitarian (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994). Individuals high in SDO are likely to believe that social inequality is “fair” on the grounds that certain people are innately more deserving of privilege than others. While a limited number of studies have demonstrated a relationship between SDO and RE (e.g., Altemeyer, 2004; Banyasz, Tokar, & Kaut, 2013), SDO has consistently been linked with secular prejudices including cultural elitism, racism, nationalism, generalized prejudice, and ethnic prejudice (e.g., Pratto, Sidanious, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994; Ekehammer et al., 2004; Ekehammer, Akrami, & Yang-Wallentin, 2009). Conceptually, SDO should relate positively to any ideology that legitimizes group-based inequality (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994).

As mentioned earlier in the discussion of RWA, Altemeyer (2004) explored the relationships among SDO, RWA, and RE with a sample of undergraduate students and their parents. He found that, while relatively few in number, the “most prejudiced people” are those who score high in both RWA and SDO. Results of ANOVAs indicated that individuals who scored high on both RWA and SDO \((n = 305)\) also reported the highest RE scores when compared to the rest of the sample \((n = 1,660)\). Furthermore, while the combination of high ratings on both RWA and SDO seemed to pack the greatest “prejudicial punch,” individuals high in SDO alone still scored higher on RE than those low in RWA or SDO. Therefore, while historically being thought of as a more secular prejudicial construct, initial evidence identifies a relationship between SDO and RE, with further research required to replicate this finding.
In a manner similar to RWA, SDO has been found to mediate the relationships between the Big Five personality factors and both generalized and ethnic prejudice (Ekehammar et al., 2004; Ekehammar et al., 2009). For example, Agreeableness was found to have a negative, indirect relationship with generalized prejudice through SDO (Ekehammar et al., 2004). Therefore, like RWA, research supports the conceptualization of SDO as a characteristic adaptation that serves as a more proximal individual difference construct through which more basic tendencies exert their influence on prejudice. Research has also found that RWA and SDO each account for unique variance in the prediction of various types of prejudice (Duckitt, 2006; Asbrock et al., 2010); therefore, any comprehensive test of individual difference variables contributing to prejudice (including RE) should include both SDO and RWA.

In contrast to RWA, which is conceptualized as an intra-group phenomenon, SDO is conceptualized as an inter-group phenomenon motivated by competition, dominance, and superiority, particularly over groups perceived to be socially subordinate or low in status (Asbrock, Sibley, & Duckitt, 2010; Duckitt, 2011). While RWA is conceptually thought to predict intragroup prejudice (i.e., prejudice against individuals who threaten the stability and values of an in-group), SDO is believed to predict prejudice toward out-group members, particularly those perceived as being inferior. Therefore, RWA and SDO complement one another by differentially predicting different types of and different components of prejudice, while only possessing a modest average correlation of .20 (Altemeyer, 2004). Research has supported the differential predictive power of these variables. For instance, Duckitt (2006) found that while RWA was significantly and positively correlated with value-oriented prejudices such as prejudice toward rock stars
and drug dealers, SDO was significantly and positively correlated with prejudice towards socially oppressed out-groups such as racial minorities and women. Currently, the relationship that SDO has with value-oriented prejudices, and with RE specifically, requires further clarification.

Hunsberger and Jackson (2005) speculated that “religiosity may be associated with prejudice if religion justifies inequalities” (p. 817). Recall that a fundamentalist religious (RF) perspective includes the belief that adherents to fundamental teachings share a special relationship with God (Hunsberger, 1995). Therefore, RF implies a hierarchical distinction between privileged adherents and disadvantaged non-adherents. Thus, it is plausible that SDO, which justifies intergroup inequality, may exert part of its influence on RE through a religious fundamentalist ideology. Despite the plausibility of this argument, the empirical relation between measures of SDO and RF tends to be quite modest (i.e., \( r < .10 \); Altemeyer, 2004). Additionally, in a model identifying predictors of RE, SDO was found to relate directly and positively with RE, but did not evidence an indirect relationship with RE through the mediator of RF (Banyasz, Tokar, & Kaut, 2013). Therefore, it may be the case that SDO predicts RE simply because individuals high in SDO tend to derogate and perceive religious out-groups as inferior, not because of their greater adherence to fundamentalist religious ideology.

Overall, SDO is defined as a characteristic adaptation that, similar to RWA, appears to mediate the relationship between the Big Five personality factors and various forms of prejudice. SDO has been found to positively predict various types of prejudice, including RE specifically, with further research needed to replicate this relationship. The previously summarized literature identifies RF, RWA, and SDO as individual difference
constructs that all positively predict RE. However, given the conceptual overlap among the three constructs (most notably RF and RWA), future research is needed to clarify their unique contributions to the prediction of RE. Furthermore, as mentioned previously, social learning/identity variables have been posited to play an equally important and complementary role to individual difference variables in the prediction of prejudice generally, and RE specifically (Ekehammar et al., 2004).

**Social Learning Perspectives on Prejudice**

In contrast to the individual differences perspective which implies the presence of specific personality-related variables (e.g., SDO) and/or cognitive styles (e.g., RF) as contributing to RE, the social learning perspective posits that RE is a function of identification with one’s religious group and the associated belief system (Jackson & Hunsberger, 1999). The social learning perspective assumes that religious group identification results from the same social processes that lead to ethnic, racial, or political group identification (Jackson & Hunsberger, 1999). Strong social group identification has been found to predict prejudice in explicit and implicit ways, as explained by the minimal group effect and social identity theory. The minimal group effect states that inherent to any group membership is a certain degree of ethnocentrism (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). This prejudicial “template” established by the minimal group effect is thought to become a generalized way of thinking and acting, spreading to other prejudices (including those not specifically taught) toward various out-groups. This concept attests to the assumptions of the *generalized prejudice issue* (mentioned previously) by explaining how individuals with one type of prejudice also identify with other types of prejudice. In support of the minimal group effect, Altemeyer (2003) found that
individuals who reported strong training in identifying with their family religion also scored high on measures of RF and RE, as well as on measures of hostility toward gay men and racial and ethnic minorities. While these individuals reported being specifically taught prejudicial beliefs toward gay men, they did not report being taught specific prejudicial beliefs regarding ethnicity and race. Altemeyer speculated that these individuals’ strong religious training and identity may have contributed to the creation of a generalized prejudicial template that was reflected in racial and ethnic prejudice as well. Indeed, other research has demonstrated a positive association between religious in-group identification and racial prejudice (Hall, Matz, & Wood, 2010).

Social identity theory expands on the minimal group effect by stating that identifying with one’s social group leads to prejudice towards out-groups, typically implicitly, by creating the schema of “our group” and “their group” (Hunsberger & Jackson, 2005; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Given that identifying with any social group creates a sense of support, stability, and self-esteem, people naturally perceive their group as superior in order to maintain a positive identity, which leads to prejudice towards out-groups (Ekehammar, Akrami, & Yany-Wallentin, 2009). Therefore, the in-group vs. out-group distinction created by social group identification (in this case religious group identification) is reinforced by feelings of belonging and positive self-worth. Social identity theory has also received empirical support. Studies have shown that, especially when one’s religious group identification becomes circumstantially salient (i.e., becomes threatened in some way), individuals who strongly identify with their religious group tend to make negative evaluations of religious out-groups as a form of identity preservation (e.g., Burris & Jackson, 2000; Ysseldyk et al., 2011)
Religious Group Identification and Prejudice

Religious group identification (RGI), or the tendency for individuals to consider their religious group membership as a salient component of their identity, provides a unique context for meaning making in which individuals can cultivate a positive self-image (Hunsberger & Jackson, 2005). As previously stated, by viewing one’s religious identity as superior to that of others, an individual enhances his/her own self-image and fosters a bias towards religious out-groups. Therefore, such a process could lead to in-group vs. out-group distinctions as manifested in RE. While little, if any, research has been conducted on the relationship between RGI and RE specifically (as measured via Altemeyer’s [2003] Religious Ethnocentrism Scale), related research can inform predictions between these two constructs.

Studies have revealed a positive relationship between RGI and prejudice towards various religious out-groups. For example, Jackson and Hunsberger (1999) found that stronger levels of RGI, as measured by an adapted version of Luhtanen and Crocker’s (1992) Collective Self-Esteem Scale, predicted significantly more negative appraisals of non-believers and atheists (out-group) and more positive appraisals of Christians and believers (in-group). In a similar study, Johnson et al. (2012) assessed the relationship between religious group membership and prejudice towards various religious out-groups. Results based on 144 undergraduate students indicated that stronger religious group membership, as measured via reports of spirituality and religiosity, predicted more negative attitudes toward both gay men and specific religious out-groups (i.e., atheists and Muslims).
Additional studies have explored the relationship between salience of RGI and prejudice towards religious out-groups. For example, in a study of 96 undergraduate students, Burris and Jackson (2000) found that religious individuals reported significantly higher levels of RGI in response to information that threatened their religious group identity compared to information that bolstered this identity, perhaps in order to maintain the positive self-esteem associated with their religious group membership. In line with social identity theory, this suggests that negative perceptions of out-groups exist insomuch as out-groups are perceived as threatening the values or resources of one’s religious group, and, in turn, one’s social identity. Such threats may elicit not only negative attitudes, but also emotional responses of anger, disgust, or even fear (Ysseldyk et al., 2011).

In a study examining the role of the salience of RGI in determining attitudinal and affective evaluations of religious out-groups, Ysseldyk et al. (2011) found that, when faced with a specific threat to their RGI, participants who considered their religion to be a salient component of their identity were more likely to report sadness, anger, and intentions of confrontation (towards out-group members) when compared to individuals with a less salient religious identity. Furthermore, participants with salient religious identities, while evidencing adaptive responses (e.g., problem solving, humor) to secular identity threats (e.g., university affiliation), displayed emotionally charged (e.g., rumination) and confrontational responses to religious identity threats. Therefore, it seems that high levels of RGI are likely related to both attitudinal and affective responses towards out-groups, particularly under conditions when one’s RGI becomes salient.

Ysseldyk et al. (2011) also pointed out that “the collective aspects of the group affiliation
appeared to predominate, relative to the guidance offered by the system of beliefs inherent to the identity” (p. 144). Therefore, it seems that the degree of identification with one’s religious group may potentially have the “power” to override specific religious teachings of acceptance and brotherhood.

Finally, whereas the aforementioned theoretical and empirical literature indicates a likely positive and direct relationship between RGI and RE, somewhat competing research points to a potentially indirect relationship between the variables. For instance, Jackson and Hunsberger (1999) conducted a study to explore the relationships of RGI, RF, and Christian orthodoxy (see below) with attitudes towards religious out-groups (i.e., atheists and non-believers). RGI, RF, and Christian orthodoxy were all found to be positively intercorrelated and to be related to negative attitudes toward atheists/non-believers (Jackson & Hunsberger, 1999). However, follow-up partial correlations revealed that RF and Christian orthodoxy both uniquely predicted negative attitudes toward atheists/non-believers, whereas RGI did not. These findings suggest that RGI might exert its effect on prejudice towards religious out-groups (i.e., RE) via RF and/or CO, with RF being the more likely mediator. Furthermore, from a theoretical standpoint, it seems possible that RGI would be more likely to predict prejudice towards religious out-groups if a prejudicial belief system was also simultaneously present. For instance, it may be that simply being a member of a religious group does not alone predict out-group derogation, but rather the perceived supremacy that comes from the belief system that one’s group is the “correct one” with the “correct set” of beliefs (i.e., RF; Ysseldyk, Matheson, & Anisman, 2010). While this caveat may seem to undermine the suppositions of the minimal group effect and social identity theory (which seem to imply a direct
relationship between social identity and prejudice), it may be that coexisting beliefs of perceived supremacy (i.e., RF) may underlie the esteem serving function established by social identity theory, at least in the case of religiously oriented prejudices.

Overall, it seems that RGI should relate positively with RE, especially in individuals whose religious identity is currently being threatened and/or who possess a prejudicial lens for viewing their religious identity. While studies provide preliminary evidence to inform the prediction that a positive relationship exists between RGI and RE, empirical verification of this relation is needed. Further research is also needed to clarify the potential mechanisms through which RGI may relate to prejudice.

**Christian Orthodoxy and Prejudice**

Christian orthodoxy is the “acceptance of well-defined, central tenants of the Christian religion” (Fullerton & Hunsberger, 1982, p. 318). This construct is typically referred to as *Christian* orthodoxy (CO) given that orthodoxy, or adherence to one’s religious doctrine, has most frequently been studied with Christian populations using Hunsberger’s (1989) Christian Orthodoxy Scale. CO may be considered an important component of one’s social identity inasmuch as orthodoxy reflects an adherence to an accepted set of common core beliefs shared among members of an identifiable group linked by a common belief system (Ysseldyk et al., 2010). Examples of CO include adherence to beliefs such as “love thy neighbor” or “there is life after death.” CO has the potential to contribute to various types of prejudice, particularly if one’s religious beliefs prescribe prejudice (e.g., being gay is a sin) or are interpreted in a prejudicial way (e.g., interpreting Christian Bible verses to indicate that women are the inferior sex). Even so,
research indicates that religious beliefs (i.e., CO) possess a complex and slightly unclear relationship with prejudice.

CO has historically possessed varying relationships with different types of prejudice. For instance, initial research on CO found that while CO had a significant positive relationship with prejudice towards communists, CO possessed a negative relationship with prejudice towards Blacks and women, while possessing a non-significant relationship with prejudice towards LGB individuals (Kirkpatrick, 1993). In contrast, other research has found that while CO negatively predicted racial prejudice (Rowatt & Franklin, 2004; Laythe et al., 2001), it positively predicted prejudice towards LGB individuals. While no precise explanation exists to explain these seemingly contradicting findings, it remains probable that Christian doctrines most frequently proscribe racism but may promote negative beliefs towards LGB lifestyles.

While little to no research has explored the relationship between CO and the construct of RE specifically, CO has been found to predict prejudice towards specific religious out-groups. In a sample of 152 college students, CO significantly and positively correlated with an explicit preference for Christians over Muslims ($r = .64$), as well as implicit prejudice towards Muslims ($r = .19$). Jackson and Hunsberger (1999) also identified negative relationships between CO and attitudes toward those who identify as non-believers ($r = -.44, p < .001$) and atheists ($r = -.5, p < .001$). From a theoretical standpoint, it seems plausible that CO would serve as a predictor of any type of prejudice in which such a prejudice was either directly or indirectly promoted (or, at a minimum, not proscribed) by one’s religious doctrines. Since many Christian churches teach that Christianity is the one “true” path, and that the acceptance of Jesus Christ as one’s savior
is a necessary prerequisite to eternal life, Christian beliefs could potentially predict RE, especially if one’s beliefs contribute to in-group v. out-group distinctions.

Additionally, while theoretically and empirically distinct, several studies have documented a strong positive relationship between CO and RF, which, as discussed earlier, strongly relates to RE (e.g., Jackson & Hunsberger, 1999; Kirkpatrick, 1993; Laythe et al., 1999; 2000; Rowatt et al., 2005). While CO and RF are distinct in that CO explicitly proscribes various forms of prejudice and RF includes restrictive attitudes toward different, particularly religious, out-groups (Laythe et al., 2002), research has consistently shown that CO and RF are correlated positively and robustly (e.g., Jackson & Hunsberger, 1999; Laythe et al., 2002; Rowatt & Franklin, 2004). The strong correlation between CO and RF potentially confounds each variable’s relation with prejudice in general, as well as with RE specifically. In an effort to disentangle the overlapping effects of CO and RF on prejudice, researchers have used multiple regression analyses to identify each variable’s unique contribution. Studies of non-religious (e.g., racial) prejudice have shown that RF uniquely and positively related to prejudice when CO was statistically controlled, whereas CO was unrelated, or even inversely related, to prejudice when RF was controlled (e.g., Kirkpatrick, 1993; Laythe et al., 2002). These findings clearly demonstrate that RF and CO, while related, are distinct constructs with different patterns of relations to religious and non-religious forms of prejudice. Also, given that CO sometimes exhibits an inverse relationship with prejudice, it may be possible that a fundamentalist “lens” in viewing one’s religious beliefs plays an important role in “transforming” such beliefs to prejudice. While theoretically probable, these propositions require empirical support.
Overall, CO is the adherence to traditional Christian beliefs (Fullerton & Hunsberger, 1982). Past research indicates that while CO has been found to predict tolerance towards some out-groups (e.g., racial minorities, women), this construct is apt to predict prejudices associated with morality and religion (e.g., prejudice towards LGB individuals and religious out-groups). While it seems plausible that CO could be related to RE, especially if one’s beliefs are used to make in-group v. out-group distinctions, empirical support is needed to confirm this hypothesis. Empirical support is also needed to clarify the relationships among CO, RF, and RE.

Furthermore, given the moderate to strong correlations between all of the aforementioned individual difference (i.e., RF, RWA, SDO) and social identity (i.e., RGI, CO) predictors, future research would benefit from examining these predictors simultaneously in order to differentiate their unique contributions to RE. Previous research has typically explored the relationships between only one or two of these predictor variables and RE using correlations and/or regression analyses. Examining a comprehensive individual difference-social identity model could also potentially clarify *how* these different variables relate to RE. For example, previous research has suggested that some individual difference (e.g., RWA) and social identity (e.g., CO) variables may transmit at least part of their effect on RE via the mediator of RF (Banyasz et al., 2013; Jackson & Hunsberger, 1999). Therefore, future studies exploring the potential paths through which personality/individual difference and social identity variables relate to RE clearly are warranted.

**Towards a More Comprehensive Model of Religious Ethnocentrism**
While previous prejudice research has focused either on personality traits or social identity variables as the primary predictors of RE, recent studies regarding non-religion based prejudices have attempted to unite these competing viewpoints by developing models that include both types of predictors, with the aim of accounting for more variance in prejudice than either category of predictors on its own. Such research can inform future models of RE.

