UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

FAITH DEVELOPMENT, RELIGIOUS FUNDAMENTALISM, RIGHT-WING AUTHORITARIANISM, SOCIAL DOMINANCE ORIENTATION, CHRISTIAN ORTHODOXY, AND PROSCRIBED PREJUDICE AS PREDICTORS OF PREJUDICE

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

By

Carrie A. Crownover
Norman, Oklahoma
2007

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/1210

UMI Number: 3263437



UMI Microform 3263437

Copyright 2007 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

FAITH DEVELOPMENT, RELIGIOUS FUNDAMENTALISM, RIGHT-WING AUTHORITARIANISM, SOCIAL DOMINANCE ORIENTATION, CHRISTIAN ORTHODOXY, AND PROSCRIBED PREJUDICE AS PREDICTORS OF PREJUDICE

A DISSERTATION APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

BY

_____
Cal Stoltenberg, Ph.D.

_____
Ryan Brown, Ph.D.

_____
Mike Crowson, Ph.D.

_____
Melissa Frey, Ph.D.

_____
Rockey Robbins, Ph.D.

© Copyright by CARRIE A. CROWNOVER 2007
All Rights Reserved.

Acknowledgments

This dissertation could not have been completed without the support, time, and knowledge from a number of people and organizations. I would like to thank my family, friends, and co-workers whose prayers and encouragement have helped me through the normal hardships that come along with completing such an endeavor. I am grateful to my parents for their patience and financial support, as I have been a professional student for too long. To my friends, I could not have persevered without your continual love and support. Thank you for the phone calls, encouraging cards, and prayers. I have to mention my wonderful co-workers who have helped me endure with laughter and love. Emmaus Baptist Church and River Community Church assisted me with finding participants for this study, and their support is appreciated. There are others who have assisted me with accomplishing this task, including Justin Devero, who designed my web page, and Diane Ellis, who proofread my dissertation.

To my committee members, thank you for your ideas, recommendations, patience, and wisdom as I have traversed the doctoral program in counseling psychology. I would especially like to extend my appreciation to Mike Crowson, Ph.D., for your knowledge on my topic, along with your input on statistics. Lisa Frey, Ph.D., I am grateful for your encouragement and for normalizing the process for me. Cal Stoltenberg, Ph.D., I extend my thanks for taking my phone calls and hustling to assist me in bringing this to fruition. To Rockey Robbins, Ph.D., I have appreciated going through this journey with you, and Ryan Brown, Ph.D, thank you for introducing me to the topic of faith development in your course, Religion and Social Psychology.

Table of Contents

List of Tables……..vi

Abstract……..vii

Introduction……..1

Literature Review……8

Methods……..38

Results……48

Discussion……..55

References……..67

Appendix A……82

Appendix B……84

Appendix C……86

Appendix D……88

Appendix E……90

Appendix F……91

Appendix G……93

Appendix H……95

Appendix I……97

Appendix J……99

Appendix K……..101

List of Tables

Stages of Different Theories……103

Descriptive Statistics of Variables……..…….104

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation for Predictors and Criterion……....105

Hierarchical Multiple Linear Regression for Prejudice toward Ethnic Minorities……..106

Hierarchical Multiple Linear Regression for Prejudice toward Homosexuals……107

Hierarchical Multiple Linear Regression for Prejudice toward Women…….108

Abstract

The association between religiosity and prejudice is well documented. Several constructs including religious fundamentalism, right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, and Christian orthodoxy are related to prejudice. A search of current literature highlights the lack of research on the relationship between faith development and prejudice. The present study fills this void, by examining this relationship utilizing a quantitative measure, the Faith Development Scale (FDS). The study further assesses the validity of FDS by correlating it with other measures that are well known in the field of religiosity and prejudice. This study explores prejudice within one conservative religious group, Southern Baptists, and examines proscribed prejudice within that religious group. Results of this study indicate faith development does not account for a significant amount of variance in prejudice towards ethnic minorities, homosexuals, or women. The study found, however, that religious fundamentalism, right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, and proscribed prejudice are predictors of prejudice. Right-wing authoritarianism appears to be the strongest predictor of prejudice towards ethnic minorities, homosexuals, and women. Faith development was found to be negatively and moderately associated with right-wing authoritarianism.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Allport in 1950 defined prejudice "as an inappropriate or unfair negative reaction" (as cited in Fulton, Gorsuch, & Maynard, 1999, p. 14). He later refined his definition to characterize prejudice as hostility "based upon faulty and inflexible generalization" (Allport, 1954, p. 9). Others have defined prejudice as "antipathy toward members of a group in excess of that required by religious value statements" (Fulton et al., 1999, p. 14). The present study defines prejudice as a negative bias towards an individual based on ethnicity, sexual orientation, or gender.

History illustrates that no society, people, or nation has been impervious to prejudice, either as the oppressed or as the oppressor (Farley, 2000). Prejudice takes many forms, including genocide, slavery, apartheid, and discriminatory immigration laws (Farley, 2000). Prejudice can occur at the individual level such as an employer paying Asian workers less than Caucasian workers. It also can occur at the institutional level, such as school segregation, which occurred in the 1950s in the United States (Farley, 2000). These examples focus on prejudice toward ethnic minorities. History also shows, however, that other groups, such as women and homosexuals have endured prejudice. For example, women were in the past prohibited from voting, owning property, or attending certain universities (Haslanger & Tuana, 2004). Homosexuals have been ridiculed and killed because of their sexual orientation (Herek, Gillis, & Cogan, 1999). At present, homosexuals face numerous political issues. These include legislation that would prevent homosexuals from marrying and adopting children. In the United States Senate, there has been heated debate over the ban of same-sex marriages (Abrams, 2006).

Forty-four states only recognize traditional marriages, meaning a union between two people of the opposite sex ("Marriage in the 50 States," 2007). The Catholic Church and Protestant groups have been at the forefront in opposing same-sex marriages. According to a 2006 survey by Pew Forum, 79% of Caucasian evangelicals oppose same-sex marriages ("Gay Marriage," 2007). A few states such as California and New York allow gay and lesbian couples to adopt children. Most states, however, still prohibit such adoptions (Burtoft, 1994).

Religion is not beyond the reach of prejudice. The Bible teaches that all men and women should "love one another" (John 13:34, New International Version, p. 1658). Despite that directive, a plethora of evidence suggests prejudice existed in biblical times. According to the book of Genesis, the Egyptians enslaved and mistreated the Jews for hundreds of years (Genesis 1, 5). The New Testament relates that Paul continually preached to the Gentiles because Jews would not preach to them (Galatians 2:11-16). Other historical examples include the Crusades, which resulted in a series of wars against Muslims, Christian heretics, and enemies of the Papacy (Snell, 2007). In a modern day example, the September 11th, 2001, attacks on the World Trade Center and Pentagon are attributable to a few radical Muslims' values and their beliefs about the United States (National Commission On Terrorist Attacks Upon The United States, n.d.). Religion has been instrumental in prejudicial attitudes, which have generated both positive and negative social changes. For example, Martin Luther King, Jr. was a Baptist minister who became a prominent leader of the American civil rights movement (Gale, 1997). Mahatma Gandhi was a Hindu who became a civil rights leader in India (Nanda, 1987).

As outlined above, religiosity and prejudice are concepts worthy of study because they are pervasive in every society and people.

The relationship between various aspects of religiosity and prejudice has been well researched. For instance, religious fundamentalism is correlated with prejudice. Altemeyer and Hunsberger (1992) define religious fundamentalism as:

> The belief that there is one set of religious teachings that clearly contains the fundamental, basic, intrinsic, essential, inerrant truth about humanity and deity; that this essential truth is fundamentally opposed by forces of evil which must be vigorously fought; that this truth must be followed today according to the fundamental, unchangeable practices of the past; and that those who believe and follow these fundamental teachings have a special relationship with the deity. (p. 118)

Baptists, Mennonites, Jehovah's Witnesses, Evangelicals, and Pentecostals have the highest levels of fundamentalism (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992). Since this study plans to focus on one religious denomination, Southern Baptists, and they are known for being conservative in their beliefs and religious teachings, religious fundamentalism is used.

Another construct frequently utilized in research, right-wing authoritarianism, is an ideology that highly respects authority, supports traditional values of the authority, and exhibits prejudice toward out-group members (Altemeyer, 1981). This construct is used in many studies focusing on religiosity and prejudice because it, along with social dominance orientation, has been found to account for more variance in prejudice than other constructs (Altemeyer, 1988). The following characteristics of individuals high in right-wing authoritarians have been identified: they are religious, they come from religious backgrounds, their beliefs affect their behavior, they are fundamentalist, and they attend church regularly (Altemeyer, 2004).

Because the combination of right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation accounts for a significant amount of variance in prejudice, social dominance orientation (Altemeyer, 1988) is another construct that is added to this study. Social dominance orientation is defined as the "extent to which one desires that one's in-group dominate and be superior to out-groups" (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994, p. 742). Social dominance orientation alone has not generally been found to be associated with religiousness; however, since this study concentrates on one specific religious group, it is worth examining whether they wish to dominate other groups, such as ethnic minorities, homosexuals, and women (Altemeyer, 1988, 2004). Therefore, these constructs are relevant in understanding the relationship between religiosity and prejudice in Southern Baptists.

Although Christian orthodoxy, "the acceptance of well-defined, central tenets of the Christian religion" does not have a strong relationship with prejudice, it is important to include this construct in the study because it addresses the likelihood that a person will adhere to Christian beliefs (Fullerton & Hunsberger, 1982, p. 318; Kirkpatrick, 1993). This is critical to this research because Southern Baptists strongly believe in a literal interpretation of the Bible, which may affect their beliefs and values about prejudice toward certain groups such as ethnic minorities, homosexuals, and women.

Faith, a universal topic that encompasses world religions, beliefs, relationships, and values, is defined in numerous ways. From Fowler's perspective, faith goes beyond mere beliefs and values, to a person's "evolved and evolving ways of experiencing self, others, and the world" (Fowler, 1981, p. 92). Tillich (1957) defines faith as "a state of being ultimately concerned and an act of the total personality" (p. 4). *The American*

Century Dictionary defines faith as "complete trust and confidence" (p. 203). From a Christian perspective, faith can be defined as a confession of confidence in God. In other words, faith celebrates the objective reality of the blessings for which Christians hope and the demonstration of events as yet unseen (Hebrews 11:1). Depending on the reference point, faith can be broad and generalized to all people, such as in Fowler's definition, or very narrow and guided by a religious context or denomination, such as Southern Baptist.

Fowler (1981) further describes faith development as a way of bringing meaning to our experiences through relationships and our identities, commitments, and images. He categorizes faith development in six different stages: Intuitive-Projective Faith, Mythic-Literal Faith, Synthetic-Conventional Faith, Individuative-Reflective Faith, Conjunctive Faith, and Universalizing Faith (Fowler, 1981). These stages progress in faith and age, respectively.

Fowler's concept of faith differs from faith as professed by religious denominations such as Southern Baptists. According to Fowler (1981), most Protestants and Catholics see faith as a belief in an essential element or doctrine of the Christian life that holds truth, and, as faith develops, one increases his or her confidence in Christian tenets, which displays itself in his or her life. Therefore, the more fundamental and orthodox one is, the greater one's faith.

While faith development has only been studied for approximately the past 20 years in the psychology of religion, prejudice has been researched for longer. A review of the literature indicates, however, that the relationship between faith development and prejudice has not been an area of focus. This study attempts to address this void in research. It is important to explore whether immature or mature faith is linked to

prejudice because it may help in not only understanding religiosity and prejudice better but also in knowing how to address prejudice within groups. Therefore, Fowler's theory of faith development and distinctions between different types of prejudice are used to provide a conceptual framework. This study examines prejudice toward three different groups, ethnic minorities, homosexuals, and women, as measured from the beliefs and values of a conservative religious denomination, Southern Baptists. Prejudice is further assessed by focusing on the individual's perceptions of prejudice within the denomination. This focus allows assessment of perceived proscribed and nonproscribed prejudice in a religious denomination. Perceived proscribed prejudice is defined as "religious denominations that make serious attempts to eliminate prejudiced attitudes," while perceived nonproscribed prejudice is defined as "situations where a religious denomination does not attempt to negate prejudice and may formally or informally support specific prejudice against groups" (Duck & Hunsberger, 1999; Spilka, Hood, Hunsberger, & Gorsuch, 2003, p. 464).