In one such model predicting ethnic prejudice, Ekehammar et al. (2009) conducted one of the first studies to include both personality and social identity variables within the same model. The five-factor model (FFM) of personality was operationalized via the Big Five Inventory; SDO and RWA—the other personality variables of interest—were operationalized using the Social Dominance Orientation scale (Pratto et al., 1994) and a 15-item version of the Right Wing Authoritarianism scale (Zakrisson 2005), respectively. Social identity was operationalized using a 7-item measure of ethnic identification developed by the authors for their current study. After collecting self-report data from 182 students, hierarchical regressions demonstrated that the combined social identity-personality model was a stronger predictor of ethnic prejudice than either the social or personality models on their own. Similar results were found in the prediction of sexism.

Researchers studying RE have similarly made a case for exploring more comprehensive models. Jackson and Hunsberger (1999) posit that while social identity variables (i.e., RGI, CO) are more likely to explain between-group prejudices (i.e., prejudice directed from a religious group towards a religious out-group), individual difference variables (i.e., RWA, SDO, RF) may be more likely to explain within-group
differences in RE (i.e., prejudices of religious in-group members towards individuals within their own group). Based on this, they suggest that “if minor individual differences exist in terms of the way in which people experience and express prejudice, then an interactionist approach to the problem of prejudice against religious out-groups would be most accurate . . . integrating inter-group perspectives with the more common individual-difference approaches in this area of study is likely to be quite fruitful” (p. 519).

Based on the limitations of current empirical findings, as well as calls from researchers, a combined individual difference-social identity model holds the potential for painting the clearest and most comprehensive picture of factors contributing to RE, and examining such a model appears to be the obvious next step in understanding this construct. One study to date has addressed some of the limitations of previous research by evaluating a more comprehensive model of RE.

**Combined Personality and Social Identity Model of RE**

Banyasz, Tokar, and Kaut (in press) explored perhaps the first model of RE that included both individual-difference and social identity predictors. A sample of 158 Christian college students from a midwestern university (119 women, 39 men) completed self-report measures of RE, RF, RWA, SDO, CO, and RGI, as well as a measure of impression management (IM). Given the significant and robust positive relationship between RF and RE, as well as the previously documented positive relationships between RF and RWA, RGI, and CO, it was hypothesized that RF would serve as the mechanism through which these other variables would relate (at least partially) to RE. (Given previously documented low correlations between SDO and RF [Altemeyer, 2004], a path from SDO to RF was not predicted.) Specifically, Banyasz et al. hypothesized that RF
would partially mediate the effects of RWA and CO on RE, and completely mediate the effect of RGI on RE. Additional direct paths from SDO to RE and from IM (the covariate) to both RF and RE were also included in the model. Two path analyses were conducted to test the fit of the data to the hypothesized partially mediated model (Model 1) and a slightly modified (i.e., trimmed) variant of that model (Model 2). Model-data fit was evaluated using the $\chi^2$ significance test, comparative fit index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis fit index (TLI), root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), and standardized root mean square residual (SRMR).

Model 1 possessed an excellent fit to the data, $\chi^2 (2, N = 156) = 4.48, p = .11$, CFI = .992, TLI = .956, RMSEA = .089, SRMR = .014. Hypothesized positive paths from RF, RWA, and SDO to RE were statistically significant, whereas the hypothesized path from CO to RE was not. Hypothesized positive paths from RWA, CO, and RGI to RF—the proposed mediator—were statistically significant. Hypothesized indirect (i.e., mediated) effects of RWA, CO, and RGI on RE via RF also were significant. Finally, IM did not have a significant direct effect on either RF or RE.

Based on the results for the first model, several non-significant paths were trimmed to represent more parsimoniously the structural relations among the variables of interest, resulting in the final model. Specifically, direct paths from CO and IM to RE, and the direct path from IM to RF were fixed to zero. Because IM did not uniquely predict either RF or RE, covariances between IM and the primary exogenous variables (i.e., SDO, RWA, CO, and RGI) were also fixed to zero. The final model (Model 2) demonstrated an excellent fit to the data, $\chi^2 (3, N = 156) = 4.80, p = .19$, CFI = .994, TLI = .982, RMSEA = .062, SRMR = .018. Based on these findings, Model 2 was considered
the best representation of the structural relations among the constructs. As was observed in the first model, hypothesized positive paths from RF, RWA, and SDO to RE, and hypothesized positive paths from RWA, CO, and RGI to RF, were all statistically significant. Further, hypothesized indirect (i.e., mediated) effects of RWA, CO, and RGI on RE via RF were significant. Model 2 accounted for 65% of the variance in RF and 60% of the variance in RE.

Several notable conclusions can be drawn from Banyasz et al.’s (in press) study. Firstly, each individual difference variable (RF, RWA, SDO) served as a significant direct predictor of RE, while each social identity variable (RGI, CO) served as a significant indirect predictor of RE. This provides evidence that both individual difference and social identity variables have significant effects on RE when included in the same model. Secondly, the relationships among the predictors were clarified in that RF was found to partially mediate the relationship between RWA and RE, and fully mediate the relationships of both RGI and CO with RE. Therefore, it appears that RF serves as one viable mechanism through which these predictors have their effect on RE. More specifically, it seems that interpreting one’s authoritarian tendencies, religious identity, and religious beliefs through a fundamentalist perspective may influence (either completely or partially) how such constructs take on a religiously prejudiced tone.

Future research is required to replicate and expand upon the findings of Banyasz et al.’s (in press) model. While serving as perhaps the most comprehensive model of RE thus far, it remains limited in several ways. Firstly, while predicting a considerable amount of variance in RE, the Banyasz et al. model certainly did not account for all of the possible variance in RE. Secondly, this model fails to take into account recent literature
which encourages researchers to explore a third, and potentially equally important, category of predictors of religiously oriented prejudices, namely numinous, or spiritual, variables (e.g., Pargament, 1999; Piedmont 1999, 2001). Such literature argues for the construction of multi-variable models that include numinous variables in the prediction of various psychosocial outcomes, suggesting that “spiritual constructs need to be used in conjunction with measures of personality in order for one to obtain comprehensive assessments of the individual” (Piedmont, 2001, p. 11). Given that individual difference variables (e.g., RWA, SDO) appear to account for more unique variance in RE than do more contextualized social identity variables (Banyasz et al., 2014), future researchers should consider numinous variables that are relatively immutable across different situations. Including numinous variables in the prediction of RE not only has the potential to account for additional variance in this outcome, but would continue to clarify the specific ways in which spirituality is related to RE and the previously studied predictor variables.

In addition to overlooking the potential importance of numinous variables, the Banyasz et al. (in press) study remains limited in its measurement of the construct of RE itself. More specifically, while their model measured the attitudinal component of RE, it failed to measure the affective components of RE. Current research posits that the affective components of prejudice are just as important as the attitudinal component (Crandall & Eshleman, 2003; Troop & Pettigrew, 2005). Affective components of prejudice have also been found to predict different behavioral outcomes when compared to the attitudinal components. Therefore, measuring RE in a more comprehensive way would increase the field’s understanding of how individual difference, social identity, and
spiritual predictors relate to both the attitudinal and affective components of RE, while setting the stage for understanding the various outcomes of religious-based prejudice.

**Spiritual Perspectives on Prejudice**

The field of psychology remains divided regarding its definitions of religion and spirituality, as well as its perspectives regarding which of the two serves as the broader construct (Zinnbauer & Pargament, 2005). In accordance with the field’s most recent trends, this study considers spirituality to be the broader construct, defined as “a personal or group search for the sacred” (p. 35), and religion to be a secondary construct, defined as “a personal or group search for the sacred that unfolds within a traditional sacred context” (p. 35). In this sense, the two are seen as different in that spiritually is viewed as a more innate, universal human motivation, and religion is viewed as a sentiment or “emotional tendency that develops out of social traditions and educational experiences” (Piedmont, Werdel, & Fernando, 2009). Therefore, this study assumes that while both spirituality and religion share a search for the sacred and an interest in matters of eternal significance, an individual’s religion is viewed as a socialized manifestation of one’s spiritual drives. This study also assumes that spirituality is a universal human predisposition, an assumption that will be discussed later in this section. Therefore, given the definitions and assumptions regarding the constructs of spirituality and religion, this study’s chosen focus is the unique contribution of spirituality to the prediction of RE, a relationship that has yet to be empirically explored.

According to Pargament's (2007) spiritual coping theory, a propensity toward spirituality, or “the desire to seek out something that transcends the self,” is a basic human motivation and process (Abu-Raiya, Pargament, Mahoney, & Trevino, 2011, p.
According to this theory, humans are not only physical, psychological, and social beings, but spiritual beings as well. It is this innate spiritual tendency that drives individuals to seek a connection with the sacred. The sacred refers to notions of the Divine or a Higher Power, as well as any dimension of life that takes on a sacred significance through its association with the Divine, via a process known as sanctification. Through sanctification, individuals may come to view multiple variables, including people (e.g., religious leaders), psychological qualities (e.g., identities, beliefs, attitudes), emotions (e.g., intimacy, love), time (e.g., Sabbath), and places (e.g., nature, churches) as sacred. Furthermore, spiritual theory posits that psychosocial outcomes, including prejudice, cannot be understood as separate from a human yearning for the sacred and the lengths that individuals are willing to go to protect their sacred values. Therefore, given a conceptualization of humans as spiritual beings, it seems that the inclusion of uniquely spiritual variables is essential in understanding psychosocial phenomena. Recent empirical studies have sought to explore whether spiritual constructs represent a distinct domain of individual differences, or if they are simply a “repackaging” of other individual difference and social identity variables (Piedmont, 1999). Indeed, such research has identified spiritual variables as unique predictors in their own right by being associated with the sacred, which serves as a unique motivation and point of reference (Pargament, 2007).

Pargament’s (2007) spiritual coping theory further states that when people perceive that something sacred has been violated or threatened, they experience heightened levels of distress, as well as a stronger desire to protect what they deem to be sacred. Spiritual coping theory provides a useful framework for understanding
religiously oriented prejudices in general, as well as RE specifically, by explaining prejudice as a response to perceived threats to the sacred. Abu-Raiya et al. (2011) concluded that religion-based prejudice cannot be understood apart from “(a) the human yearning for the sacred,” (b) the capacity to sanctify a wide variety of aspects of life, [and] (c) the sensitivity to spiritual encounters in terms of their potential implications for what people hold sacred” (p. 464). From this perspective, including variables that capture the spiritual or sacred dimension of human motivation is essential in the prediction of RE. Expanding upon Pargament’s (2007) suppositions, multiple researchers have also construed spirituality not only as a unique source of motivation, but as a universal and cross-cultural individual difference variable (e.g., Bateson, Schoenrade, & Vensu, 1992; Miller & Thoresen, 1999; Piedmont, 1999, 2001; Rican & Janosova, 2010).

Piedmont (1999, 2001) views spirituality as an intrinsic motivational drive to create personal meaning which, in turn, drives, directs, and selects behaviors. Consistent with Pargament’s (2007) theory of spirituality, Piedmont argues that humans are motivated to construe a sense of purpose and meaning in their lives, and that spirituality is a universal path to accomplishing this task. In this sense, as mentioned previously, spirituality is thought to causally precede the development of religion, as well as a plethora of other psychosocial outcomes (Dy-Liacco, Piedmont, Murray-Swank, Rodgerson, Sherman, 2009; Piedmont, 1999). Because of its universal and innate nature, Piedmont (1999; 2001) specifically views spirituality as a personality factor, analogous to the Big Five personality factors, which contributes unique variance to the prediction of many psychosocial outcomes and behaviors.

**Spiritual Transcendence**
The construct of spirituality has been operationalized by Piedmont’s (1999) Spiritual Transcendence Scale (STS), which specifically aims to measure an individual’s capacity to “stand outside their immediate sense of time and place to view life from a larger, more objective, perspective” (p. 988). ST is comprised of three distinct and related components including (a) connectedness, a belief that one is part of a larger human family and possesses an indispensable role in creating life’s ongoing harmony; (b) universality, a belief in the unitive nature of all life; and (c) prayer fulfillment, feelings of joy and contentment resulting from personal encounters with a transcendent reality. As alluded to earlier, ST is conceptualized as a trait-based construct, or a unique individual difference variable, and has even been identified by Piedmont as the “sixth factor” of personality. Piedmont’s characterization of ST as a personality factor stems from his empirical findings in which ST has been found to predict additional variance in a variety of psychosocial constructs (e.g., attitudes toward abortion, internal health locus of control, vulnerability to stress, perceived social support, sexual attitudes, prosocial behavior, altruism, self-actualization, worldview, materialism, and alcohol related behaviors; Burris, Sauer, & Carlson; Dy-Liacco et al., 2009; Piedmont, 1999) above and beyond what has been accounted for by the Five-Factor Model (FFM) of personality. Such findings seem to imply not only that spirituality is a universal human predisposition, but also that including spiritual constructs in the prediction of psychosocial outcomes provides a more comprehensive understanding of human motivation and behavior in general.

In the initial development of the Spiritual Transcendence Scale (STS), Piedmont (1999) created items by reviewing religious texts and consulting religious leaders from
Christianity, Hinduism, Judaism, Quakerism, Lutheranism, and Catholicism traditions. The development sample consisted of 277 female and 102 male undergraduate students ranging from 17 to 40 years old, with 98% identifying as Christian affiliated and 2% not indicating a religious faith. Items that correlated significantly with other personality scale (i.e., NEO PI-R; Costa & McCrae, 1992) items were deleted. Items that correlated strongly with the Five Factors, or that did not correlate significantly with the Faith Maturity Scale (Benson, Donahue, & Erickson, 1993), a measure of the degree to which a person embodies a vibrant faith, were also deleted. Factor analyses were then conducted with NEO PI-R, Faith Maturity Scale, and STS items, and spiritual transcendence items that loaded on personality facets were dropped. Finally, remaining items loaded onto a 3-factor structure, consistent with the three measures. A CFA was then run on the STS items using a validation sample of 265 female and 91 male undergraduate students ranging in age from 17 to 52 years old. A second-order factor model was identified, showing that the STS items comprise three subscales (connectedness, universality, prayer fulfillment) which are facets of the larger domain of spiritual transcendence. The final factor structure of the remaining spiritual transcendence items possessed a good fit with the data. As mentioned before, joint factor analysis of NEO-PI-R and STS indicate that STS items load on different factors.

In an attempt to replicate his initial findings, Piedmont (2001) conducted factor analyses on 322 undergraduate participants’ responses to the NEO Personality Inventory-Revised (NEO PI-R; Costa & McCrae, 1992) and the Spiritual Transcendence Scale (STS; Piedmont, 1999). A joint factor analysis was conducted using the 30 NEO PI-R facet scales and the 3 STS facet scales from both self and observer ratings. While the
facets of the NEO PI-R scales aligned on their intended factors, the STS facets aligned to form their own independent factor, showing that ST accounts for qualities that are non-redundant with the personality variables represented by the FFM. Correlations between the ST factor and the NEO factors ranged from .07-.14, demonstrating minimal relationships between the constructs. Participants’ self-report scores were significantly related with observer ratings (which are less likely to be contaminated by correlated method error), demonstrating that both targets and observers seemed to have similar understandings and perceptions of what it means to be “spiritual.” Furthermore, hierarchical regressions established that ST possessed additional explanatory power above and beyond the FFM. Specifically, ST predicted an additional 7% of the variance in prosocial attitudes ($\Delta R^2 = .07, p<.001$), an additional 4% in self-actualization ($\Delta R^2 = .04, p<.001$), and an additional 2% in purpose in life ($\Delta R^2 = .02, p<.001$). While seemingly small in absolute terms, this additional variance is actually quite large in light of the predictive power of the five other personality domains.

Other research has also found support for ST as a significant and unique predictor above and beyond the FFM, particularly in the prediction of variables that possess a values-related component. For instance, Piedmont, Ciarrochi, Dy-Liacco, & Williams (2009) found ST to predict an additional 8% of the variance (i.e., beyond the FFM) in interpersonal orientation, an additional 6% in attitudes toward sexual orientation, 4% in attitudes towards abortion, and 3% in prosocial behavior. While created and validated with American undergraduate students, the “6-factor model” has also been validated in cross cultural populations and with individuals from various religious backgrounds.
The STS was translated into Tagalog, a native Filipino language, in order to assess its validity and reliability with a non-American population (Piedmont, 2007). The assumption underlying the translation process was that if two cultures/languages that do not share etymological roots still possess words for the same concept (i.e., spirituality), the concept likely represents a universal experience and serves as an adaptive trait of functioning. Therefore, the fact that the STS was able to be translated via similar words in Tagalog serves as preliminary evidence of the scale’s cross-cultural validity.

Furthermore, in two samples of Filipino adults (Ns = 654 and 248), separate CFAs supported the STS’s intended hierarchical structure (i.e., a superordinate dimension with three correlated facets of connectedness, universality, and prayer fulfillment). Test-retest analyses indicated no mean level changes over time (i.e., seven days) in participants’ scores, and STS scores at time one predicted outcomes measured at time two above and beyond NEO PI-R scores measured at time two. Additionally, STS scores predicted more variance in attitudes towards abortion and individualism than did the NEO domain scale scores, indicating once again that the construct of spirituality may be tapping into a distinct domain of human functioning, particularly with constructs that possess a value dimension.

ST as measured by the STS has been found to predict a variety of psychosocial outcomes above and beyond the FFM, including outcomes not previously discussed, such as alcohol use and alcohol related problems and treatment outcomes (Burris et al., 2011; Piedmont, 2004), well-being and quality of life in patient samples (Barlett, Piedmont, Bilderback, & Matsumoto, 2003), as well as altruism, purpose in life, subjective well-being, positive affect, life satisfaction, individualism/collectivism,
attitudes toward sex, and materialism (Dy-Liacco et al., 2009). Taken together, it seems that the inclusion of ST (in addition to secular individual difference constructs) is important in comprehensively predicting a variety of psychosocial outcomes, particularly those possessing a values/moral component (e.g., RE). Even so, no extant research has examined the relationship between ST and any type of prejudice, including religion-based prejudice in general, or RE specifically. Not only would such research prove helpful in understanding the contributions of spirituality to RE, but also in understanding how predispositions toward spirituality are related to other well documented predictors of prejudice such as RWA, SDO, RGI and CO.

Given that RWA and SDO have been found to mediate the relationships between the Big Five personality dimensions and other types of prejudice (Ekkehammar et al., 2004), it may be that that RWA and SDO similarly mediate the relationship between ST (also conceptualized as a basic tendency, or disposition) and prejudice. Furthermore, given that ST has been found to be negatively related with other conservative values (e.g., attitudes toward sex; Dy-Liacco et al., 2009), it is plausible that ST is negatively related to RWA. In terms of its relationship with SDO, ST’s facets of prayer fulfillment, unity, and connectedness seem to contrast SDO’s tendency toward social inequalities and hierarchies. Therefore, conceptually, ST is negatively related to SDO.

ST has not been empirically examined in relationship to the social identity variables of RGI or CO. However, ST possesses a strong relationship with religiosity and religious practices, and has been found to causally precede religiosity (Dy-Liacco et al., 2009; Piedmont et al., 2009). Thus, it seems likely that individuals who are predisposed to high levels of ST would be motivated to participate in religious activities where both
religious group identities and specific religious beliefs are fostered. Even so, it seems equally plausible that individuals who are high in ST may “bypass” organized religion in an attempt to be strictly “spiritual.” Therefore, no clear theoretical or empirical justification exists to inform future predictions regarding the relationships of ST with RGI and CO.

Finally, while research exists which establishes a relationship between generalized measures of religion and various types of prejudice (e.g., Allport, 1954; Rowatt et al., 2009), no studies have implemented the use of a dispositional measure of spirituality such as the STS in assessing the relationship between the broader construct of spirituality and prejudice. In fact, most research has relied on self-reported ratings of religiosity and/or spirituality (Hill & Pargament, 2003; Leak & Finken, 2011). Additionally, as mentioned before, no research has examined the relationship of spirituality, as measured by the STS, with RE, as measured by Altemeyer’s (2003) measure of Religious Ethnocentrism, specifically. Assessing the relationship of ST with RE, as well as the relationship of ST with more proximal individual difference predictors (i.e., RWA and SDO) of RE, may also clarify the mechanisms through which spirituality relates to intolerance towards religious out-groups.

In addition to exploring the relationship between RE and a stable, trait-like manifestation of spirituality (i.e., ST), this dissertation will also extend the literature by exploring the potential contribution to RE of more contextual spiritual variables. More specifically, in the section to follow, it will be explained how the prediction of RE could likely be enhanced by the inclusion of spiritual variables that highlight how perceptions
of the sacred, which are influenced by an individual’s context or socialization, contribute to evaluations of out-groups, mainly those driven by the construct of desecration.

**Desecration**

While a large body of research exists connecting personality/individual difference and social identity variables to religion-based prejudice, Abu-Raiya et al. (2011) suggests that this literature is currently limited in three primary ways: (1) since some correlations between prejudice and psychosocial (i.e., individual difference, social identity) predictors are fairly low, there is a need to identify spiritually oriented variables that are more robustly and proximally tied to prejudice; (2) a reliance on global religious predictors of prejudice (e.g., self-reported religious affiliation) fails to acknowledge the specific aspects of religiousness that may increase prejudice; and (3) most studies fail to acknowledge the implications of the spiritual function of religion for prejudice. Therefore, a new avenue of research has begun to apply Paragment’s (2007) spiritual coping theory to address these limitations. More specifically, such research has explored how spiritual constructs that are theoretically more contextual, and therefore more proximally related to prejudice, may potentially mediate the relationship between psychosocial predictors and prejudice, while also clarifying how specific components of spirituality predict prejudice under specific circumstances (i.e., times of threat). Central to this new avenue are the concepts of sanctification and its counterpart, desecration.

Pargament and Mahoney (2005) posit not only that people are goal-directed beings in search for meaning, but also that sacred matters are universally interwoven into the fabric of people’s life experiences. As mentioned earlier, what constitutes “sacred matters” may extend beyond typical spiritual constructs (e.g., gods, spirits, etc.) to any
object or concept that takes on a sacred character by virtue of its association with Divinity. Therefore, secular constructs may take on a spiritual significance if an individual perceives them to be related to the Divine. The transformation from secular to spiritual occurs via the process of sanctification, “through which seemingly secular aspects of life are perceived as having spiritual character and significance” (p. 8).

Sanctification is considered to be a “psychospiritual” construct that focuses on individual perceptions of what is sacred, which are influenced by an individual’s context. Early research on this topic (e.g., Mahoney et al., 1999) has identified multiple implications of sanctification. First, people invest increased time and energy into matters which they perceive as sacred. Second, people go to extensive lengths to preserve what they perceive to be sacred. Third, people experience an array of spiritual emotions in response to what they consider to be sacred. Finally, people experience devastating effects when something they consider to be sacred is damaged or lost.

Early research on this topic examined the sanctification of marriage and parenting (Mahoney et al., 1999; Swank et al., 1999) and found that those who sanctified these roles, or viewed them as manifestations of “God’s will,” were more likely to invest time, effort, and money to preserve and protect such roles compared to individuals who did not sanctify them. Additional research on individuals who sanctified their life goals and strivings (e.g., jobs, family relationships, altruistic endeavors) found that greater sanctification of strivings was related to higher levels of psychological investment and commitment to such strivings (Pargament & Mahoney, 2005). Given the wide variety of constructs that fall under the category of being “sanctifiable,” it seems probable that individuals would also sanctify constructs such as spiritual beliefs, doctrines, and
identities; that is, they would consider these things to be of sacred importance due to their innate association with the Divine. Furthermore, the loss or perceived threat to such variables, once sanctified, may be likely to predict distress, and perhaps even prejudice towards whomever is thought to threaten such entities (i.e., religious out-groups; Abu-Raiya et al., 2011; Krumrei et al., 2009).

Desecration, the counterpart to sanctification, is defined as the perception that “a sacred aspect of life has been violated or threatened” (Abu-Raiya et al., 2011, p. 461). Therefore, once an object or concept has been sanctified, desecration is likely to result if that object or concept is perceived to be threatened. Spiritual coping theory predicts that since desecration involves perceptions that the most sacred aspects of life have been lost or violated, individuals will experience high levels of distress in response. Desecration has been theoretically and empirically related to various types of value-violating prejudice, where religious out-groups are perceived to contaminate, or desecrate, in-group religious values and institutions. In addition to prejudicial attitudes, perceptions of desecration are also followed by negative affective and behavioral responses towards the out-groups responsible for perpetrating the perceived value violations. An example of perceiving and acting upon desecration can be seen by perpetrators of the September 11th terrorist attacks, who justified their actions as a response to a nation that was morally corrupt (e.g., USA) and who had desecrated the holy land during the Gulf war. It seems that by justifying their actions through an association with God’s will (i.e., sanctification) and as retribution for the violation of their holy beliefs and lands (i.e., desecration), terrorists were willing to sacrifice their lives for a cause which they believed possessed sacred and eternal significance. Similarly, in a study examining college students’
responses to the 9/11 terrorist attacks (Abu-Raiya et al., 2011), the event was viewed as an act of desecration, with many participants agreeing that “this act was both an offense against me and against God.” Overall, desecration, or perceptions that a religious out-group is threatening or violating the values of one’s in-group, appears to be a spiritually oriented predictor possessing the potential of contributing unique variance to the prediction of religion-based prejudice.

Abu-Raiya et al. (2011) suggest that focusing on spiritually oriented individual difference and contextual variables is essential in obtaining a comprehensive understanding of the relationship between spirituality and prejudice. Therefore, while spiritual constructs such as ST have the potential to predict the unique variance in prejudice stemming from people’s dispositional tendencies, desecration holds the potential to predict unique variance stemming from individual perceptions (i.e., of threat, loss) within a particular social context. Three empirical studies have explored the relationships between individual difference variables, social identity variables, perceptions of desecration, and prejudice towards religious out-groups and/or value violating groups, mainly prejudice toward Jewish individuals, Muslims, and LGB individuals. While no research to date has explored the relationship between desecration and RE specifically, existing research could potentially inform future work in this area.

In their study of religion-based prejudice towards Jews (i.e., anti-Semitism), Pargament et al. (2007) addressed the following research questions: How common are perceptions of Jews as desecrators?; Do perceptions of Jews as desecrators predict anti-Semitism above and beyond other established individual difference and social identity predictors (i.e., RWA, RF, CO, religious orientation, and church attendance)?; and What

In response to the first research question, 7–17% of participants either agreed or strongly agreed with items assessing perceptions that Jews were desecrators of Christianity (Pargament et al., 2007). The scores on the desecration scale were positively skewed, indicating that a small, yet notable, percentage of undergraduate students perceived Jews as desecrators. In response to the second research question, findings indicated that greater perceptions of desecration were associated with higher reports of anti-Semitism and perceived conflict with Jews, even after accounting for the other demographic, individual difference, and social identity variables. Furthermore, a model containing demographic variables (e.g., age, gender, global religiosity), individual difference and social identity variables (RWA, RF, Doctrinal Orthodoxy, Religious Pluralism, Christian Particularism), and perceptions of historical and current desecration by Jews significantly predicted 17% of the variance in anti-Semitism ($R^2 = .17$, $p < .001$). However, the only individual variable that significantly and uniquely predicted anti-Semitism in this model was Perceptions of Current Desecration ($\beta = .34; p < .01$). This finding was surprising in light of past research, which has revealed that the other
individual difference and social identity variables included in this study did significantly and uniquely predict various types of prejudice (e.g., Asbrock et al., 2010).

Although the previously mentioned individual difference and social identity variables did not predict Anti-Semitism directly, they did predict both past and current perceptions of desecration. More specifically, the demographic variables, individual difference variables, and social identity variables significantly predicted 36% of the variance in Perceptions of Current Desecration, with RWA ($\beta = 0.18, p < 0.10$) and CO ($\beta = 0.22, p < 0.05$) emerging as significant unique predictors. Surprisingly, RF was not a unique predictor of desecration ($\beta = -0.03, p = \text{n.s.}$). Closeness to Jews (i.e., frequency of exposure to Jewish individuals) negatively predicted desecration ($\beta = -0.16, p < .05$), indicating that exposure to the out-group predicted perceptions of tolerance. Results of this study suggest the possibility that desecration may be a more proximal and robust predictor of prejudice than are often-studied individual difference and social identity variables, and, therefore, that desecration may mediate the relations of individual difference and social identity variables with prejudice. Even so, only regressions predicting prejudice were used in this study. A comprehensive model that simultaneously examines predictors of both desecration (e.g., RWA, CO) and prejudice (e.g., desecration, RWA, CO) has not yet been explored in the literature. Furthermore, observed relations of individual difference variables, social identity variables, and desecration with prejudice were specific to prejudice towards Jews. Therefore, it is currently unknown if those relationships would be replicated in a study of RE. While not yet examined specifically with RE, support for the pattern of relationships reported by
Pargament et al. (2007) was found in another study examining prejudice towards Muslims.

Abu Raiya et al. (2008) found support for desecration as a predictor of prejudice, specifically anti-Muslim attitudes. In a study of 192 Christian undergraduate participants, perceptions of Muslims as desecrators of Christianity was found to significantly predict anti-Muslim prejudice above and beyond both demographic and individual difference/social identity variables. Of those participants, 14 – 28% agreed or strongly agreed with items assessing perceptions of anti-Muslim attitudes. Hierarchical regression analyses were conducted in which demographic variables (age, year in school, gender, ethnicity, and global religiousness), individual difference/social identity variables (RWA, RF, CO, Religious Pluralism, Christian Particularism, and Closeness to Muslims), and Perceptions of Desecration by Muslims predicted 32% of the variance in anti-Muslim prejudice. In this model, CO was found to uniquely and negatively predict anti-Muslim prejudice (β = -.30, p<.05), and Perceptions of Desecration were found to uniquely and positively predict anti-Muslim prejudice (β = .37, p<.01). CO and Perceptions of Desecration by Muslims emerged as the only unique predictors. This finding, again, is perhaps surprising in that the individual difference variables measured in this study (e.g., RWA, RF) typically have been related to multiple types of prejudice (Altemeyer, 2004; Asbrock et al., 2010). Consistent with Pargament et al.’s (2007) study of anti-Semitism, desecration surfaced as the strongest unique predictor of anti-Muslim prejudice.

Furthermore, as was seen in the Pargament et al. (2007) study on anti-Semitism, further regression analyses found support for a model in which demographic, individual difference, and social identity variables predicted 42% of the variance in Perceptions of
Desecration by Muslims. RWA ($\beta = .26, p<.01$), RF ($\beta = .28, p<.05$), Religious Pluralism ($\beta = -.22, p<.05$), Christian Particularism ($\beta = .29, p<.05$), and Exposure to Desecration ($\beta = .45, p<.01$) emerged as significant unique predictors. These results represent somewhat of a departure from those of the Pargament et al. (2007) study, in which RWA and CO emerged as the only unique predictors of desecration by Jews. Therefore, while RWA seems to be the most consistent predictor of desecration (based on the results of the two studies reviewed so far), CO and RF also appear to be unique (although group-specific) predictors. Many of the findings of Abu Raiya et al.’s (2008) study on anti-Muslim prejudice were replicated in a similar study on prejudice toward LGB individuals, another value violating out-group.

Trevino et al. (2012) explored whether perceptions that LGB individuals desecrated Christianity predicted anti-LGB prejudice, while also exploring potential individual difference/social identity predictors of desecration. A largely Christian sample of 328 participants completed measures of desecration (Exposure to Desecration and Agreement with Desecration), demographic variables (age, ethnicity, gender, religious preference, church attendance, prayer, self-rated religiosity), and individual difference/social identity variables (RWA, Religious Pluralism, Doctrinal Orthodoxy, RF, and Closeness to the LGB Community). Approximately 14-42% of participants agreed or strongly agreed with items assessing perceptions that LGB individuals were desecrators of Christianity. Similar to the findings of Abu-Raiya et al. (2008), results of hierarchical regression analyses indicated that Agreement with Desecration predicted 7% ($R^2\Delta=.7, p<.001$) incremental variance in hostile attitudes toward LGB individuals above and beyond contributions of other predictors. The full model containing demographic,
individual difference, and desecration variables predicted 32% of the total variance in hostility toward LGB individuals, with gender ($\beta = -0.11$, $p < .01$), RWA ($\beta = .25$, $p < .01$), Closeness to the LGB community ($\beta = -0.26$, $p < .01$), RF ($\beta = -0.21$, $p < .01$), and Agreement with Desecration ($\beta = .32$, $p < .01$) emerging as unique predictors. In terms of unique predictors of Agreement with Desecration, closeness to the LGB community emerged as a significant negative predictor ($\beta = -0.20$, $p < .001$), whereas RF ($\beta = .35$, $p < .001$) and exposure to desecration ($\beta = .24$, $p < .001$) emerged as significant positive predictors. In sum, this study produced similar findings to those of Pargament et al. (2007) and Abu-Raiya et al. (2008) in which both individual difference and social identity variables predicted desecration, and desecration emerged as the strongest unique predictor of prejudice.

Considered collectively, the results of this set of three studies strongly support the notion that desecration is a significant and positive predictor of prejudice. Extrapolating from these findings, it is reasonable to hypothesize that perceptions of desecration will positively predict RE. The extant empirical findings also suggest that desecration may act as a transmitter, or mediator, through which RWA and RF relate to prejudice. Recall that desecration consistently emerged as a unique predictor of prejudice, whereas RWA and RF did not, when all three variables were included in the different models predicting prejudice. Moreover, RWA and RF emerged as unique and positive predictors of desecration in two of the three models predicting desecration and prejudice. This pattern of relationships is consistent with the proposed mediation (via desecration) of the effects of RWA and RF on prejudice. Conceptual arguments also support the proposed mediator effects. High RWA individuals tend to view out-groups as a threat to their group’s values,
and religious fundamentalists perceive religious out-groups as inferior because they do not possess the specialized knowledge of or privileged relationship with the Divine. It is reasonable to suspect that high-RWA and high-RF individuals’ negative attitudes toward religious out-groups reflect their belief that such out-groups are desecrators of Christianity.

Overall, desecration has been found to account for unique and significant variance above and beyond other individual difference and social identity variables in the prediction of various types of prejudice towards religious and value-violating out-groups. However, the current literature remains limited in its understanding of the relationship between desecration and RE specifically, as well as how desecration is related to the previously discussed predictor variables. In fact, no studies to date have included individual difference and social identity variables, along with desecration and RE, in the same model. However, results of empirical studies are consistent with the possibility that (a) desecration is an important positive predictor of RE, and (b) desecration may serve as a potential mediator of the relationships of both RWA and RF with RE. Finally, desecration has been theorized to predict not only prejudicial attitudes, but prejudicial affect as well (Abu-Raiya et al., 2011). An additional direction for future study is an examination of how the previously discussed predictor variables, including desecration, relate to both the attitudinal AND affective components of RE.

**Attitudinal and Affective Components of RE**

Empirical attention has begun to focus on the affective outcomes of spiritual experience (Pargament & Mahoney, et al., 2002). While feelings such as gratitude, love, and humility are often associated with positive experiences of the sacred, perceptions of
responsibility, duty, obligation, and protectiveness may also be elicited. As mentioned previously, while greater commitment is attributed to objects and strivings that are sanctified, greater distress has been identified when a sanctified object or striving is thwarted or lost, referred to here as perceptions of desecration. Of particular interest to the study of RE, in light of the theoretical and empirical propositions of spiritual coping theory, are feelings such as anger and fear that result when individuals perceive that what they consider to be sacred (i.e., spiritual beliefs, identities) has been violated by a religious out-group. An exploration of the emotions associated with RE would provide a more comprehensive measurement of this outcome than previous assessments of RE.