In this document, faith development, religious fundamentalism, right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, Christian orthodoxy, and perceived proscribed prejudice are presented in a broad context, including theories, research, and instruments that measure these constructs. The importance of this research lies in several different areas. This study is designed to provide a more complex way of conceptualizing the relationship between religion and prejudice by adding Fowler's theory of faith development. It also attempts to look at prejudice within the scope of a particular religious group, Southern Baptists, rather than combining many Protestant groups together. This exclusive focus extends our understanding of the relationship

between a conservative Protestant religious group and prejudice. The present study will perhaps give us additional insight into how religious groups and individuals are prejudiced toward out-groups. Additionally, it is important to look at religious groups in the context of prejudice, as religious beliefs and values have resulted in social change in the past and will likely continue to influence major decisions in the future. Focusing on Southern Baptists offers a broad base to examine the relevant issues, since there are more than 16 million Southern Baptist members who attend 42,000 churches in the United States ("About Us—Meet Southern Baptists," 2007). Southern Baptists constitute the largest Protestant denomination and the second largest religious group in the United States ("Southern Baptist Convention," n.d.). By virtue of their number, Southern Baptists have the ability to influence politics, especially in southern states where the majority reside. They can affect the outcome of proposed legislation on key issues such as legalizing same-sex marriages and allowing homosexual couples to adopt children.

In conclusion, the present study attempts to address a void in the current literature by exploring the relationship between faith development and prejudice toward ethnic minorities, homosexuals and women. Incorporating well-researched constructs related to prejudice, such as right-wing authoritarianism and religious fundamentalism, is important to better understand these constructs in the context of individuals of a specific religious group. Social dominance orientation and perceived proscribed prejudice are included to illuminate whether prejudice may stem from an individual's perceptions of his or her group's values and beliefs. Inclusion of Christian orthodoxy is designed to indicate how dedicated an individual is to the Christian tenets of his or her religion, which can affect prejudice. Finally, prejudice towards ethnic minorities, homosexuals, and women is

explored among Southern Baptists, a denomination which, by virtue of its large membership, has the potential to affect our society, especially in the political arena.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

This section reviews current professional literature examining prejudice towards ethnic minorities, homosexuals, and women; religious fundamentalism (RF); right-wing authoritarianism (RWA); social dominance orientation (SDO); proscribed prejudice (PP); and faith development (FD). Definitions, theories, and research on these constructs are discussed below.

Religiosity and Prejudice

Since the 1940s, research has repeatedly suggested that people who attend church with moderate frequency, score higher on measures of racial and ethnic prejudice than people who do not attend church and people who are highly active members of a church (Allport & Kramer, 1946; Gorsuch & Aleshire, 1974). Some researchers found that prejudice increases as the religiosity of a person increases (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950; Glock & Stark, 1966).

Allport (1954) found that different religious orientations might result in different degrees of prejudice. Allport and Ross (1967) link religious orientation with prejudice, which has influenced the study of religion and prejudice over the years. They define a person with intrinsic religiousness as one whose faith encompasses his or her whole life. Someone with an extrinsic religiousness orientation, on the other hand, uses his or her faith for some type of gain, such as for business purposes or social gain. Allport and Ross's (1967) research originally found a positive correlation between prejudice and both

intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientation, even though they had hoped to find a negative correlation between intrinsic orientation and prejudice. For subsequent research, they categorized people into four types: consistently I (intrinsic), consistently E (extrinsic), indiscriminately pro (high scores on both scales), and indiscriminately anti (low scores on both scales). This later study suggests that those with an intrinsic orientation are less prejudiced than those with an extrinsic orientation. Gorsuch and Aleshire (1974) found that persons who possess intrinsic religiousness are not fundamentalist in their beliefs and are able to theologically discriminate, which results in them being more tolerant. Furthermore, those who score high on both scales are more prejudiced than the consistently I and E (Allport & Ross, 1967).

Although Allport and Ross's conceptualization of religious orientation is used frequently in studies on prejudice, there are several problems with the constructs of intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientation and the scales used to measure them (Altemeyer, 1996; Donahue, 1985; Hunsberger, 1995; Kirkpatrick, 1989; Kirkpatrick & Hood, 1990; Laythe, Finkel, & Kirkpatrick, 2001). Donahue (1985) found that few studies utilize the four-way categorization that Allport and Ross recommended from their earlier research. From a meta-analysis of the intrinsic-extrinsic research, Donahue found that the I scale is not correlated with prejudice, rather than being negatively correlated to prejudice. Donahue also concluded that the E scale is negatively correlated with prejudice, but not to the degree indicated by Allport's research. Additionally, he found that the E scale has low internal consistency and item-total correlations. Hunsberger (1995) states that Allport's conceptualization of intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientation has not met expectations in its ability to explain the relationship between

religious orientation and prejudice. A review of the literature confirms that many studies have used Allport and Ross's original approach to religious orientation, rather than incorporating the four types. Other researchers have reconstructed the scales in hopes of correcting the problems of the I scale not being correlated with prejudice and the E scale having low internal consistency and item-total correlations (Spilka et al., 2003).

Although there are problems with the conceptualization and structure of religious orientation, considerable research has focused on the relationship between religious orientation and prejudice. Study of religious orientation has been instrumental in furthering research on religiosity and prejudice, and many instruments utilized in this study have used religious orientation in their validation studies. It is critical to address religious orientation, as it is the foundation upon which study of the relationship between religiosity and prejudice began.