Attitudinal/cognitive based assessments of prejudice overall, and of RE in particular, dominate the literature (e.g., Altemeyer, 2004). This is problematic given the potential impact that prejudicial emotions can have on both attitudes and behaviors. Intergroup emotions theory (IET; Smith 1993, 1999) states that, particularly when social identities are salient, individuals evaluate others as having either harm or benefit to one’s group. These evaluations lead to distinct emotions toward different out-groups, which in turn predict one’s attitudes and behavioral responses. Therefore, once possessing an in-group identity, people react emotionally when circumstances are perceived to impact their in-group (Miller, Smith, & Mackie, 2004). For instance, if an out-group is perceived as threatening, emotions such as fear or anger may result, which in turn may motivate discriminatory behavior. Intergroup emotions theory, in conjunction with personality and social identity theories, helps to explain how adherence to one’s social identity can lead to affective prejudicial responses.
Consistent with this theory, Cottrell and Neuberg (2005) posit that generalized (i.e., attitudinal) measures of prejudice mask the varied underlying emotions which may predispose these general attitudes. Intergroup emotions theory was empirically examined in a study of 235 undergraduate students. Participants completed self-reports of a variety of affective reactions toward multiple racial and religious out-groups (African Americans, Asian Americans, Native Americans, Gay men, feminists, and fundamentalist Christians). Results indicated that participants elicited emotions such as anger in response to perceived obstacles to desired outcomes, disgust in the face of potential contamination to in-group values, and fear in the face of threats to immediate safety. Hierarchical regressions indicated that perceiving out-groups as obstacles toward achieving a group’s goals predicted 58% ($R^2 = .58, p < .05$) of the variance in feelings of anger; perceiving out-groups as contaminating a group’s values predicted 35% ($R^2 = .35, p < .05$) of the variance in feelings of disgust; and perceiving out-groups as being a physical threat to a group’s safety predicted 37% ($R^2 = .37, p < .05$) of the variance in feelings of fear. Overall, while Intergroup Emotions Theory suggests that prejudicial emotions serve as a reaction to an appraisal or attitude, these empirical findings cannot confirm a causal order (i.e., whether emotions or appraisals temporally precede the other). Even so, these findings do highlight the importance of both emotions and attitudes as being important in understanding the manifestation of prejudice towards various out-groups, including religious out-groups. In addition to Cottrell and Nueberg’s (2005) theory and empirical findings, a plethora of research has established both the attitudinal and affective components of prejudice, as well as the differential predictive value of each.
In contrast to Cottrell and Nueberg’s (2005) theoretical conceptualization, which suggests that cognitive appraisals temporally precede prejudicial emotions, Eagly & Chaiken (1993) argue that the attitudinal and affective components of prejudice have a “synergistic relation,” or bidirectional relationship. Specifically, it is posited that while affective reactions toward a group can induce thoughts about it, cognitive appraisals of a group can conversely influence one’s affective reactions towards it. Other theorists have further clarified the relationship between affect and cognitions.

Stephan and Stephan (1993) make a similar argument to Eagly and Chaiken (1993) by proposing an interconnected parallel network of cognitions and affect, in which the two are neither completely independent nor completely unitary (overlapping). Within this system, it is equally possible for affect to activate cognition and vice versa. However, there are also differences between cognitive and affective networks. For instance, while the neural processing of affect is predominantly automatic, the processing of cognitions is often more controlled. Therefore, while it may seem that an affect is “causing” a cognition, it may be that the affect simply occurred more automatically and without explicit awareness, but could have equally been the result of a cognition. A second reason that affective reactions may appear to precede cognitions is because they are inherently less complex. Finally, arousal, or the activation of one’s neural system, has differential effects on the processing of affective versus cognitive information. For instance, while arousal may interfere with the processing of cognitive information, it is less likely to interfere with the processing of affective information. High levels of arousal have also been found to lead to more extreme attitudinal evaluations. In the case of prejudice, high levels of arousal in the presence of positive affect may lead to
cognitive evaluations that are biased in the positive direction, while high arousal paired with negative affect could lead to negatively skewed evaluations or more extreme forms of prejudice.

The joint yet differential effects of affective and attitudinal prejudice have also been explored empirically, specifically with racism. While no studies currently exist that examine the affective and attitudinal components of religion-based prejudice (i.e., RE), studies on other types of prejudice may serve to inform future predictions regarding the affective and attitudinal components of RE. Esses, Haddock, and Zanna (1993) investigated their position that prejudice is composed of both affective (feelings) and cognitive (attitudinal / stereotype) components, which are distinct yet interrelated. A sample of 71 students completed measures of stereotypes, emotions, and values, as well as ratings on an evaluation thermometer toward English Canadians, French Canadians, Native Indians, Pakistanis, and LGB persons. Correlations indicated that emotions were most predictive of attitudes toward ethnic groups, while values were most predictive of attitudes toward LGB persons. In a series of regressions in which stereotypes, emotions, and values were entered simultaneously, emotions predicted prejudice towards French Canadians and Native Americans, while values significantly predicted prejudice towards Pakistanis and LGB persons. No variable emerged as a unique predictor of prejudice towards English Canadians (perhaps because this group was the most similar to the participants being studied). Overall, even though this study assessed the affective and cognitive components of out-group attitudes, instead of assessing prejudicial affect and cognitions as distinct types of prejudice in their own right, results nonetheless speak to the dual role of affect and cognitions in prejudicial evaluations towards out-groups. This
study also sheds lights on the seeming lack of consensus in the literature regarding the relationship and causal direction between affective and attitudinal components of prejudice.

Tropp and Pettigrew (2005), in contrast to Esses et al. (1993), assessed attitudinal racial prejudice and affective racial prejudice as separate latent variables. A sample of 126 undergraduate students completed measures indicating the quantity and quality of intergroup relations, as well as affective measures of prejudice (negative / positive emotions, favorability, and liking) and cognitive measures of prejudice (stereotypes, beliefs, and judgments). Tropp and Pettigrew (2005) found that various affective and cognitive dimensions of prejudice evidenced mild to moderate correlations (e.g., negative emotions and stereotypes: \( r = .35, p < .001 \); negative emotions and anti-Black attitudes: \( r = .21, p < .05 \)). Additionally, each facet of prejudice demonstrated different relationships to intergroup contact. For instance, affective prejudice related more strongly to aversion to out-group contact than did cognitive prejudice, a finding which highlights the importance of assessing the affective, as well as the attitudinal, component of prejudice. Additionally, results of confirmatory factor analysis indicated support for a model of racism in which affective and cognitive dimensions of prejudice served as separate latent factors, with affective prejudice being composed of positive emotions, negative emotions, favorability, and liking, and cognitive prejudice being composed of stereotypes, beliefs, and pro/anti out-group attitudes (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005). This model possessed a good fit to the data, \([\chi^2 (36, N = 126) = 104.30, p < .001, CFI = .982, TLI = .982]\), and supports the utility of simultaneously assessing the affective and
cognitive dimensions of prejudice, particularly because of the differential predictive power of each component.

Multiple studies have found measures of affective prejudice to be stronger predictors of prejudicial behaviors when compared to measures of attitudinal/cognitive prejudice (Cuddy, Fiske, Glick, 2007; Miller, Smith, & Mackie, 2004). For instance, since emotions are processed more quickly and automatically than cognitions, they may be more difficult to control, and may potentially lead to more severe behavioral outcomes (Stephan & Stephan, 1993). While the causal order of the attitudinal and affective components of prejudice (including RE) remains empirically unclear, this issue is beyond the scope of this study. However, it is obvious that future research would benefit from an exploration and identification of the emotions associated with RE, not only to provide a more comprehensive measure of this construct, but also to “set the stage” for future research regarding the causal order of such components, as well as the differential behavioral outcomes that may potentially be predicted by each.

The previously discussed theoretical and empirical literature speaks to the importance of understanding the attitudinal and the affective components of prejudice overall, and of RE specifically. Given that no research to date has explicitly examined the attitudinal and affective components of religion-based prejudice generally, or RE specifically, the relationships between the previously discussed predictor variables and each component of RE (i.e., attitudinal and affective) is currently unclear. Furthermore, little empirical literature exists to inform predictions regarding potential differential relationships of individual difference, social identity, and desecration predictors with the attitudinal versus affective components of RE. The previously discussed relationships
between the various predictor variables and RE have primarily been based on attitudinal measures of RE, not affective ones. The limited body of research conducted on RE specifically has typically utilized Altemeyer’s (2003) Religious Ethnocentrism Scale, a measure of attitudes and behavioral intentions (e.g., Altemeyer 2004; Banyasz et al., 2014). Other research on religion-based prejudice has largely relied on affective measures of prejudice such as the affective thermometer (e.g., Johnson, Rowatt, & LaBough), or social proximity measures (e.g., Rowatt, Franklin, & Cotton, 2005; Village, 2011). Therefore, no research to date has measured both the attitudinal and affective components of RE and related those different RE components to the same set of predictor variables within the same study. Curiously, the differences between the attitudinal and affective components of prejudice are typically discussed in the literature in terms of their outcomes (i.e., behavioral outcomes) and not their predictors. For instance, in Troop and Pettigrew’s (2005) study of affective and cognitive dimensions of prejudice, the same predictors accounted for variance in both components, but evidenced relationships of differing strengths. Because there is no empirical evidence supporting differential relationships between the predictor variables of interest (e.g., RWA, RF, ST, desecration) and each component of RE, it is anticipated that similar (though not identical) patterns of relationships will emerge in models predicting affective and attitudinal components of RE. Clearly, future research is needed to clarify the relationship between the affective and attitudinal components of RE, as well as their relationships with individual difference, social identity, and numinous variables.
Summary and Purpose of the Current Study

The purpose of this dissertation, then, is to investigate religious ethnocentrism in a comprehensive way via replicating and expanding on Banyasz et al.’s (in press) model of RE, which includes the predictors of religious fundamentalism (RF), right-wing authoritarianism (RWA), social dominance orientation (SDO), Christian orthodoxy (CO), and religious group identification (RGI). Because these predictors have not yet been explored in relationship to both attitudinal AND affective components of RE, it remains unknown how they relate to these different components. Additionally, research has not yet explored the contributions of either dispositional or contextual spiritual variables, such as spiritual transcendence (ST) and desecration, as they uniquely relate to RE.

Based on a review of the extant theoretical and empirical literatures, the aims of the study are to answer the following research questions: (1) How do individual difference (i.e., RWA, SDO, RF), social identity (i.e., CO, RGI), and spiritual (i.e., ST, desecration) variables relate to the affective and attitudinal components of RE? (2) Do spiritual variables predict unique variance in RE above and beyond that accounted for by established individual difference and social identity variables? (3) Do individual differences in ST relate inversely to individual differences in RWA and SDO? (4) Is the relationship between ST (a basic tendency, or disposition) and RE mediated by the more proximal and contextualized individual difference variables (i.e., characteristic adaptations) of RWA and SDO? (5) Does desecration mediate the relationships of RWA and RF to RE? (6) Does RE serve as a latent variable possessing attitudinal and affective components, or should each of these components be considered unique outcomes?
Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were derived from the findings of Banyasz et al. (in press) as well as the theoretical and empirical literatures reviewed herein.

**Hypothesis 1: Hypothesized structure of religious ethnocentrism.** A 2-factor model of religious ethnocentrism (RE), consisting of positively related but distinct attitudinal and affective components, will provide a better fit to the data than will a 1-factor general model of RE.

**Direct Relationships**

**Hypothesis 2: SDO will have a direct positive relationship with the attitudinal and affective components of RE.**

**Hypothesis 3: RWA will have a direct positive relationship with the attitudinal and affective components of RE.**

**Hypothesis 4: RF will have a direct positive relationship with the attitudinal and affective components of RE.**

**Hypothesis 5: ST will have a direct negative relationship with the attitudinal and affective components of RE.**

**Hypothesis 6: Desecration (DC) will have a direct positive relationship with the attitudinal and affective components of RE.**

**Mediated Relationships**

**Hypothesis 7: Part of the positive relationship of RWA with RE will be mediated by RF and DC.**

**Hypothesis 8: Part of the positive relationship of RF with RE will be mediated by DC.**
Hypothesis 9: The positive relationship of CO with RE will be completely mediated by RF.

Hypothesis 10: The positive relationship of RGI with RE will be completely mediated by RF.

Hypothesis 11: Part of the negative relationship of ST with RE will be mediated by RWA and SDO.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

Participants

Participants were self-identified Christians who were at least 18 years of age. They were recruited from undergraduate psychology courses at a large, Midwestern, public university, as well as through social media (i.e., Facebook). A power analysis indicated that at least 300 participants were needed (Kline, 1991, 2005). While a total of 538 individuals began the study, 65 cases were deleted for not having completed the surveys beyond the informed consent. An additional 39 cases were deleted for not meeting the inclusion criterion (i.e., identifying as a Christian), with 20 of these cases identifying as Unknown, 11 as Atheist, five as Agnostic, and three as Buddhist. Therefore, the total usable sample size was 434 participants.

The sample was 71% female and 29% male. The greatest number of participants identified as Catholic (51.7%), with 26.1% identifying as Non-denominational, 18.9% identifying as Protestant, and 3.2% identifying as Other (type of Christian). The sample was primarily White/European American (83.4%), with 9% of the sample identifying as Black/African American, 2.3% as Biracial, 2.1% as Asian/Asian American, 1.8% as Latino/Latin American, .7% as Arab/Arab American, .5% as Other, and .2% as Native American. Ages of participants ranged from 18 – 65 years, with a mean age of 24 years. In terms of self-reported spirituality, 32.3% identified as “very spiritual,” 43.5%
identified as “moderately spiritual,” 19.4% identified as “slightly spiritual,” 4.6 identified as “not at all spiritual,” and .2% did not respond. In terms of self-reported religiosity, 14.7% of the sample identified as “very religious,” 47.9% of the population identified as “moderately religious,” 31.3% identified as “slightly religious,” 5.5% identified as “not at all religious,” and .5% did not respond.

Procedure

This study was approved by the University of Akron Institutional Review Board prior to data collection. A link to the online survey was emailed to the university psychology students, and was also posted on Facebook web pages, allowing participants to access the survey by clicking on the link. Extra credit was given in exchange for participation for individuals currently enrolled in psychology courses. Data were collected online via Qualtrics, a secure and encrypted computerized data collection website. All participants were first presented with an informed consent document in which they indicated their consent by clicking on a box labeled “I consent to participate in this study.” Students then completed a demographics questionnaire before completing the surveys described below. Individuals who did not identify as Christian on the demographics questionnaire were routed out of the survey battery to a debriefing screen. Additionally, individuals who identified as Christian on the demographic survey, but subsequently identified with a different orientation (e.g., “checked” the Christian box but listed themselves as atheist) were removed from subsequent analyses. The battery of surveys included the Spiritual Transcendence Scale (Piedmont, 1999), the short version of the Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale (Zakrison, 2005), the Social Dominance Orientation Scale (Pratto et al., 1994), Burris and Jackson’s (2000) adapted version of the
original Collective Self-Esteem Scale (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992), the Short Christian Orthodox (SCO) Scale (Hunsberger,1989), the Revised Religious Fundamentalism Scale (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 2004), an adapted form of the Perceptions of Current Desecration Scale (Pargament et al., 2007), the Religious Ethnocentrism Scale (Altemeyer, 2003), and an adapted version of Miller, Smith, and Mackie’s (2004) measure of emotions felt when thinking about African Americans. The measures were presented in this order, partially modeled after Altemeyer (2003), with the scales inquiring specifically about religiously prejudiced beliefs “sandwiched” between potentially less emotionally charged scales, so as to not sensitize participants to the exact purpose of the study. Each of these measures is described in detail in the following section.

**Measures**

**Demographic information** (Appendix A). Demographic variables (e.g., sex, age) were assessed using a demographic questionnaire. This form also asked participants to report their religious affiliation, perceived religiosity and spirituality, and frequency of religious service attendance. The information regarding religious affiliation was used to remove individuals who did not meet the study’s inclusion criterion (i.e., identify as a Christian).

**Religious Fundamentalism** (Appendix B). Religious fundamentalism (RF) was measured using the Revised Religious Fundamentalism Scale (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 2004), a 12-item, unidimensional scale that asks participants to rate the extent to which they agree with each statement using an 8-point Likert scale (-4 = *very strongly disagree*, +4 = *very strongly agree*). Items are counterbalanced to control for acquiescent
responding, and item ratings are summed, with higher scores indicating a higher level of RF. Sample items include “God has given humanity a complete, unfailing guide to happiness and salvation, which must be totally followed” and “No single book of religious teachings contains all the intrinsic, fundamental truths about life” (reverse scored). The Revised Religious Fundamentalism Scale has been used to assess RF within individuals from different religious backgrounds, including Christians, Jews, Hindus, and Muslims. Altemeyer and Hunsberger (2004) reported Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of .91 and .92 in a sample of 354 introductory to psychology students and 424 of their parents, respectively. The Revised Religious Fundamentalism Scale demonstrated validity through strong positive correlations with belief in a traditional God, dogmatism, reports of emphasis of religion during one’s youth, and frequency of church attendance.

Right-Wing Authoritarianism (Appendix C). Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) was measured using the Short Version of the Right-Wing Authoritarianism Scale (Zakrisson, 2005), a 15-item counterbalanced scale measuring the three components of RWA, namely conventionalism, authoritarian aggression, and authoritarian submission. Participants are asked to rate their perception of the items on a 7-point Likert scale, with 1 indicating very negative, and 7 indicating very positive. Sample items include “Our country needs a powerful leader, in order to destroy the radical and immoral currents prevailing in society today” and “It is better to accept bad literature than to censor it” (reversed scored). Higher scores on the scale indicate a higher degree of RWA. This scale was found to function similarly to the original, full-length RWA scale developed by Altemeyer (1998), while measuring a slightly narrower version of the construct. In a sample of 179 high school and university students, Zakrisson (2005) reported a
Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .72 and positive correlations with social dominance orientation, modern racism, and modern sexism.

Social Dominance Orientation (Appendix D). Social dominance orientation (SDO) was measured with the Social Dominance Orientation Scale (Pratto et al., 1994), a 14-item counterbalanced measure that, to date, it is the only scale that assesses the construct of SDO. Participants are asked to rate statements on a 7-point scale, with a 7-point rating indicating very positive feelings, and a 1-point rating indicating very negative feelings. Example items include “Some groups of people are simply not equal to others” and “It is important that we treat other countries as equals” (reverse scored), with a higher scores on the scale indicating a higher degree of SDO. During its development, an averaged Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .83 was reported across samples totaling 1,952 private and public college students. Convergent validity was demonstrated through significant negative correlations with concern for others and social programs and significant positive correlations with racism and sexism.

Christian Orthodoxy (Appendix E). Christian Orthodoxy (CO) was measured using the Short Christian Orthodox (SCO) Scale (Hunsberger, 1989), an 8-item scale that maintains the same psychometric properties as the original 24-item scale (Fullerton & Hunsberger, 1982) but is more time efficient. Participants are asked to rate the items on a 6-point Likert scale, with a -3 indicating that the individual strongly disagrees with the statement, and a +3 indicating that the individual strongly agrees with the statement. Sample items include “Jesus Christ was the Divine Son of God” and “Despite what many people believe, there is no such thing as a God who is aware of our actions” (reverse scored). Higher scores indicate a higher degree of orthodoxy. Hunsberger (1989)
reported a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .94 in a sample of 669 university students and found that the scale correlated as expected with religious socialization, agreement with parental teachings, and doubt about religious teachings.

**Religious Social Group Identification** (Appendix F). Religious social group identification was measured with the Religious Collective Self-Esteem Scale (R-CSES), an adapted version of the original Collective Self-Esteem Scale (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992), modified by Burris and Jackson (2000) to specifically measure religious social identity. Burris and Jackson (2000) re-worded the items to specifically pertain to one’s religious social identity and removed items containing overlapping content. This resulted in a 16-item counterbalanced scale measuring the three factors of self-stereotyping, denial of regrets, and social approval. Participants are asked to rate the degree to which they agree with the items on a 7-point Likert scale, with 1 indicating *strongly disagree* and 7 indicating *strongly agree*. Sample items include “The religious group I belong to is an important part of who I am” and “Overall, my religious group has very little to do with how I feel about myself” (reverse scored). Higher scores on the scale indicate a stronger identification with one’s religious group. Using a sample of first-year college students, Jackson and Hunsberger (1999) reported a Cronbach’s alpha of .90, as well as validity evidence through positive correlations with Christian orthodoxy and religious fundamentalism.

**Religious Ethnocentrism-Attitudes** (Appendix G). The attitudinal components of religious ethnocentrism (RE) were measured with the Religious Ethnocentrism Scale (Altemeyer, 2003), a 16-item counterbalanced measure. Participants are asked to rate the degree that they agree with the items on an 8-point Likert scale with a -4 indicating
strongly disagree and a +4 indicating strongly agree, with a higher score indicating a higher degree of negative emotions toward religious out-groups. Example items include “Christian prayer should be said in our public schools” and “It would not bother me if my children regularly went to some other religion’s ‘youth group’ with their friends” (reverse scored item), with higher scores indicating a higher self-report of religious ethnocentrism. Altemeyer (2003) reported Cronbach’s alpha coefficients ranging from .89 to .91 in samples of 837 introductory psychology students and 1,308 of their parents. The Religious Ethnocentrism Scale demonstrated validity through strong positive correlations with measures of racial-ethnic prejudice and hostility toward gay men and lesbians.

Religious Ethnocentrism-Affect (Appendix H). The affective components of RE were measured with an adapted version of a questionnaire used by Miller, Smith, and Mackie (2004) to measure emotions experienced while thinking about African Americans. The original version of the questionnaire was developed with 213 undergraduate college students, and was factor analyzed to obtain 2 factors (positive emotions and negative emotions), with each factor being composed of 6 items. Neither internal consistency nor specific validity information was reported. Given the focus of this study (i.e., prejudicial emotions), only the questions composing the negative emotions factor were used. Participants are asked to rate their experience of the emotions on a 5-point Likert scale, with 1 indicating never and 5 indicating almost always, with higher scores indicating greater experiences of the specified emotion. To adapt the scale, the word “African American” was replaced with the word “religious-out group.” The six negative emotions asked about are “afraid,” “angry,” “disgusted,” “uneasy,” “resentful,” and “irritated.” Sample items include “How often have you felt afraid when
encountering or thinking about religious out-groups?” and “How often have you felt irritated when encountering or thinking about religious out-groups?”

**Spiritual Transcendence** (Appendix I). Spiritual Transcendence was measured using section II (the section measuring spiritual transcendence) of the Assessment of Spirituality and Religious Sentiments (ASPIRES; Piedmont, 1999, 2003), a 23-item scale consisting of three subscales: Universality, Prayer Fulfillment, and Connectedness. Participants are asked to rate their agreement with the items on a 5-point Likert scale, with 1 indicating *strongly agree*, and 5 indicating *strongly disagree*. Sample items include “I want to grow closer to the God of my understanding” and “Death does stop one’s feelings of emotional closeness to another (reverse scored).” Scale labels were reversed from the original format so that higher scores indicate a higher degree of ST. In a sample of 379 undergraduate students, Piedmont (1999) reported Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of .83, .87, and .64 for the subscales of Universality, Prayer Fulfillment, and Connectedness, respectively. Piedmont et al. (2009) reported an alpha coefficient of .86 for the Total Transcendence score. The STS evidenced expected correlations with related constructs including faith maturity, self-reported union with God, and self-reported church attendance.

**Perceptions of Desecration** (Appendix J). Perceptions of religious out-groups as desecrators were measured using an adapted version of the Perceptions of Current Desecration Scale (Pargament et al., 2007). The original version of the scale was developed with 139 undergraduate college students, and a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .92 was reported. No additional validity information was reported for this scale beyond its relationships to other variables being explored within Pargament et al.’s (2007) study.
(e.g., RWA, anti-Semitic attitudes). The original scale is a 5-item scale used to assess perceptions of Jews as desecrators, and items were modified to assess perceptions of religious out-groups as desecrators. Participants were asked to rate each of the items on a 5-point Likert scale, with 1 indicating *strongly disagree* and 5 indicating *strongly agree*, with higher scores indicating greater perceptions of desecration. Sample items include “Religious out-groups have greatly damaged the church” and “Religious out-groups represent a threat to the ultimate mission of Christ.” To adapt the scale, the word “Jew(s)” was replaced with the word “religious-out group.” Four additional questions, grounded in the literature (i.e., Pargament & Mahoney, 2005; Pargament et al., 2007), were also added to the 5-item scale in order to more comprehensively measure the construct (e.g., “By engaging in non-Christian religious practices, religious out-groups have violated something sacred that came from God”). A Cronbach’s alpha of .91 was reported for the revised 9-item scale used in the current study, indicating that the new items correlated moderately to strongly with the previous items.

**Social Desirability** (Appendix K). Social desirability was measured using the impression management (IM) subscale of the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding, Version 6 (Paulhus, 1994), consisting of 20 questions. Participants are asked to rate themselves on a 7-point Likert Scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). Sample items include “I never cover up my mistakes” and “I have some pretty awful habits” (reverse scored). Higher total scores on this scale indicate a higher degree of impression management. Alpha coefficients reported by Paulhus (1994) for the IM subscale ranged from .75 to .80, and validity evidence was demonstrated through positive
correlations with a cluster of measures traditionally identified as lie scales (e.g., MMPI Lie scale).
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Before preliminary and primary analyses were conducted, data were cleaned and assessed for univariate and multivariate normality (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). The factor structure of religious ethnocentrism (RE) was examined via confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to determine whether the attitudinal and affective components of this construct were most accurately represented as one latent variable versus two distinct manifest variables. Hypotheses 2-11 were assessed via observed variable path analysis.

Data Cleaning and Missing Data

The data were screened in order to identify and manage missing data according to the best practices recommended by Scholmer, Bauman, and Card (2010). Scholmer et al. (2010) suggest that the amount of missing data be reported, the pattern(s) of missingness be examined, and the method by which missing data are handled be identified. Accordingly, 74% of individuals who started the surveys completed them. As mentioned earlier, 39 individuals were removed for not meeting the inclusion criterion, and another 65 were removed for not completing the surveys beyond the informed consent. This resulted in a usable sample of 434 participants. The overall amount of missing data in the usable dataset was 3.1%. A total of 29% of participants had at least one missing data point. Furthermore, 96.4% of the variables (at the scale level) had at least one missing
data point, with missing data ranging from a low of .33% (for the Religious Fundamentalism Scale) to 5.2% (for the Perceptions of Desecration Scale).

Consistent with the recommendations of Scholmer et al. (2010), Little’s (1988) test was conducted to determine the pattern of missingness in the data (i.e., whether or not the data were missing completely at random [MCAR]). A non-significant chi square value for Little’s test indicates that the data are MCAR. Results indicated that data were MCAR for the Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale ($\chi^2 = 174.06, p = .55$), the Social Dominance Orientation Scale ($\chi^2 = 130.55, p = .45$), the Revised Christian Orthodoxy Scale ($\chi^2 = 10.12, p = .43$), the Perceptions of Desecration Scale ($\chi^2 = 71.89, p = .08$), and the Impression Management Scale ($\chi^2 = 312.56, p = .15$). This indicates that the amount and pattern of missingness were not problematic. However, the data were not missing at random (NMAR) for the Revised Religious Fundamentalism Scale ($\chi^2 = 115.60, p = .00$), the Revised Collective Self-Esteem Scale ($\chi^2 = 270.31, p = .00$), the Spiritual Transcendence portion of the ASPIRES Scale ($\chi^2 = 565.72, p = .00$), the Religious Ethnocentrism (attitudinal) Scale ($\chi^2 = 220.16, p = .00$), and the Religious Ethnocentrism (affective) Scale ($\chi^2 = 56.50, p = .00$). However, the result of a Missing Values Pattern Analysis did not reveal any remarkable patterns in these data. Furthermore, full information maximum likelihood (FIML), which does not assume that data are MCAR, was used in the current study to handle the missing data, thus accounting for any bias potentially posed by data that were not MCAR.

In response to the missingness of individual items that were used to compute a total score, mean scores for each individual scale were calculated for participants who had completed at least 80% of the items composing a scale (which, according to Downey
and King [1998], is the mathematical equivalent of using mean imputation to calculate scale total scores). Full information maximum likelihood (FIML) was utilized as the default method of dealing with missing data in M-Plus, both for item level (cases that had ≤ 20% of the items missing for each scale; i.e., factor analysis) and scale level (i.e., path analyses) analyses. FIML utilizes the greatest amount of available data, allowing for participants with missing data on individual items and/or scale scores to be included in the dataset.

**Data Normality**

Prior to conducting the major analyses, data were screened for assumptions of normality and outliers. Scores for all variables satisfied assumptions of univariate normality (i.e., absolute skew value of < 3 and absolute kurtosis value of < 7; West, Finch, & Curran, 1995; see Table 1). Next, the data were screened for univariate outliers by converting each scale score to a \( z \)-score. \( z \)-scores with an absolute value greater than 3.29 were considered univariate outliers, with three cases meeting this criterion. However, Tabachnick and Fidell (2001) warned against removing univariate outliers before examining multivariate outliers, given that some univariate outliers can be expected in large data sets. Therefore, multivariate outliers were examined next. Mahalanobis distance scores and probabilities were calculated for each case, with Mahalanobis \( D^2 \) scores with \( p \leq .001 \) being considered multivariate outliers. Based on the results of this analysis, no multivariate outliers were identified; therefore, no cases were removed from the data set.
Table 1
Skewness and Kurtosis Values for All Scale Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Standard Error of Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Standard Error of Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STS</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.82</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWA</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDO</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.74</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGI</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.82</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.83</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Ns range from 397 to 434. STS = Spiritual Transcendence Scale; RWA = Right-Wing Authoritarianism Scale; SDO = Social Dominance Orientation Scale; CO = Christian Orthodoxy Scale-Short Version; RGI = Collective Self-Esteem Scale-Revised (measuring religious group identity); RF = Religious Fundamentalism Scale-Revised; DC = Perceptions of Religious Desecration Scale; RE = Religious Ethnocentrism Scale-Attitude; RA = Religious Ethnocentrism-Affect; IM = Impression Management.

Descriptive Statistics, Intercorrelations, and Preliminary Analyses

Means, standard deviations, minimum and maximum values, the percentages of missing data, and Cronbach’s Alpha coefficients for each scale are provided in Table 2. Reliability coefficients were similar to those found in previous studies (e.g., Banyasz et al., 2014; Piedmont, 1999). Several mean scale scores (e.g., RWA, RF, CO, RGI) in the
current study were slightly lower than those reported in previous research (e.g., Banyasz et al., 2014); however, all were within one-half of a standard deviation.

Preliminary correlation analyses were conducted to examine the associations of demographic variables (i.e., sex and age) and impression management (IM) with the primary endogenous variables in the path model (i.e., religious fundamentalism [RF], desecration [DC], religious ethnocentrism-attitudinal [RE], and religious ethnocentrism-affective [RA]). No significant relationships were found between the demographic variables and RF, DC, RA, or RE; therefore, demographic variables were not controlled for in the primary analyses. As shown in Table 3, IM correlated significantly with RF ($r = .15, p < .01$), DC ($r = .14, p < .05$), and RE ($r = .13, p < .01$), but not with RA ($r = .04, p = .73$). Therefore, IM was included as a covariate with paths to RF and DC in both path models (see below), as well as a path to RE in the model predicting the attitudinal component of religious ethnocentrism.

As shown in Table 3, all variables included in the current models (including IM) correlated significantly with the outcome variable of RE; STS correlated inversely with RE ($r = -.14, p < .01$), whereas all of the other variables correlated positively with RE ($rs$ ranged from .08 to .66). RF ($r = .14, p < .01$), RWA ($r = .24, p < .01$), SDO ($r = .23, p < .01$), and DC ($r = .52, p < .01$) correlated significantly and positively with the outcome variable of RA. Finally, all of the other variables of interest correlated significantly and positively with RF ($rs$ ranged from .14 to .60).
Table 2
Means, Standard Deviations, Cronbach’s Alphas, and % of Missing Data for Primary Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>86.04</td>
<td>12.61</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWA</td>
<td>55.32</td>
<td>11.16</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDO</td>
<td>35.32</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>9.74</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGI</td>
<td>80.92</td>
<td>16.35</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>-1.84</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>24.25</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>-17.41</td>
<td>20.10</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>77.56</td>
<td>15.01</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Ns range from 397 to 434. ST = Spiritual Transcendence Scale; RWA = Right-Wing Authoritarianism Scale; SDO = Social Dominance Orientation Scale; CO = Christian Orthodoxy Scale-Short Version; RGI = Collective Self-Esteem Scale-Revised (measuring religious group identity); RF = Religious Fundamentalism Scale-Revised; DC = Perceptions of Religious Desecration Scale; RE = Religious Ethnocentrism Scale-Attitude; RA = Religious Ethnocentrism-Affect; IM = Impression Management.
### Table 3
Correlations Among Variables of Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. RF</td>
<td>1.00**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. RWA</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>1.00**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SDO</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CO</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. RGI</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. RA</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. DC</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. IM</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. RE</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. ST</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** **p < 0.01, two-tailed, *p < 0.05, two-tailed. Ns range from 397 to 434. RF = Religious Fundamentalism Scale-Revised; RWA = Right-Wing Authoritarianism Scale; SDO = Social Dominance Orientation Scale; CO = Christian Orthodoxy Scale-Short Version; RGI = Collective Self-Esteem Scale-Revised (measuring religious group identity); RA = Religious Ethnocentrism-Affect; DC = Perceptions of Religious Desecration Scale; IM = Impression Management; RE = Religious Ethnocentrism Scale-Attitude; ST = Spiritual Transcendence Scale.
Confirmatory Factor Analyses

Prior to conducting the path analyses, confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) were performed to test the fit of the data to two competing structures of RE, in order to evaluate Hypothesis 1 (i.e., to assess whether the attitudinal and affective components of RE more closely reflect a general latent prejudicial tendency or separate dimensions/factors of RE in their own right). First, a one-factor RE model with 22 manifest indicators, including items from both the Religious Ethnocentrism-attitudinal and the Religious Ethnocentrism-affective scales, was tested ($\chi^2 [df = 209, N = 434] = 2465.068, p < .001, CFI = .510, TLI = .459, RMSEA = .158, SRMR = .174$). Secondly, a two-factor model in which two correlated RE factors (i.e., attitudinal and affective) containing 16 (i.e., the 16 Religious Ethnocentrism Scale-Attitudinal items) and six (i.e., the six Religious Ethnocentrism-Affect items) manifest indicator variables, respectively, was tested ($\chi^2 [df = 208, N = 434] = 1082.968, p < .001, CFI = .810, TLI = .789, RMSEA = .098, SRMR = .081$).

Although neither model fit the data well, results of a chi-square difference test indicated a relative improvement in model-data fit with the two factor model ($\Delta \chi^2 [1, N = 434] = 1382.1, p < .001$), therefore establishing some support for Hypothesis 1. The rather modest bivariate correlation between Religious Ethnocentrism-attitudinal (RE) and Religious Ethnocentrism-affective (RA) ($r = .33$, see Table 3), as well as modest correlation between the two latent factors ($r = .37$), provide additional evidence of these constructs’ distinctiveness, and thus additional support for Hypothesis 1. Given that the attitudinal and affective components of religious ethnocentrism appear to reflect related
but distinct constructs, the hypothesized path model was run separately for each type of religious ethnocentrism (i.e., attitudinal and affective).