As research on prejudice has evolved, other variables have been found that account for prejudice among various groups; these include religious fundamentalism, right-wing authoritarianism, and social dominance orientation. These constructs appear to be better indicators of prejudice than religious orientation and will be discussed later. Before further discussing these constructs, it is important to focus on groups that experience prejudice.

Targets of Prejudice

Ethnic Minorities

The Baptist Faith and Message, a statement adopted by the Southern Baptist Convention, is used as the basis for religious beliefs among Southern Baptists. The religious beliefs from this statement are derived from scripture in the Bible. Along with

the Bible, this statement is a guideline when verifying beliefs and values that are consistent with Southern Baptist doctrine. *The Baptist Faith and Message* states:

> The sacredness of human personality is evident in that God created man in His own Image, and in that Christ died for man; therefore, every person of every race possesses full dignity and is worthy of respect and Christian love. (p. 10)

In general, most mainstream Christian churches in the United States try to decrease and eradicate prejudiced attitudes towards ethnic minorities (Batson, Schoenrade, & Ventis, 1993), and as conveyed by *The Baptist Faith and Message*, Southern Baptists share this goal. Past studies have shown, however, that Christians tend to be prejudiced toward ethnic minorities (Allport & Kramer, 1946; Gorsuch & Aleshire, 1974; Herek, 1987). The present study intends to explore prejudice toward ethnic minorities, along with perceived proscribed prejudice (serious attempts by a religious denomination to eliminate prejudicial attitudes) toward ethnic minorities among Southern Baptists (Duck & Hunsberger, 1999; Spilka et al., 2003). Since Southern Baptists believe in adhering to Jesus' teachings, the tenets of their religion dictate that they should not be prejudiced toward ethnic minorities, but instead, should view ethnic minorities as equals.

Many studies have focused on ethnic or racial prejudice (Allport & Kramer, 1946; Gorsuch & Aleshire, 1974). Most of these studies have found that individuals who score higher on intrinsic religious orientation tend to be less prejudiced toward ethnic minorities, while individuals who score higher on extrinsic religious orientation and religious fundamentalism tend to be more prejudiced toward ethnic minorities (Allport & Ross, 1967). Either no correlation or a negative correlation with prejudice has been found for the Quest Scale, which measures a flexible, questioning, and open approach to religious beliefs and values that tend to be more tolerant and nonprejudiced toward others

(Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992; Batson, Naifeh, & Pate, 1978, 1986; Duck & Hunsberger, 1999; Hunsberger & Jackson, 2005; McFarland, 1989, 1990; Snook & Gorsuch, 1985). Herek (1987) found that an extrinsic orientation is more predictive of prejudice toward Black Americans.

Batson et al. (1993) indicate that prejudice against ethnic minorities is usually discouraged among mainstream religious communities in the United States. Duck and Hunsberger (1999) found that intrinsic orientation and quest are associated with individuals' perception of their religion as making attempts to eliminate prejudice, while extrinsic orientation is related to individuals' perceptions of their religion as not attempting to nullify prejudice.

Whitley (1999) found that social dominance orientation (SDO) accounts for more variance in prejudice against ethnic minorities than right-wing authoritarianism (RWA). However, Laythe, Finkel and Kirkpatrick (2001) suggest that religious fundamentalism when divided into two parts—right-wing authoritarianism (the manner in which religious beliefs and values are practiced) and Christian belief content (the substance of Christian beliefs)—contributes to racial prejudice. They found that RWA is positively correlated with racial prejudice, while Christian beliefs are negatively correlated with such attitudes. Those who score high on RWA tend to be more prejudiced against ethnic minorities (McFarland, 1990; Altemeyer, 1988; Laythe et al., 2001; Whitley, 1999).

Homosexuals

Various scriptures in the Bible indicate that homosexuality is a sin, meaning that this lifestyle and act is in direct violation of God's will (Leviticus 18:22; 1 Corinthians 6:9). *The Baptist Faith and Message* states:

> In the spirit of Christ, Christians should oppose racism, every form of greed, selfishness, and vice, and all forms of sexual immorality, including adultery, homosexuality, and pornography (p. 19).

It makes sense in view of this statement that Southern Baptists would have a negative bias toward homosexual behaviors; however, prejudice against homosexuals as people is not addressed. This study intends to explore prejudice towards homosexuals among Southern Baptists. Since Southern Baptists adhere to traditional religious teachings and tend to be conventional, it is hypothesized that they are prejudiced toward homosexuals. Past studies indicate that those who embrace conventional moral standards and beliefs tend to be more prejudiced toward those who go against societal norms, and homosexuality has been negatively stigmatized in our society (Altemeyer, 1996; Herek, 2003).

Hunsberger and Jackson (2005) found that intrinsic religious orientation, extrinsic religious orientation, and religious fundamentalism are positively correlated with intolerance towards homosexuals, while the Quest Scale is negatively correlated with prejudice against homosexuals. Duck and Hunsberger (1999) found that intrinsic religious orientation is positively correlated with prejudice against homosexuals, and extrinsic religious orientation and quest are negatively correlated with prejudice against homosexuals. Therefore, there is some discrepancy in the findings about extrinsic religious orientation and its relationship to prejudice among homosexuals.

Fulton, Gorsuch, and Maynard (1999) attempt to separate the person from the actual lifestyle of homosexuality in a study regarding anti-homosexual opinions among Christians. They found that those who score higher on intrinsic religious orientation tend to be more accepting of homosexuals than those who score lower on intrinsic religious

orientation when fundamentalism is controlled. Additionally, Fulton et al. (1999) found prejudice against homosexuals to be in excess of ideology, which suggests that participants' prejudice went beyond the stated beliefs of their denomination.

Whitley and Lee (2000) found that people scoring higher on RWA, SDO, dogmatism, and political-economic conservatism all had negative attitudes toward homosexuals. However, RWA had the highest correlation with negative attitudes toward homosexuals. In a second study, they found that RWA and SDO accounted for the most variance in prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals (Whitley & Lee, 2000). Other studies corroborate the finding that those who score higher on RWA are more prejudiced toward homosexuals (Altemeyer, 1996; Haddock, Zanna, & Esses, 1993; Oyamot, Borgida, & Fisher, 2006).