**Primary Analyses**

Separate path analyses were performed to test the fit to the data of the hypothesized partially mediated model with RE and RA serving as discrete outcome variables (see Figures 1 and 2). First, each model was run with the inclusion of IM as a covariate (i.e., Models 1 and 3, see Figures 3 and 5). Secondly, trimmed/modified variants of each model were run following the removal of non-significant paths as well the addition of paths based on modification indices (i.e., Models 2 and 4, see Figures 4 and 6). Path models were tested using M-Plus version 7 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2012), using maximum likelihood estimation. Model-data fit was evaluated using the $\chi^2$ significance test, comparative fit index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis fit index (TLI), root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), and standardized root mean square residual (SRMR). RMSEA and SRMR values < .10 and TLI and CFI values > .90 suggest a reasonable fit to the data, especially for sample sizes of fewer than 500 (Weston & Gore, 2006), though RMSEA values < .06, SRMR values < .08, and TLI and CFI values > .95 are preferred (Kline, 2005). In addition to assessing model-data fit, the hypothesized direct and indirect relationships were estimated. A hypothesis was considered supported if a path coefficient corresponding to the hypothesized relation resulted in a significant ($p < .05$) value in the specified direction. Additionally, bootstrapping analyses were used to evaluate hypotheses regarding indirect effects. This procedure computes bias-corrected 95% confidence intervals (CI) for indirect effects. CIs not including zero indicate significant indirect effects (Shrout & Bolger, 2002). As already mentioned, the
hypothesized model was tested separately on each of the outcome variables, attitudinal RE and affective RE, respectively.

Figure 2. Hypothesized Partial Mediation Model with Religious Ethnocentrism-Attitudinal (RE) as the Outcome Variable.

Figure 3. Hypothesized Partial Mediation Model with Religious Ethnocentrism-Affective (RA) as the Outcome Variable.

Model Evaluation for RE- Attitudinal
Path analyses were performed to test the fit to the data of the hypothesized partially mediated model, including IM, (i.e., Model 1; shown in Figure 3), as well as a trimmed variant of that model (i.e., Model 2; shown in Figure 4), with RE-attitudinal (RE) serving as the outcome variable. Model 1 was found to have a poor fit to the data, $\chi^2 (df = 15, N = 434) = 206.90, p < .001, \text{CFI} = .835, \text{RMSEA} = .172, \text{SRMR} = .122$. Non-significant paths from Model 1 were trimmed to represent more parsimoniously the structural relations among the variables of interest. Specifically, IM did not have a significant direct effect on RF ($\beta = -.04, p = .30$), DC ($\beta = -.03, p = .44$), or RE ($\beta = -.01, p = .70$). Therefore, the direct paths from IM to RF, DC, and RE, as well as the covariances between IM and the primary exogenous variables (i.e., ST, CO, and RGI), were fixed to zero. In addition to removing the aforementioned paths related to IM, the direct path from spiritual transcendence (ST) to right-wing authoritarianism (RWA), also non-significant ($\beta = .08, p = .13$), was also fixed to zero. Finally, an examination of modification indices indicated that model fit could be improved via the addition of a unidirectional path from RWA to SDO. Given that previous empirical research (e.g., Ekehammar et al., 2004, 2009) has established support for this relationship, a path was also added from RWA to SDO, resulting in the post hoc Model 2 (shown in Figure 4).

Model 2 was found to have a relatively improved, and generally adequate, fit to the data based on the previously discussed criteria, $\chi^2 (df = 10, N = 434) = 49.024, p = <.001, \text{CFI} = .96, \text{RMSEA} = .095, \text{SRMR} = .04$. Overall, Model 2 accounted for 26% of the variance in SDO, 52% of the variance in RF, 33% of the
variance in DC, and 66% of the variance in RE. Refer to Table 4 for a summary of hypothesis test results for these direct effects.

Figure 4. Standardized Path Coefficients for Hypothesized Model Including IM with RE as the Outcome Variable (Model 1). *p < .01, **p < .001
**Test of Hypothesized Direct Effects for RE- Attitudinal**

Direct and indirect paths for Model 2 were examined in order to evaluate the project’s proposed hypotheses regarding the attitudinal component of RE. Overall, hypotheses 2-6, involving direct relations between the predictor variables and the attitudinal component of RE, were supported. Specifically SDO ($\beta = .15, p < .001$), RWA ($\beta = .29, p < .001$), RF ($\beta = .35, p < .001$), and DC ($\beta = .27, p < .001$) had positive direct paths to RE. ST ($\beta = -.24, p < .001$) possessed a negative direct path to RE. RWA ($\beta = .55, p < .001$), CO ($\beta = .30, p < .001$), and RGI ($\beta = .13, p < .01$) had positive direct paths to RF. Additionally, RWA ($\beta = .39, p < .001$) and RF ($\beta = .25, p < .001$) had positive direct paths to DC. Finally, ST had a negative direct path to SDO ($\beta = -.32, p < .001$), and RWA had a positive direct path to SDO ($\beta = .39, p < .001$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Standardized Path Coefficient</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>SDO → RE</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>RWA → RE</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>RF → RE</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>ST → RE</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>DC → RE</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at $p < .01$.
** Significant at $p < .001$. 

Table 4
Tests of Hypothesized Direct Effects for RE-Attitudinal Modified Model
Test of Hypothesized Indirect Effects for RE- Attitudinal

Hypotheses 7-11, involving indirect (mediated) relations between the predictor variables and the attitudinal component of RE, were examined for Model 2 using a bootstrapping procedure with 10,000 bootstrap draws of the original data. This procedure computes bias-corrected 95% confidence intervals (CI) for indirect effects. CIs not including zero indicate statistically significant indirect effects (Shrout & Bolger, 2002). Hypotheses 7-10 received full support regarding the attitudinal component of RE, with hypothesis 11 only receiving partial support (given that ST and RWA were not significantly related, as mentioned previously). Specifically, RWA had significant positive indirect effects on RE through RF ($\beta = .17$, 95% CI [.126, .221]), DC ($\beta = .11$, 95% CI [.065, .148]), the combination of RF and DC ($\beta = .03$, 95% CI [.018, .050]), and SDO (modified path; $\beta = .06$, 95% CI [.026, .089]), with the largest percentages of RWA’s indirect effect on RE occurring through RF and DC. RF had a significant positive indirect effect on RE through DC ($\beta = .07$, 95% CI [.037, .100]). CO had a positive indirect effect on RE through RF ($\beta = .10$, 95% CI [.068, .140]) as well as the combination of RF and DC ($\beta = .02$, 95% CI [.009, .032]). Similarly, RGI had a significant positive indirect effect on RE through RF ($\beta = .04$, 95% CI [.009, .078]) as well as the combination of RF and DC ($\beta = .01$, 95% CI [.001, .016]). The indirect effects of both CO and RGI occurred primarily through RF. Finally, ST had a significant negative indirect effect on RE through SDO ($\beta = -.05$, 95%
Collectively, Model 2 results indicated that SDO, RF and DC each had a significant and positive direct effect on RE; CO and RGI each had a significant and positive indirect effect (primarily through RF) on RE; ST had significant and negative effects on RE both directly and indirectly (through SDO); and RWA had significant and positive effects on RE both directly and indirectly (through RF and DC). Therefore, full support was found for hypotheses 2 through 10 as applied to the attitudinal component of RE. Partial support was found for hypothesis 11, in that part of the negative relationship of ST with RE was mediated by SDO, but not by RWA. Lastly, while not initially hypothesized, RWA also had a significant indirect effect on RE through SDO. Hypotheses 2-11 were also tested with the affective component of RE (i.e., RA) as the outcome variable.
### Table 5
Bootstrap Analysis of Indirect Effects for RE-Attitudinal Modified Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Path(s)</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>RWA $\rightarrow$ RF $\rightarrow$ DC $\rightarrow$ RE</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RWA $\rightarrow$ RF $\rightarrow$ RE</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RWA $\rightarrow$ DC $\rightarrow$ RE</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>RF $\rightarrow$ DC $\rightarrow$ RE</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>CO $\rightarrow$ RF $\rightarrow$ DC $\rightarrow$ RE</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CO $\rightarrow$ RF $\rightarrow$ RE</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10</td>
<td>RGI $\rightarrow$ RF $\rightarrow$ DC $\rightarrow$ RE</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RGI $\rightarrow$ RF $\rightarrow$ RE</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11</td>
<td>ST $\rightarrow$ RWA $\rightarrow$ RE</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11</td>
<td>ST $\rightarrow$ SDO $\rightarrow$ RE</td>
<td>-.05*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Hypothesis supported, $p < .001$.

### Model Evaluation for RE- Affective

Path analyses were performed to test the fit to the data of the hypothesized partially mediated model, including IM, (i.e., Model 3; see Figure 5), as well as a trimmed variant of that model (i.e., Model 4; see Figure 6), with RE-affective (RA) serving as the outcome variable. Model 3 was found to have a poor fit to the data, $\chi^2$ ($df = 15, N = 434$) = 215.34, $p = .001$, CFI = .763, TLI = .525, RMSEA = .175, SRMR = .112.

Non-significant paths from Model 3 were trimmed to represent more parsimoniously the structural relations among the variables of interest. Specifically, IM did not have a significant direct effect on RF ($\beta = -.04, p = .30$) or DC ($\beta = -.03, p = .45$). Therefore, the direct paths from IM to RF and DC, as well as the covariances between IM
and the exogenous variables (i.e., ST, CO, and RGI), were fixed to zero. In addition to removing the aforementioned paths related to IM, the non-significant direct paths from RWA to RA ($\beta = -.01, p = .88$), SDO to RA ($\beta = .05, p = .31$), ST to RA ($\beta = .01, p = .95$), and ST to RWA ($\beta = .08, p = .11$), also were fixed to zero. Additionally, based on the modification indices and consistent with the modification made to the RE model, as indicated by prior research (e.g., Ekehammar et al., 2004, 2009), a path was also added from RWA to SDO, resulting in Model 4 (as shown in Figure 6). Given that the aforementioned paths were not significant, and therefore trimmed, no support was found for hypotheses 2, 3, 5, or 11.

Model 4 was found to have a reasonable fit to the data based on the previously discussed criteria, $\chi^2 (df = 12, N = 434) = 57.808, p = .001$, CFI = .94, RMSEA = .09, SRMR = .04. Overall, Model 4 accounted for 26% of the variance in SDO, 52% of the variance in RF, 33% of the variance in DC, and 26% of the variance in RA. Refer to Table 6 for a summary of hypothesis test results for these direct effects.
Figure 6. Standardized Path Coefficients for Hypothesized Model Including IM with RA as the Outcome Variable (Model 3). *p < .01, **p < .001.
Test of Hypothesized Direct Effects for RE-Affective

Both direct and indirect paths were examined in order to evaluate the remaining hypotheses (i.e., 4, 6, and 7-10) as they applied to the outcome variable of RA. Many of the hypotheses involving direct relations (except for the previously mentioned paths that were removed) in the trimmed RA model were supported. Contrary to hypothesis 4, RF ($\beta = -.14$, $p < .01$) possessed a direct, albeit negative, path to RA. In support of hypothesis 6, DC ($\beta = .56$, $p < .001$) possessed a positive direct path to RA. RWA ($\beta = .50$, $p < .001$), CO ($\beta = .30$, $p < .001$), and RGI ($\beta = .13$, $p < .01$) had positive direct paths to RF. RWA ($\beta = .39$, $p < .001$) and RF ($\beta = .25$, $p < .001$) had positive direct paths to DC. ST had a direct negative path to SDO ($\beta = -.35$, $p < .001$), and RWA had a positive direct path to SDO ($\beta = .39$, $p < .001$).

Table 6
Tests of Hypothesized Direct Effects for RE-Affective (RA) Modified Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Standardized Path Coefficient</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>SDO → RA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>RWA → RA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>RF → RA</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>ST → RA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>DC → RA</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at $p < .01$
** Significant at $p < .001$

Test of Hypothesized Indirect Effects for RE-Affective

Hypothesized indirect (mediated) effects were examined for Model 4 using a bootstrapping procedure with 10,000 bootstrap draws of the original data.
Support was found for hypothesis 7 in that RWA had significant positive indirect effects on RA through RF ($\beta = -0.07$, 95% CI [-.119, -.016]), DC ($\beta = 0.22$, 95% CI [.146, .293]), and the combination of RF and DC ($\beta = 0.07$, 95% CI [.036, .103]). In support of hypothesis 8, RF had a significant positive indirect effect on RA through DC ($\beta = 0.14$, 95% CI [.077, .202]). In support of hypotheses 9-10, CO had a positive indirect effect on RA through RF ($\beta = -0.04$, 95% CI [-.074, -.006]) as well as the combination of RF and DC ($\beta = 0.04$, 95% CI [.019, .064]). Similarly, RGI had a significant positive indirect effect on RA through RF ($\beta = -0.02$, 95% CI [-.031, -.003]) as well as the combination of RF and DC ($\beta = 0.02$, 95% CI [.003, .032]). Refer to Table 7 for a summary of hypothesis test results for these indirect effects.

Table 7
Bootstrap Analysis of Indirect Effects for RE-Affective (RA) Modified Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Path (s)</th>
<th>Standardized Indirect Effects</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>RWA→RF→DC→RA</td>
<td>.07***</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RWA→ RF→RA</td>
<td>-.07**</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RWA→DC→RA</td>
<td>.22***</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>RF→DC→RA</td>
<td>.14***</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>CO→RF→DC→RA</td>
<td>.04***</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CO→RF→RA</td>
<td>-.04**</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10</td>
<td>RGI→ RF→DC→RA</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RGI→RF→RA</td>
<td>-.02*</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11</td>
<td>ST→RWA→RA</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11</td>
<td>ST→SDO→RE</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Hypothesis supported, $p < .001$.
**Hypothesis supported, $p < .01$.
*Hypothesis supported, $p < .05$. 
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Collectively, Model 4 results indicated that DC had a significant and positive direct effect on RA; CO and RGI each had significant indirect effects on RA (through RF); and RWA had significant indirect effects on RA (through RF and DC). Therefore, full support was found for hypotheses 6-10.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The present study explored the interplay among personal-dispositional variables (RWA, SDO, ST), contextualized religious identity variables (CO and RGI), uniquely spiritual variables (ST, DC), and religious orientation (RF) within a comprehensive model predicting religious ethnocentrism (RE) towards non-Christians. Specifically, the current study revisited and expanded upon Banyasz et al.’s (2014) model of RE by including spiritual predictor variables and examining the relationships of the aforementioned predictors with both the attitudinal and affective components of RE, thus providing a more comprehensive appraisal of the RE construct.

**Banyasz et al. (2014) Revisited**

The significant direct and indirect relationships identified by Banyasz et al. (2014) were replicated in the current study with a larger and more diverse sample, supporting the previously established paths through which personality, religious identity, and religious fundamentalism (RF) variables predict attitudinal RE. A strong positive direct relationship between RF and RE was identified, consistent with the finding of Banyasz et al., as well as other researchers (e.g., Altemeyer, 2003). The conservative personality predisposition of RWA was again found to relate both directly and indirectly (via the mediator of RF) to RE. In addition to serving as one mechanism through which differences in RWA tendencies related to RE, RF completely mediated the significant
positive relations of doctrinal exposure (i.e., CO) and identification with a religious group (i.e., RGI) to RE. The current findings also parallel past research (e.g., Banyasz et al.; Altemeyer, 2003) by demonstrating a direct, positive relationship between SDO and RE. Banyasz et al. interpreted their set of findings as suggesting that it is likely not religion itself, but rather the personal-dispositional and religious identity variables associated with being a member of a religious group, which lead individuals to develop prejudice towards those possessing a different religion than their own (i.e., RE). The current findings bearing on Banyasz et al.’s study lend additional support to their interpretation.

**Extending Banyasz et al.’s (2014) Model**

While all types of group memberships have the potential of creating out-group bias, “religious identification offers a distinctive ‘sacred’ worldview and ‘eternal’ group membership unmatched by identification with other social groups” (Ysseldyk et al., 2010, p. 60), mainly through an association with the Divine. Through this association, spiritual variables have been found to take on an enhanced and eternal significance, which has in turn increased the commitment and energy that individuals allot to their religious identities, beliefs, and endeavors (e.g., prejudice; Mahoney et al., 1999; Pargament & Mahoney, 2002; Swank et al., 1999). Therefore, by expanding upon Banyasz et al.’s (2014) model via the inclusion of spiritual predispositions (ST) and contextualized spiritual influences (DC), the current model highlighted the unique impact of numinous variables as they relate to RE, thereby responding to recent calls in the literature to include spiritual variables in the prediction of important psycho-social outcomes (e.g., Pargament et al., 2007; Piedmont, 1999). This enhanced model was tested separately
with the outcome variables of attitudinal and affective religious ethnocentrism, which were found in the current study to be distinct constructs.

CFA and bivariate correlation results indicated that the attitudinal manifestation of RE, as measured by Altemeyer’s (2003) Religious Ethnocentrism Scale, is moderately positively related to, but distinct from, the affective manifestation of RE, as measured by the prejudicial affect questionnaire adapted for this study. These results mirror prior findings regarding other types of prejudice (e.g., racism) which also found the affective and attitudinal components to be moderately correlated, albeit separate latent factors (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005). While previous research considers the attitudinal and affective components of prejudice to be equally important (e.g., Esses et al., 1993; Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005), given their potential for predicting differential prejudice-related behaviors, the present study is the first to measure the affective manifestation of RE. Although this study did not explore the potentially differential behavioral manifestations of the two RE components, the attitudinal and affective manifestations of RE related quite differently with the proposed predictor variables (see below for a more in-depth description of these differences). For this reason, the models predicting attitudinal and affective RE will hereafter be discussed separately, with separate implications being posited for each.