Women

In addition to prejudice against ethnic minorities and homosexuals, the present study explores prejudice against women. Women as a target of prejudice are included for two reasons. First, there are few studies focusing on the relationship between religiosity and prejudice against women, even though it has long been thought that religion may affect gender inequalities (Daly, 1974, as cited in Burn & Busso, 2005; Sered, 1994, as cited in Burn & Busso, 2005). Therefore, one purpose of this study is to further research on this topic. Second, there has been considerable controversy over the role of Southern Baptist women in family, ministry, and on the mission field due to the revision of *The Baptist Faith and Message*. This study hopes to explore the relationship of religiosity and prejudice towards women to investigate if prejudice, is in fact, a facet of Southern

Baptists. The revised *Baptist Faith and Message* added the following section on the family:

> …The husband and wife are of equal worth before God, since both are created in God's image. The marriage relationship models the way God relates to His people. A husband is to love his wife as Christ loved the church. He has the God-given responsibility to provide for, to protect, and to lead his family. A wife is to submit herself graciously to the servant leadership of her husband even as the church willingly submits to the leadership of Christ. She, being in the image of God as is her husband and thus equal to him, has the God-given responsibility to respect her husband and to serve as his helper in managing the household and nurturing the next generation (p.21).

For the purpose of this study, prejudice toward women is defined as maintaining patriarchy and traditional gender roles, which is derived from the ambivalent sexism theory (Glick & Fiske, 1997). This theory not only focuses on patriarchy and hostile attitudes toward women that stem from this societal structure, but also on positive attitudes of affection from the dominant group toward the subordinate group (Glick & Fiske, 1997; Glick & Fiske, 2001; Harris, 1991, as cited in Glick & Fiske, 1996; Jackman, 1994; Pratto, 1996). Glick and Fiske (1997) created an instrument based on the ambivalent sexism theory that is divided into two types of sexism, benevolent sexism and hostile sexism. These two forms of sexism are known as "legitimizing ideologies" or "beliefs that help to justify and maintain inequality between groups (Glick & Fiske, 2001, p. 110; Sidanius et al., 1994). Those with benevolent sexism have positive attitudes toward women in traditional roles. Those with hostile sexism, however, tend to characterize women in derogatory ways.

Both forms of sexism address "power, gender differentiation and sexuality" (Glick & Fiske, 1997, p. 121). Power is defined by "dominative paternalism, the belief that women ought to be controlled by men, and protective paternalism, the belief that

men serve as protectors and providers for women" (Glick & Fiske, 1997, p. 121, 122). These two types of paternalism may coexist because "men are dependent on women to be wives, mothers, and romantic objects" (Glick & Fiske, 1996, p. 493). Gender differentiation is defined by competitive gender differentiation, the belief that men are better than women, and complementary gender differentiation, traits deemed as being positive for women in traditional roles (Glick & Fiske, 1996; Glick & Fiske, 1997). Sexuality is defined as "heterosexual hostility, the tendency to view women merely as sexual objects, as well as the fear that women may use sexual attraction to gain power over men; and intimate heterosexuality, the idea that a man is not complete without a female romantic partner" (Glick & Fiske, 1997, p. 122). Thus, these three aspects of sexism create hostile sexism and benevolent sexism.

Glick & Fiske (1997) found that those with hostile sexism have greater hostility toward women than those with benevolent sexism. Hostility is greatest against career women among men who endorsed hostile sexism, while the traditional woman is seen more favorably among men who endorse benevolent sexism. Women tend to have the same trend in attitudes toward career and traditional women in their overall scores; however, the findings are not as strong as those of men (Glick, Diebold, Bailey-Werner, & Zhu, 1997; Glick & Fiske, 2001).

In their review, Hunsberger and Jackson (2005) found no relationship between prejudice and women among intrinsic religious orientation, extrinsic religious orientation, and quest. The researchers found a relationship between religious fundamentalism (RF) and negative attitudes towards women. When looking at prejudice against women in Ghana and Canada, Hunsberger, Owusu and Duck (1999) found that both RWA and RF

are correlated with negative attitudes toward women, with RWA having a stronger relationship with negative attitudes toward women. Burn and Busso (2005) found a positive relationship between benevolent sexism with intrinsic religious orientation, extrinsic religious orientation, and scriptural literalism. Additionally, intrinsic religious orientation and scriptural literalism are positively correlated with protective paternalism, which is the opinion that men should provide for and protect women (Burn & Busso, 2005). On the other hand, extrinsic religious orientation is related to heterosexual intimacy, complementary gender differentiation, and protective paternalism, indicating that women are more moral and are needed in a man's life in order for him to be happy (Burn & Busso, 2005). Christopher and Mull's (2006) study suggests that RWA is strongly associated with benevolent sexism, while SDO is strongly related to hostile sexism.

In summary, research indicates Southern Baptists will be prejudiced toward women because they are conventional and condone traditional roles for women. Furthermore, RWA will be more strongly related to benevolent sexism, while SDO will be more strongly related with hostile sexism (Christopher & Mull, 2006).

Religious Fundamentalism and Prejudice

As with many constructs in religious studies, it is difficult to pinpoint one definition for religious fundamentalism. This term has been defined as referring to evangelicals who emphasize the validity of the Bible and its authority; the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ as our Savior; and evangelism (Kelstedt & Smidt, 1991). It is a way of thinking that measures an individual's feelings and thoughts about his or her religious beliefs (Conway & Siegelman, 1982; Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 2004). As

stated previously, the definition of religious fundamentalism focuses on the belief that there is only one correct set of religious teachings that contains the truth about humanity and God (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992). Past studies have found fundamentalists to be unwilling to look at other views and reluctant to question their belief system (Hunsberger, Alisat, Pancer, & Pratt, 1996; McFarland & Warren, 1992; Richards, 1994). Other researchers have found that religious fundamentalism helps an individual maintain boundaries in his or her belief system (Ethridge & Feagin, 1979; Hood, Morris, & Watson, 1986).

Altemeyer and Hunsberger (1992) found that religious fundamentalism is positively correlated with prejudice and authoritarian aggression toward several minority groups. Other studies, which used different instruments to measure fundamentalism or the original religious fundamentalism scale, with a focus on Christianity have found a positive correlation between fundamentalism and prejudice (Altemeyer, 2003; Hunsberger, 1996; Hunsberger et al., 1999; Jackson & Esses, 1997; Laythe et al., 2001; Wylie & Forest, 1992). Kirkpatrick (1993) found a positive correlation between fundamentalism and discriminatory attitudes toward Black Americans, women, homosexuals, and communists. Altemeyer (2003) found a relationship between religious fundamentalism and religious ethnocentrism, with fundamentalists identifying their religion being an integral part of their lives from an early age.

Altemeyer and Hunsberger's (1992) study focuses on the relationship among religious fundamentalism, quest, and right-wing authoritarianism. They found that participants who score high on RWA also score high on RF. After they controlled for the effects of RWA for RF and prejudice, the correlation between RF and prejudice

decreased to nonsignificant levels (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992). This suggests that RWA contributes more to prejudice than RF. However, RWA and RF measure different things—RWA concentrates on authority, while RF focuses on a person's attitude toward his or her religious beliefs. Past research indicates a strong relationship between RWA and RF (.62 to .82), and each tends to reinforce the other (Altemeyer, 1981, 1988; Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 2004; Hunsberger, 1996). Additionally, research suggests that religious fundamentalists in other religious groups, such as Muslims, Hindus, and Jews, also are authoritarian and prejudiced toward homosexuals (Hunsberger, 1996).

Since Southern Baptists are often described as conservative, religious fundamentalism is used in this study to measure participants' attitude toward their beliefs and religious teachings. Religious fundamentalism is also being examined because it has been found to account for variance in prejudice. Because religious fundamentalism and right-wing authoritarianism reinforce one other, right-wing authoritarianism is included in this study.

Right-Wing Authoritarianism and Prejudice

Authoritarian personality theory contributes to research on prejudice by showing that people who are prejudiced against one group are also more likely to be prejudiced against other groups (Altemeyer, 1981). This disposition is found to encompass personality characteristics as well as sociopolitical beliefs such as political conservatism, pseudo-patriotism and religiosity (Altemeyer, 1981, 1998). Fromm (1941) coins the term "authoritarian character" to refer to the combination of these personality characteristics and sociopolitical beliefs. Adorno et al. (1950) found that a relationship exists between religiousness and an authoritarian personality. For example, people high in

authoritarianism have great respect for authority, show aggression toward out-groups when authorities permit it, and support traditional values when those values are endorsed by authorities (Whitley, 1999).

Altemeyer's (1981, 1988, 1996) Right-Wing Authoritarianism scale is used extensively in current research on prejudice, as Adorno's F-scale has been plagued by methodological problems. RWA is a strong predictor of an individual's personal prejudice (Altemeyer, 1988; Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992; Duckitt, 1991, 1992; Wylie & Forest, 1992). Past research indicates that people who score high in authoritarianism are prejudiced against Black Americans (Altemeyer, 1998; Lambert & Chasteen, 1997; McFarland & Adelson, 1996, 1997; Whitley, 1998, 1999), American Indians (Altemeyer, 1998), women (Altemeyer, 1998; Duncan, Peterson, & Winter, 1997; McFarland & Adelson, 1996, 1997), and homosexuals (Altemeyer, 1998; Lippa & Arad, 1999; Whitley & Lee, 2000). Further RWA research found a relationship with ethnocentrism and deliberate and subtle prejudice (Van Hiel & Mervielde, 2002), modern racism (Reynolds, Turner, Haslam, & Ryan, 2001) and prejudice toward Asians and Aboriginals in Australia (Heaven & St. Quintin, 2003).

Altemeyer (1981, 1988) describes people who are high in authoritarianism as feeling threatened by out-group members because the out-group members may question or threaten traditional values or the traditional power structures in society. For example, people high in authoritarianism tend to agree with the belief that males are superior to females, and they disagree with egalitarian gender-role relationships (Altemeyer, 1998; Duncan, Peterson, & Winter, 1997; Kristiansen & Hotte, 1996). Additionally, those who score high on authoritarianism "tend to be highly self-righteous" (Altemeyer &

Hunsberger, 1992, p. 116; Altemeyer, 1988). Therefore, they are more likely to express prejudice against out-group members who do not adhere to traditional values (Whitley, 1999).

Duck and Hunsberger's (1999) study looks at the relationship between religious orientation, RWA, RF and proscription status (PP). The results indicate that RWA is a stronger predictor of prejudice than a religious community's influence. When controlling for RWA, the results change for intrinsic scores and prejudice (Duck & Hunsberger, 1999). Intrinsic religious orientation is no longer related to negative attitudes toward homosexuals (Duck & Hunsberger, 1999). Leak and Randall (1995) suggest that less mature faith development is positively correlated with RWA.

Social Dominance Orientation and Prejudice

Social dominance orientation (SDO) comes from Social Dominance theory, which focuses on individual and structural elements in society that increase various forms of group-based oppression such as racism, ethnocentrism, and sexism (Sidanius, Pratto, Van Laar, & Levin, 2004). This group-based oppression is universal among humans in their endeavor to form and maintain group-based hierarchies (Sidanius et al., 2004). Group-based oppression is affected by institutional and individual prejudice. For example, many social institutions such as schools and organized religions distribute their wealth, support, food, and other resources to their members but may not make resources available to those who are not members. Therefore, institutional prejudice is a major factor in establishing, preserving and multiplying systems of group-based hierarchy (Sidanius et al., 2004).