**RE Attitudinal Model**

This model closely resembles the predictive model of RE established by Banyasz et al. (2014) given the use of the same outcome variable, as well as five common predictor variables (i.e., RF, RWA, SDO, CO, and RGI). However, as mentioned above, the current study expanded Banyasz et al.’s model via the addition of uniquely spiritual
constructs (i.e., spiritual transcendence and desecration). An existing body of empirical literature had already demonstrated both spiritual transcendence (ST) and desecration (DC) to be significant and unique predictors of a variety of psychosocial outcomes, including prejudice towards specific religious out-groups (e.g., Abu Raiya et al., 2008; Burris et al., 2011; Dy-Liacco et al., 2009; Pargament, 2007; Piedmont, 1999). In a similar vein, the current study found ST and DC to be unique predictors of RE.

In accordance with past research (e.g., Piedmont 1999, 2001), the current study conceptualized spiritual transcendence (ST) as a temperament-based personality factor. As such, it was hypothesized that ST would have both a direct relationship with RE, as well as a mediated relationship with RE via the constructs of RWA and SDO. RWA and SDO were conceptualized here as characteristic adaptations, “reflecting heritable characteristics, shaped in part by social and contextual affordances” (see Banyasz et al., 2014, p. 21), which have previously been found to mediate the relationships of other established personality factors with prejudice (e.g., Ekehammar et al., 2004; Ekehammar et al., 2009). As predicted, ST was found to have a direct negative relationship with RE, thus establishing its unique contribution to the prediction of attitudinal RE in a model that included more proximal personality and religious identity variables. This finding is significant because it lends support to propositions (e.g., Piedmont 1999, 2001) that numinous variables generally, and a spiritual temperament (i.e., ST) specifically, contribute uniquely to important psychosocial outcomes. This is the first study to establish a significant relationship between ST and prejudice, in this case religion-based prejudice (i.e., RE), and it suggests the possibility that individual differences in ST may contribute to other non-religious-based forms of prejudice.
Conceptually, it makes sense that ST, which is defined by interconnections among people and unity with a higher power, would be inversely related to any construct characterized by group distinctions (i.e., prejudice). It is also understandable how ST inversely predicted SDO, a tendency promoting division among groups (i.e., competition, social supremacy) as opposed to oneness. Also consistent with prediction, ST related to RE indirectly through the mechanism of SDO. Such an indirect effect via SDO emulates past research in which SDO, conceptualized here as a characteristic adaptation, mediated the relationship between the personality factors of the five-factor model (FFM) and various forms of prejudice (Ekehammar et al., 2004). This finding also provides support for Piedmont’s (1999, 2001) conceptualization of ST as a distal, temperament-based, personality factor akin to the FFM personality dimensions.

However, contrary to what was hypothesized, RWA, also conceptualized here as a characteristic adaptation, did not mediate the relationship between ST and RE. It is unclear why ST did not significantly (and negatively) relate to RWA, therefore preventing the possibility of the predicted mediated relationship. Theoretically, ST, characterized by openness and connectedness with the Divine and others, seems to stand in contrast (and would seemingly relate inversely) to the conservative, aggressive, and judgmental features characterizing RWA. Even so, ST has empirically been found to correlate positively with concepts likely advocated by those high in RWA. For instance, Piedmont et al. (2009) found ST to predict negative attitudes towards abortion, as well as towards liberal sexual practices. Therefore, it may be that ST’s relation to the conservative component of RWA is opposite of its relation to the other RWA components (i.e., aggressive, judgmental). If so, this might explain the observed non-
significant relation between ST and RWA. Perhaps future research will clarify the currently unclear association between ST and RWA.

Also worth mentioning are the strong correlations found between ST with CO and RGI (.62 and .67 respectively). Given that no previous empirical research existed to justify predictions regarding the relationships between ST with these social identity variables, this is the first study to identify strong relationships among them. In fact, counter to theoretical assumptions that ST would relate most strongly with personality-type variables, ST evidenced significantly stronger correlations with both CO and RGI than it did with SDO and RWA. From a conceptual standpoint, it may be that those high in ST are likely to seek out a religious framework (CO) and/or religious community (RGI) through which to manifest their spiritual tendencies. This may also serve as preliminary evidence that either ST, or perhaps SDO and RWA, are not as temperament-based as originally conceptualized. Considered together, this study provides empirical justification to explore the relationships between ST with CO and RGI in the future, in addition to the potentially socialized influences inherent to the aforementioned personality variables. In addition to the unexpected relationships between ST and the social identity predictors, other unanticipated relationships were also identified.

While not hypothesized, modification indices of the path analysis results indicated that the addition of a path from RWA to SDO would significantly improve model fit. Post hoc additions such as this are not typically implemented without empirical and/or theoretical justification; however, a re-examination of the empirical literature regarding the relationship between RWA and SDO provided such a justification. Specifically, Ekehammar (2004) found RWA to causally precede SDO in model relating FFM
personality dimensions, RWA, and SDO to various forms of prejudice. Ekehammar et al. (2009) replicated these findings by hypothesizing and showing support for SDO as a mediator between RWA and generalized prejudice. Conceptually, RWA possesses a documented history as being a more distal personality construct, stemming first from Adorno’s (1950) concept of authoritarian personality.

Moreover, while RWA is conceptualized as an *intragroup* phenomenon, SDO is conceptualized as an *intergroup* phenomenon (Asbrock et al., 2010; Duckitt, 2011). Therefore, it makes sense theoretically that within-group prejudice (i.e., RWA) would precede between-group prejudice (i.e., SDO), with high RWA individuals using their adherence to a conservative ideology as a rationalization for identifying as inherently more valuable than out-group members (i.e., SDO ideology). Given this empirical and theoretical justification, the current study added a path from RWA to SDO to estimate the direct positive relation involving these variables.

In addition to the numinous variable of ST, desecration (DC), or the tendency to perceive that a sacred aspect of life has been violated or threatened (Abu-Raiya et al., 2011), was also found to significantly and uniquely predict RE in the current model. As hypothesized, DC evidenced a direct and positive relationship with the attitudinal manifestation of RE, indicating that stronger perceptions that religious out-groups have profaned constructs that Christians imbued with divine significance (e.g., the Church, one’s beliefs, faith, etc.) were related to stronger expressions of prejudice towards religious out-groups (i.e., RE). This finding, the first to establish a significant relationship between DC and RE specifically, echoes previous research which identified DC as a predictor of prejudice towards specific religious out-groups (e.g., Jews, Muslims;
Abu-Raiya et al., 2008; Pargament et al., 2007). DC was also found to mediate the relationships of both RWA and RF with RE. This finding is noteworthy in that it suggests that those high in RWA and RF are more prone to perceiving the actions of religious out-groups as a threat, in turn leading to between group distinctions (i.e., RE). Furthermore, perceptions of disgust and feelings of being threatened by religious out-groups (i.e., DC) serve as a socialized or contextualized mechanism through which individual differences in both a personality-type constructs (RWA) and religious orientation (RF) relate to the outcome of RE. Considered together, results imply that individuals high in RWA and RF are prejudiced towards religious out-groups because they are apt to perceiving them as having profaned what they deem to be of the utmost significance: their religion.

**RE Affective Model (RA Model)**

As mentioned earlier, the affective manifestation of RE related differently to the proposed predictor variables when compared to the attitudinal manifestation of RE, though some similarities were evident. In accordance with the previous (attitudinal) model, ST inversely predicted SDO, RWA positively predicted DC and RF, RGI and CO positively predicted RF, RF positively predicted DC, and (based on modification indices; see above for empirical and theoretical justification) a path was added from RWA to SDO. RF was found to relate to RA both directly and indirectly through the mediator of DC, as hypothesized; however, the direction of the relation was opposite of prediction. DC was also found to have a direct relationship with RA, as hypothesized. However, in contrast to the attitudinal model, ST, RWA, and SDO did not possess direct relationships with RA, as hypothesized. RWA did relate positively to RA; however, the relationship
was completely mediated through both DC and RF. Finally, RGI and CO related positively and indirectly (via RF) with RA, as hypothesized.

While the reasons that ST and SDO did not relate to RA are currently unclear, it is possible that the lack of relationship was an artifact of measurement. While the scales for ST, RWA, and SDO all ask the respondent to rate the extent to which they agree with a statement (with the statements being worded as predominantly attitudinal), the scale used to measure RA asks the respondents to rate how often they feel an emotion towards an out-group. Therefore, perhaps the aforementioned predictors are more likely to relate to RE because the wording of the measures simply makes them more similar, and/or because the inherent attitudinal nature of the constructs makes them more similar.

Another reason that ST and SDO (as well as RWA) were not directly related to RA may have to do with their nature as personality-type constructs. For instance, given the more distal nature of personality traits/characteristic adaptations (i.e., ST, RWA, SDO), it may be that affective expressions of prejudice are best predicted by more contextualized variables. This may explain why RWA, as well as RGI and CO, only related to RA through the more contextualized and proximal variables of DC and RF. (While RGI and CO are considered to be socialized/contextual variables themselves, RF seems to be a more proximal contextualized variable, hence the mediation.) Furthermore, while the literature is currently divided regarding the causal direction between attitudinal and affective prejudice, several studies indicate that prejudicial attitudes/cognitions likely precede prejudicial affect, which in turn predicts prejudicial behavior (Cuddy et al., 2007). Therefore, in terms of causal order, it may be that personality-type variables
predict attitudes/beliefs, which in turn predict prejudicial affect via the mechanisms of contextualized influences.

A primary difference between the affective and attitudinal models of RE is the dominant predictive role that DC plays in the affective model. Inherent to the concept of desecration is affective experiences (e.g., disgust, anger, fear, etc.). Given this intrinsically visceral nature of desecration, it is not surprising that it related directly and substantially ($\beta = .56$, compared to $\beta = .27$ in the model predicting attitudinal RE) to the affective manifestation of RE (i.e., RA). Indeed, this current finding is consistent with past research in which perceiving out-groups as a threat and/or as contaminating a group’s values predicted reactions of disgust and anger (Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005). As mentioned above, DC also served as a mechanism through which a conservative temperament/ideology (i.e., RWA) and religious orientation (i.e., RF) related positively to prejudicial emotions (i.e., RA). These findings are consistent with intergroup emotions theory which states that prejudicial emotions serve as a reaction to an appraisal or attitude when circumstances are perceived to impact their in-group (Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005). Considered in light of spiritual coping theory (Pargament, 2007), which states that individuals’ religious identities and beliefs take on a heightened significance given their association with the Divine, it is intuitive that DC, serving as a contextualized awareness that one’s religious identity is being threatened, would serve as a “bridge” through which RWA and RF are “transformed” into an affective prejudicial reaction. Indeed, one’s conservative ideology (i.e., RWA) and tendency to view one’s religion as the “only right one” (i.e., RF) may primarily lead to prejudicial affect when viewed “through” perceptions of threat.
While the direct relations of CO and RGI with RA were not evaluated in the current study, these variables were also found to be related to RA via the mediator of RF, as hypothesized. It may be that one’s religious beliefs and identity have their effect on affective prejudice when interpreted through the lens of having an exclusive relationship with the Divine (i.e., RF). Such an interpretation seems to lend itself to both attitudinal and affective expressions of prejudice, and remains consistent with intergroup emotions theory specifically, which posits that once an in-group identity is established, people react emotionally when circumstances are perceived as being relevant to their in-group (Miller et al., 2004). It may be that possessing a religious group identity (i.e., RGI) and adhering to religious beliefs (i.e., CO), if interpreted in light of a fundamentalist religious orientation (i.e., RF), may make the mere presence of religious out-groups “relevant” in the sense of being in direct opposition to the worldview one one’s religious in-group.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

From a methodological standpoint, a principal limitation in the current study lies in the very nature of the sample itself—namely a college student sample of primarily Caucasian women. While the current study built upon past research by additionally recruiting from social media sites (i.e., religiously identified Facebook groups), future research may be mindful of recruiting participants from specifically religious populations (e.g., church congregations), participants from racially diverse backgrounds, as well as equal numbers of men and women. Furthermore, the sample did not possess typically high levels of RE/RA, which may have led to weaker relationships than those which might be found when using more religiously biased samples (i.e., church congregations). Nevertheless, the model fit indices and path coefficients for each model indicated an
adequate fit to the data, and the structural framework offers a perspective that is both compatible with the extant literature in this area, yet formative in terms of suggestions advocated previously. Indeed, former authors encouraged the inclusion of spiritually oriented personality (Piedmont, 2001) and contextual variables (Pargament, 2007) in developing comprehensive models of psychosocial constructs—a perspective foundational to the approach taken here in the prediction of religious ethnocentrism.

An additional limitation of the current study was the measurement of the affective manifestation of religious ethnocentrism. Given that no previous scale had been developed to assess this construct, Miller et al.’s measure (2004), initially intended to assess affective racism, was adapted and used. It is possible, since this scale was only composed of six items, that not all potential emotions related to affective prejudice were examined. Furthermore, while reliability coefficients for the current study were found to be adequate, it is recommended that future research obtain additional reliability and validity information to support the continued use of this measure for assessing affective RE.

Overall, the current study constitutes an important contribution to the literature by offering a potential explanation regarding how multiple individual difference, social identity, and spiritual variables are related to RE and RA. Future research might benefit from testing models that include additional variables such as religious emphasis during childhood or stages of religious development. The inclusion of such variables might enhance the prediction of prejudicial attitudes and/or affect, and would permit an examination of early developmental influences on later adult expression of RE/RA. Also, given the high correlations found between spiritual transcendence with Christian
orthodoxy and religious group identity, an examinations of paths among these variables may also provide useful information regarding how a spiritual predisposition may increase the likelihood of individuals adopting specific religious beliefs and identities.

This study also suggests that different constructs may be responsible for predicting / mediating attitudinal versus affective manifestations of prejudice. Further studies may benefit from identifying variables specifically predictive of RA, as well as from clarifying the potential causal order of prejudicial attitudes and affect (though it should be noted that the relationship is likely bidirectional; Eagly & Chaiken, 1993). Given that path models cannot address causality in the same way that larger scale longitudinal studies (Ekehammar et al., 2004) or experimental designs can, incorporating cross-sectional model comparisons across developmental age might be of considerable importance in evaluating causal direction, as well as the overall etiology and development of RE/RA over time. Furthermore, given the difficulty of simulating prejudice experimentally, priming prejudicial attitudes and/or affect via vignettes in which individuals’ religious identity becomes salient or threatened potentially serves as a fruitful avenue for gathering data.

In addition to investigations of the potential causal relationships among prejudicial attitudes and affect, research opportunities remain in the realm of predicting prejudicial behaviors, specifically. Especially in light of Cuddy et al.’s (2007) research which finds prejudicial affect, not prejudicial attitudes, to be the primary predictor of behavior, clarification regarding the relationships between attitudes, affect, and behaviors will serve to inform interventions for reducing prejudice moving forward. Further inquiry regarding which of these components is the most responsive to intervention
seems like another logical step in reducing and eliminating prejudice on both individual and group levels. Given that religion is frequently used to justify even the most horrific prejudicial acts by justification of doing “divine work” (Pargament et al., 2005), such research is consistent with Counseling Psychology’s values of promoting social justice and giving a “voice” to oppressed out-groups.

Importantly, future research opportunities additionally lie in the prediction of RE for individuals from religious backgrounds other than Christianity. However, for this to occur, measures that are appropriate for such populations will need to be developed and validated. As mentioned earlier, the creation of measures that assess both attitudinal and affective prejudice, and perhaps even behavioral intentions, would be useful tools to comprehensively and efficiently assess the different components of prejudice. Finally, and as a direct consequence of the approach advocated here, integrating developmental and even qualitative perspectives with the typical statistical modeling approaches (e.g., SEM, path analysis) might broaden the field’s appreciation of the dynamic interplay among dispositional, social, and temporal factors in predicting RE/RA.

In conclusion, this study indicates that spiritual variables play an important role, in conjunction with personality and social identity variables, in understanding the experience of both attitudinal and affective religious ethnocentrism. This study also confirms that these predictors have both similarities and differences in their relationships to prejudicial attitudes and affect. Finally, individuals’ belief systems, religious social group identity, and perceptions of out-group threat all serve as potential areas of intervention regarding the prevention and reduction of religious ethnocentrism.
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APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM

1. What is your gender? (please circle one)
   Male    Female    Transgender    Other

2. What is your sexual orientation? (please circle one; of other, please state)
   Gay    Lesbian    Bisexual    Heterosexual    Other

3. What is your age? _______

4. What is your race/ethnicity? (please circle one; if other, please state)
   White/European American    Black/African American    Asian/Asian American
   Native American    Latino/Latin American
   Biracial
   Arabic/Arabic American    Other

5. Please indicate your current and/or highest level of education? (please circle one; if other, please state)
   Elementary school    High School Graduate    Trade/Professional school
   College 1st year    College 2nd year    College 3rd year
   College 4th year    College 5th year or beyond    graduate student
   Other

6. What is your religious affiliation? (please circle one; if other, please state)
   Christian- Catholic    Christian-Protestant    Christian-non-denominational
   Other (please state)

7. How often do you typically attend a religious service? (please circle one)
   Daily    Weekly    Monthly    Biannually    Annually    Never

8. How often do you engage in private prayer? (please circle one)
   Daily    Weekly    Monthly    Biannually    Annually    Never

9. To what extent do you consider yourself religious?
   Very    Moderately    Slightly    Not at all

10. To what extent do you consider yourself spiritual?
    Very    Moderately    Slightly    Not at all
APPENDIX B

THE REVISED 12-ITEM RELIGIOUS FUNDAMENTALISM SCALE

This survey is an investigation of general public opinion concerning a variety of social issues. You will probably find that you agree with some of the statements, and disagree with others to varying extents. Please indicate your reaction to each statement by blackening a bubble in SECTION 1 of the bubble sheet, according to the following scale:

-4 if you very strongly disagree with the statement
-3 if you strongly disagree with the statement
-2 if you moderately disagree with the statement
-1 if you slightly disagree with the statement
 0 if you feel exactly and precisely neutral about the statement
+1 if you slightly agree with the statement
+2 if you moderately agree with the statement
+3 if you strongly agree with the statement
+4 if you very strongly agree with the statement

If you feel exactly and precisely neutral about an item, blacken the “0” bubble. You may find that you sometimes have different reactions to different parts of a statement. For example, you might very strongly disagree (“-4”) with one idea in a statement, but slightly agree (“+1”) with another idea in the same item. When this happens, please combine your reactions, and write down how you feel on balance (a “-3” in this case).

1. God has given humanity a complete, unfailing guide to happiness and salvation, which must be totally followed.
2. No single book of religious teachings contains all the intrinsic, fundamental truths about life.*
3. The basic cause of evil in the world is Satan, who is still constantly and ferociously fighting against God.
4. It is more important to be a good person than to believe in God and the right religion.*
5. There is a particular set of religious teachings in this world that are so true, you can’t go any “deeper” because they are the basic, bedrock message that God has given humanity.
6. When you get right down to it, there are basically two kinds of people in the world: the Righteous, who will be rewarded by God; and the rest, who will not.
7. Scriptures may contain general truths, but they should NOT be considered
completely, literally true from beginning to end.*
8. To lead the best, most meaningful life, one must belong to the one, fundamentally true religion.
9. “Satan” is just the name people give to their own bad impulses. There really is no such thing as a diabolical “Prince of Darkness” who tempts us.*
10. Whenever science and sacred scripture conflict, science is probably right.*
11. The fundamentals of God’s religion should never be tampered with, or compromised with others’ beliefs.
12. All of the religions in the world have flaws and wrong techniques. There is no perfectly true, right religion.*

Note. * indicates that an item is reverse-coded.
APPENDIX C

SHORT VERSION OF THE RIGHT-WING AUTHORITAIRANISM SCALE

Items in the revised, short version of the RWA scale (counter-balanced items in italics).

Using the scale below as a guide, rate the degree to which you have a positive or a negative opinion towards the following statements:

1 very negative opinion
2 moderately negative opinion
3 slightly negative opinion
4 neutral opinion
5 slightly positive opinion
6 moderately positive opinion
7 very positive opinion

1. Our country needs a powerful leader, in order to destroy the radical and immoral events prevailing in society today.
2. Our country needs free thinkers, who will have the courage to stand up against traditional ways, even if this upsets many people.
3. The “old fashioned ways” and “old fashioned values” still show the best way to live.
4. Our society would be better off if we showed tolerance and understanding for untraditional values and opinions.
5. God’s laws about abortions, pornography and marriage must be strictly followed before it is too late, violations must be punished.
6. The society needs to show openness towards people thinking differently, rather than a strong leader, the world is not particularly evil or dangerous.
7. It would be best if newspapers were censored so that people would not be able to get hold of destructive and disgusting material.
8. Many good people challenge the state, criticize the church and ignore “the normal way of living.”
9. Our forefathers ought to be honored more for the way they have built our society, at the same time we ought to put an end to those forces destroying it.
10. People ought to put less attention to the Bible and religion, instead they ought to develop their own moral standards.
11. There are many radical, immoral people trying to ruin things; the society out to stop them.
12. It is better to accept bad literature than to censor it.
13. Facts show that we have to be harder against crime and sexual immorality,
order to uphold law and order.

14. The situation in society today would be improved if troublemakers were treated with reason and humanity.

15. If society so wants, it is the duty of every true citizen to help eliminate evil that poisons our country from within.

Note. Items in italics are reverse-coded.
APPENDIX D

SOCIAL DOMINANCE ORIENTATION SCALE

Rate which statements you have positive or negative feelings toward based on the following scale:

1 Very negative
2 Moderately negative
3 Slightly negative
4 Neutral
5 Slightly positive
6 Moderately positive
7 Very positive

1. Some groups of people are simply not the equals of others.
2. Some people are just more worthy than others.
3. This country would be better off if we cared less about how equal all people were.
4. Some people are just more deserving than others.
5. It is not a problem if some people have more of a chance in life than others.
6. Some people are just inferior to others.
7. To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on others.
8. Increased economic equality.
9. Increased social equality.
11. If people were treated more equally we would have fewer problems in this country.
12. In an ideal world, all nations would be equal.
13. We should try to treat one another as equals as much as possible.
14. It is important that we treat other countries as equals.

Note. All items are measured on a very negative (1) to a very positive (7) scale. Items 8-13 are reverse-coded.
APPENDIX E

THE SHORT CHRISTIAN ORTHODOXY SCALE

This survey includes a number of statements related to specific religious beliefs. You will probably find that you agree with some of the statements and disagree with others, to varying extents. Please mark your opinion on the line to the left of each statement, according to the amount of your agreement or disagreement, by using the following scale: In the space provided, write down a:

-3 if you strongly disagree with the statement
-2 if you moderately disagree with the statement
-1 if you slightly disagree with the statement
0 if you are neutral about the statement
+1 if you slightly agree with the statement
+2 if you moderately agree with the statement
+3 if you strongly agree with the statement

If you feel exactly and precisely neutral about an item, write down a “0” in the space provided.

1. Jesus Christ was the divine Son of God.
2. The Bible may be an important book of moral teachings, but it was no more inspired by God than were many such books in human history.*
3. The concept of God is an old superstition that is no longer needed to explain things in the modern era.*
4. Through the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus, God provided a way for the forgiveness of people’s sins.
5. Despite what many people believe, there is no such thing as a God who is aware of our actions.*
6. Jesus was crucified, died, and was buried but on the third day He arose from the dead.

Note: No response is scored as “0” on the (-3 to +3) response scale for each item. It is suggested that a participant’s data be discarded if he/she does not answer four or more items. Data can easily be prepared for analysis by rescaling responses such that $-3 = 1; -2 = 2; -1 = 3; 0$ (or no response) = 4; $+1 = 5; +2 = 6; \text{and } +3 = 7$. The keying of all negatively worded items – indicated above by an asterisk (*) – is reversed so that for all items a low score indicates an unorthodox belief and a high score indicates an orthodox belief. The SCO score is then computed for each participant by summing over the six items. Finally, it is recommended that one or two “buffer items” be inserted before the
first item above, so that participants will feel comfortable with both the content of the survey and the format before completing the SCO scale. It is suggested that these items be two of the original CO items not included in the SCO scale, such as “God exists as: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit” and “Those who feels that God is answering prayers are just deceiving themselves” (a reverse-coded item).
APPENDIX F

REVISED COLLECTIVE SELF-ESTEEM SCALE

Rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements based on the following scale. If you consider yourself to be not affiliated with a religion or not religious, consider the religion in which you were raised or in which your parents practice as your religious group.

1 strongly disagree
2 moderately disagree
3 slightly disagree
4 neutral
5 slightly agree
6 moderately agree
7 strongly agree

1. The religious group I belong to is an important part of who I am.
2. In general, belonging to a religious group is an important part of my self-image.
3. Overall, my religious group has very little to do with how I feel about myself. (-)
4. The religious group I belong to is unimportant to my sense of what kind of person I am. (-)
5. I am a cooperative participant in the religious group I belong to.
6. In general, I’m glad to be a member of the religious group I belong to.
7. I feel good about the religious group I belong to.
8. I am a worthy member of the religious group I belong to.
9. I feel I don’t have much to offer to the religious group I belong to. (-)
10. I often feel I’m a useless member of my religious group. (-)
11. I often regret that I belong to the religious group I do. (-)
12. Overall, I often feel that the religious group of which I am a member is not worthwhile. (-)
13. In general, others respect the religious group that I am a member of.
14. In general, others think that the religious group that I am a member of is unworthy. (-)
15. Overall, my religious group is considered good by others.
16. Most people consider my religious group, on average, to be more ineffective than other religious groups. (-)

Note. Negatively worded items are reverse scored. Higher scores indicate more endorsement of the construct.
APPENDIX G

THE RELIGIOUS ETHNOCENTRISM SCALE

Rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements based on the following scale:

-4 strongly disagree
-3 moderately disagree
-2 mildly disagree
-1 disagree
0 neutral
+1 agree
+2 mildly agree
+3 moderately agree
+4 strongly agree

1. Christian prayer (and only Christian prayer) should be said in public schools.
2. Our country should always be a Christian country, and other beliefs should be ignored in our public schools.
3. I would not mind if my child had atheist teachers in elementary school.*
4. If there is a heaven, good people will go to it no matter what religion they belong to, if any.*
5. If an acquaintance invited me to her temple to see a ceremony such as a Bar Mitzvah or Jewish evening prayers, I would have no religious hesitation about going.*
6. I am appalled that tax dollars go to public television when they feature programs on evolution, pagan religions, and other unchristian topics.
7. You can trust members of all religions equally; no one religion produces better people than any other does.*
8. Non-Christian religions have a lot of weird beliefs and pagan ways that Christians should avoid having any contact with.
9. All people may be entitled to their own religious beliefs, but I don’t want to associate with people whose views are quite different from my own.
10. People who belong to different religions are probably just as nice and moral as those who belong to mine.*
11. If a politician were an atheist, I would refuse to vote for him even if I agreed with all his other ideas.
12. I would like my church to hold joint services with a wide variety of other religions.
13. I would not mind at all if my son’s best friends were all atheists.*
14. I would be against letting some other, different religion use my church for its services when we were not using it.
15. If it were possible, I’d rather have a job where I worked with people with the same religious views I have rather than people with different views.
16. It would not bother me if my children regularly went to some other religion’s “youth group” with their friends.*

Note. * indicates that an item is reverse-coded.
APPENDIX H

RELIGIOUS ETHNOCENTRISM EMOTIONS QUESTIONNAIRE

Rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements based on the following scale:

1 ----------- 2 ----------- 3 ----------- 4 ----------- 5

Never                      Almost Always

Religious out-groups are defined here as individuals and/or groups who identify with a religious doctrine that is different from yours (i.e., not Christian) and/or who do not identify with a religious doctrine (i.e., atheists and/or agnostics).

1. How often have you felt afraid when thinking about things that religious out-groups have done or the kinds of people they are?

2. How often have you felt angry when thinking about things that religious out-groups have done or the kinds of people they are?

3. How often have you felt disgusted when thinking about things that religious out-groups have done or the kinds of people they are?

4. How often have you felt uneasy when thinking about things that religious out-groups have done or the kinds of people they are?

5. How often have you felt resentful when thinking about things that religious out-groups have done or the kinds of people they are?

6. How often have you felt irritated when thinking about things that religious out-groups have done or the kinds of people they are?
APPENDIX I

SPIRITUAL TRANSCENDENCE SCALE

Rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements based on the following scale:

1 Strongly disagree
2 Disagree
3 Neutral
4 Agree
5 Strongly agree

1. I have not experienced deep fulfillment and bliss through my prayers and/or emotions.*
2. I do not feel a connection to some larger Being or Reality.*
3. I do not believe that at some level my life is intimately tied to all of humankind.*
4. I meditate and/or pray so that I can reach a higher spiritual level.
5. All life is interconnected.
6. There is an order to the universe that transcends human thinking.
7. Death does stop one’s feelings of emotional closeness to another.*
8. In the quite of my prayers and/or meditations, I find a sense of wholeness.
9. I have done things in my life because I believed it would please a parent, relative, or friend that had died.
10. Although dead, memories and thoughts of my relatives continue to influence my current life.
11. Spirituality is not a central part of my life.*
12. I find inner strength and/or peace from my prayers and/or meditations.
13. Although there is good and bad in people, I believe that humanity as a whole is basically bad.*
14. I do not have any strong emotional ties to someone who has died.*
15. There is no higher plane of consciousness or spirituality that binds all people.*
16. Although individual people may be difficult, I feel an emotional bond with all humanity.
17. I meditate and/or pray so that I can grow as a person.
18. Prayer and/or meditation does not hold much appeal to me.*
19. My prayers and/or meditations provide me with a sense of emotional support.
20. I feel that on a higher level all of us share a common bond.
21. I want to grow closer to the God of my understanding.
22. The praise of others gives deep satisfaction to my accomplishments.
23. I am not concerned with the expectations that loved ones have of me.*

*Note.* Likert scale reflects adaptation from initial formatting. * indicates that an item is reverse-coded.
APPENDIX J

PERCEPTIONS OF RELIGIOUS OUTGROUPS AS DESECRATORS OF
CHRISTIANITY

Rate the extent to which you agree with the following statements based on the following scale:

1. Strongly disagree
2. Disagree
3. Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly agree

Religious out-groups are defined here as individuals and/or groups who identify with a religious doctrine that is different from yours (i.e., not Christian) and/or who do not identify with a religious doctrine (i.e., atheists and/or agnostics).

1. Some religious out-groups have greatly damaged the Church.
2. The failure of religious out-groups to accept Jesus Christ is an insult to the Church.
3. Among themselves, religious out-groups think Christians are ignorant for believing Christ was the son of God.
4. Religious out-groups represent a threat to the ultimate mission of Christ.
5. Religious out-groups oppose the fundamental teachings of Christ.

6. By engaging in non-Christian religious practices, religious out-groups have violated something sacred that came from God.
7. It is my responsibility to preserve and protect my Christian beliefs from the potential threats of non-Christians.
8. Non-Christians have defiled what is most sacred to me.
9. I become angry when I think of the ways that religious out-groups have violated the Church.

Note. Items 6-9 were added to the scale in the current study.
APPENDIX K

BALANCED INVENTORY OF DESIRABLE RESPONDING

Using the scale below as a guide, write a number beside each statement to indicate how much you agree with it.

1 ------------ 2 ------------ 3 ------------ 4 ------------ 5 ------------ 6 ------------ 7
Not True Somewhat True Very True

_____ *1. I sometimes tell lies if I have to.
_____ 2. I never cover up my mistakes.
_____ *3. There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone.
_____ 4. I never swear.
_____ *5. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.
_____ 6. I always obey laws, even if I’m unlikely to get caught.
_____ *7. I have said something bad about a friend behind his or her back.
_____ 8. When I hear people talking privately, I avoid listening.
_____ *9. I have received too much change from a salesperson without telling him or her.
_____ 10. I always declare everything at customs.
_____ *11. When I was young I sometimes stole things.
_____ 12. I have never dropped litter on the street.
_____ *13. I sometimes drive faster than the speed limit.
_____ 14. I never read sexy books or magazines.
_____ *15. I have done things that I don’t tell other people about.
_____ 16. I never take things that don’t belong to me.
_____ *17. I have taken sick-leave from work or school even though I wasn’t really sick.
_____ 18. I have never damaged a library book or store merchandise without reporting it.
_____ *19. I have some pretty awful habits.
_____ 20. I don’t gossip about other people’s business.

Note. * indicates that an item is reverse-coded.
APPENDIX L
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Title of Study: An Exploration of Individuals’ Religious and Political Beliefs

Introduction: You are invited to participate in a research project being conducted by Alissa Banyasz, MA (a doctoral student in the Department of Psychology at The University of Akron).

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to explore the religious and political beliefs of individuals who identify as Christian.

Procedures: Completion of the survey(s) will serve as your consent to participate in the study. Participation will entail completing a number of surveys about your experiences and beliefs. The surveys will take approximately 45-60 minutes to complete.

Exclusion: You must be at least 18 years old to participate in this research study, and you must identify as a Christian.

Risks and Discomforts: No adverse events are expected beyond those encountered in daily life.

Benefits: The information gathered from participants will assist the field of psychology in understanding the subjective experiences and beliefs of self-identified Christian individuals. If currently enrolled in a U of A undergraduate psychology course, it may be possible to receive extra credit points for your participation in this study based on your specific classes’ extra credit eligibility.

Right to refuse or withdraw: Participating in this study is completely voluntary. You can quit at any time and you won’t lose anything, even if you do not complete the study.

Confidential Data Collection: Data will be kept confidential. Participants will not be individually identified in any publication or presentation of the research results.

Confidentiality of records: The data will be kept for no less than 5 years and destroyed after that time in accordance with APA guidelines.

Who to contact with questions: If you have any questions about this study you may contact the Principal Investigator, Alissa Banyasz at amb203@uakron.edu. You may also
contact the Principal Investigator’s faculty advisor, David Tokar, Ph.D. at dmt5@uakron.edu. This project has been reviewed and approved by The University of Akron Institutional Review Board. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may call the IRB at (330) 972-7666.
NOTICE OF APPROVAL

March 31, 2014

Alissa Banyasz  733 West Market St. Akron, OH 44303
From: Sharon McWhorter, IRB Administrator
Re: IRB Number 20140318 “An Exploration of Individuals’ Religious and Political Beliefs”

Thank you for submitting your IRB Application for Review of Research Involving Human Subjects for the referenced project. Your application was approved on March 31, 2014. Your protocol represents minimal risk to subjects and matches the following federal category for exemption:

Exemption 1 – Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices.

X Exemption 2 – Research involving the use of educational tests, survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior.

Exemption 3 – Research involving the use of educational tests, survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior not exempt under category 2, but subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office.

Exemption 4 – Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens.

Exemption 5 – Research and demonstration projects conducted by or subject to the approval of department or agency heads, and which are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine public programs or benefits.

Exemption 6 – Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies.

Annual continuation applications are not required for exempt projects. If you make changes to the study's design or procedures that increase the risk to subjects or include activities that do not fall within the approved exemption category, please contact me to discuss whether or not a new application must be submitted. Any such changes or modifications must be reviewed and approved by the IRB prior to implementation.
Please retain this letter for your files. This office will hold your exemption application for a period of three years from the approval date. If you wish to continue this protocol beyond this period, you will need to submit another Exemption Request. If the research is being conducted for a master’s thesis or doctoral dissertation, the student must file a copy of this letter with the thesis or dissertation.

Approved consent form/s enclosed

Cc: David Tokar, Advisor Cc: Valerie Callanan – IRB Chair