Within a group-based hierarchy, people tend to share knowledge, beliefs and values or ideologies that rationalize prejudice, and they tend to support institutions or

organizations that are congruent with their ideologies (Mitchell & Sidanius, 1995; Pratto, Stallworth, & Conway-Lanz, 1998; Pratto, Stallworth & Sidanius, 1997). "The acceptance of ideologies that legitimize inequality and behaviors that produce inequality is partly determined by people's general desire for group-based dominance" (Sidanius et al., 2004, p. 848). Group-based dominance is measured by social dominance orientation (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994).

SDO is defined as the "extent to which one desires that one's in-group dominate and be superior to out-groups" (Pratto et al., 1994, p. 742). The higher SDO a person scores, the more that person prefers group-based hierarchies and desires to be at the top of the social hierarchy (Sidanius, 1993; Sidanius & Pratto, 1993). Research has indicated that those who score high on SDO have negative attitudes toward out-groups that desire social equality, including ethnic minorities, feminists and homosexuals (Altemeyer, 1998; McFarland & Adelson, 1996, 1997; Pratto et al., 1994; Sidanius, Pratto, & Bobo, 1994, 1996; Whitley & Lee, 2000). Gender differences exist, as males tend to have higher scores on SDO than females (Sidanius et al., 1994; Van Hiel & Mervielde, 2002). Additionally, people who score high on SDO tend to justify their negative attitudes toward out-group members by rationalizing that in-group members are superior. These people use "legitimizing myths" that justify their prejudicial attitudes (Sidanius, 1993; Sidanius & Pratto, 1993).

Differences Between RWA and SDO

There are two schools of thought about what RWA and SDO actually measure. The earliest studies conceptualized authoritarianism as a predisposition based on personality to negatively assess others who are different from the in-group (Adorno et al.,

1950; Altemeyer, 1981, 1998). RWA and SDO measure two different facets of the authoritarian personality: submissiveness (RWA) and dominant (SDO) features (Altemeyer, 1998). However, later studies suggest that RWA and SDO are more strongly associated with ideological attitudes and values (Duriez & Van Hiel, 2002; Heaven & Connors, 2001). According to Duckitt (as cited in Cohrs, Moschner, Maes, & Kielmann, 2005) RWA and SDO are dimensions of ideological attitudes that stem from "parenting, personality traits, and social worldviews" (p. 1426). Duckitt (2001) introduced a causal model for RWA and SDO. RWA measures an individual's desire for social or group security, while SDO measures an individual's desire for group dominance and superiority (Duckitt, 2006).

The association between RWA and SDO is relatively weak (Altemeyer, 1998, 2004; Duckitt, Wagner, du Plessis, & Birum, 2002, as cited in Roccato & Ricolfi, 2005; Whitley, 1999). However, several studies have suggested that the correlation between RWA and SDO are higher than previous studies indicated (Crowson, DeBacker, & Thoma, 2005; Ekehammar, Akrami, Gylje, & Zakrisson, 2004; Heaven & Connors, 2001; McFarland, 2005; Van Hiel & Mervielde, 2002). Even though more recent research indicates the correlations are stronger than found in previous research, there is enough evidence to suggest that RWA and SDO are different constructs. For example, RWA tends to be associated with security values such as national strength and religiosity, while SDO is related to "low security and low harmony values" (Heaven & Connors, 2001). Additionally, RWA predicts prejudice toward deviant groups, while SDO predicts prejudice against socially subordinate groups (Duckett, 2006). Research from the 1990s suggests that RWA is "mediated by perceived threat," while SDO is "mediated by

perceived economic competition" (Esses, Haddock, & Zanna, 1993, as cited in Duckitt, 2006; Esses, Jackson, & Armstrong, 1998, as cited in Duckitt, 2006, p. 694)

Both RWA and SDO are extensively used in research on prejudice, and several studies found that both constructs jointly account for about 50% of the variance in prejudice (Altemeyer, 1998; McFarland, 2002; McFarland & Adelson, 1996). Other studies found that RWA and SDO are related to conservative attitudes, certain kinds of conservatism, and racism (Van Hiel & Mervielde, 2002; Van Hiel, Pandelaere, & Dureiz, 2004). High scores on RWA are correlated with culturally conservative attitudes; while, high scores on SDO are correlated with economically conservative attitudes (Van Hiel & Mervielde, 2002; Van Hiel et al., 2004). Since both constructs appear to be important components in prejudice, they will be utilized in this study. Because neither construct is used in the validation process of the Faith Development Scale, they are used to further the research on this instrument.

Christian Orthodoxy and Prejudice

Christian orthodoxy (CO) is defined by the "acceptance of well-defined, central tenets of the Christian religion" (Fullerton & Hunsberger, 1982, p. 318). Christian orthodoxy differs from religious fundamentalism in that it assesses a person's attitude toward traditional beliefs of Christianity rather than looking at how rigidly that person adheres to his or her religious beliefs. Fundamentalism refers to a person's belief system, which organizes how the person views CO (Kirkpatrick, Hood, & Hartz, 1991).

Research does not suggest a strong relationship between CO and prejudice. Kirkpatrick (1993) found that CO is negatively correlated to prejudice toward blacks and

women, and it has a weak positive correlation to prejudice toward communists. CO is uncorrelated with prejudice toward homosexuals (Kirkpatrick, 1993).

As the present study focuses on the Southern Baptist denomination, it is important to address a person's theological beliefs about Christianity, especially because many of the hypotheses regarding prejudice toward ethnic minorities, homosexuals, and women are based on Christian orthodoxy.

Fowler's Faith Development Theory

Faith

Before discussing Fowler's Faith Development Theory (FDT) and its stages, faith itself must be defined. According to James Fowler's *Stages of Faith*, faith is:

> People's evolved and evolving ways of experiencing self, others and world (as they construct them) as related to and affected by the ultimate conditions of existence (as they construct them) and of shaping their lives' purposes and meanings, trusts and loyalties, in light of the character of being, value and power determining the ultimate conditions of existence (as grasped in their operative images—conscious and unconscious—of them). (Fowler, 1981, p. 92-93)

Fowler looks at a broader range of faith that encompasses all human beings, rather than narrowing faith to a religion or belief. Thus, faith may not be religious in its substance or framework. He goes on to define belief as "the holding of certain ideas" (Fowler, 1981, p.11). Belief is one component that makes up faith (Fowler, 1981; Niebuhr, 1960, 1972; Tillich, 1957; Smith, 1963).

Through examining the Greek and Latin origins of the word "faith," Fowler (1981) found that it is a verb, rather than a noun, in the English language. It is a way of conceptualizing and bringing meaning to our experiences. Additionally, faith is relational and begins with the family. Fowler (1981) describes a triad made up of "self, others and shared center(s) of value and power among the family, which he calls a

covenantal pattern of the family" (p. 17). There is a two-way flow between the self and others that is constituted of a healthy relationship between child and parents consisting of love, trust and loyalty. At the top of the triad is the shared center(s) of value and power where all parties adhere, believe, and trust in the center(s). It should be noted that this is a dynamic system, in that family members continually change, which means that faith evolves (Fowler, 1981).

Faith shapes our identities because people invest or commit themselves to things that have transcendent worth, which in turn gives their lives value and gives them a sense of security (Fowler, 1981). It is these commitments that give us identities, and each person has a plethora of "faith-relational triads" (Fowler, 1981, p. 19). For example, a person has a faith-relational triad at home, work, or school and with friends, spouses, or co-workers. Fowler (1981) has examined how people integrate the different triads. Faith and identity are integrated into three main types or patterns of faith-identity relations: polytheist, henotheistic and radical monotheism. A polytheist does not have one center of value and power but instead has many minor centers of value and power, which means their commitments shift frequently or there is no passion in their commitment. A henotheist is very committed but puts his or her center of value and power in the wrong thing such as power, prestige, money, organizations, or institutions. In other words, the center of value and power serves to increase his or her worth. A radical monotheist concentrates all of his or her trust and loyalty into a transcendent center of value and power. These faith-identity relational patterns are dynamic rather than static (Fowler, 1981; Niebuhr, 1960).

Through the eyes of faith, a person sees life in images referred to as the "ultimate environment" (Fowler, 1981, p. 24). Fowler (1981) states that "all of our knowing begins with images and that most of what we know is stored in images" (p. 25). He also makes several assumptions that need to be noted to understand his concept of images. First, our knowing chronicles the influence of our experiences more than we are aware. Second, our knowing inside us is stronger than our conscious awareness . Finally, when events or experiences occur, knowing does not take place until the events or experiences are incorporated with former images. Therefore, the ultimate environment is "a comprehensive frame of meaning that both holds and grows out of the most transcendent centers of value and power to which our faith gives allegiance" (Fowler, 1981, p. 28).

Now that faith has been defined and conceptualized from Fowler's viewpoint, the components of the development of his faith stages can be discussed. The work of several theorists, including Piaget, Erickson, Kohlberg, and Levinson, heavily influenced Fowler's conceptualization of faith development. Piaget and Kohlberg's structural developmental theories added to Fowler's work by serving as a way of comprehending faith in terms of knowing and interpreting the world, and a way to generalize to all people of the world (Fowler, 1981). These theories also contributed the concept of an interactional process. However, there are some limitations to the structural developmental theories, such as separating knowing or cognition from emotion, their disinterest in images of knowing, or attention to the unconscious. Neither Piaget nor Kohlberg offered an explanation for the moral self (Fowler, 1981).

It is at this point that Erickson and Levinson contributed to Fowler's faith development by aiding him with the functional part of faith. Levinson's principal eras

and Erickson's psychosocial stages correspond with the transitioning of stages in faith development (Fowler, 1981). See Table 1 for a comparison of the different theories in relation to faith development (Fowler, 1981; Piaget, 1970; Kohlberg, 1973; Levinson, 1978).

Stages of Faith Development

Fowler (1981) identified six different stages in faith development beginning in childhood. He included a pre-stage called undifferentiated faith that emphasizes trust and mutuality with those who care for the infant. If the infant does not obtain these things in adequate quantities, he or she may develop narcissistic tendencies that distort his or her relationships or develop patterns of isolation that results in failing to have relationships (Fowler, 1981).

Stage 1: Intuitive-Projective Faith develops in children ranging in ages from two to seven years old. This is when the child develops language skills and is able to give meaning to his or her sensory experiences. The child's imagination is not influenced by logical thought and longstanding images are formed. Adults highly influence the child's perceptions (Fowler, 1981).

Stage 2: Mythic-Literal Faith may develop in elementary age children or may develop as late as adolescence or adulthood. In this stage, children are able to discern what is real and what is fantasy. They are able to compare their own perspectives and others' perspectives, while also being able to understand cause-effect relations. Their world is based on reciprocal fairness. However, they are unable to project their understandings to find conceptual meanings beyond what they obtain from their stories, beliefs and experiences (Fowler, 1981).

Stage 3: Synthetic-Conventional Faith develops from adolescence to adulthood. A person's identity not only comes from her family, but also from other realms such as school, work, or religion. It is through these interpersonal relationships that she creates her ultimate environment, which is influenced by the expectations and views of those who are important in her life. The images in her ultimate environment are tied to those of others that she deems as being significant in her life. Even though she possesses deep beliefs and values, these beliefs and values are not critically analyzed but are accepted without questioning. She is unable to examine her beliefs and values in an objective manner (Fowler, 1981).

It is during Stages 2 and 3 that prejudice may be most prevalent, due to the relationships that exist between the person's faith and the faith of those who are significant in his or her life. In Stage 3, in-group and out-group systems are very important, and categorization tends to take place frequently within a person's conceptualization of those who have different beliefs and values.

Stage 4: Individuative-Reflective Faith develops in adulthood, usually in mid-twenties. However, if a person does not transition to Stage 4 at this time, she will most likely transition to this stage in her thirties or forties. Some people never make this transition. There must be a break from depending on an external source of authority, with authority then being found within oneself. The person is able to make choices based upon her own inner self and is willing to take responsibility for her choices, which Fowler refers to as "executive ego" (Fowler, 1981, p. 179). The person forms a new identity and lifestyle and is cognizant of social systems and institutions. She becomes able to look at the broader context of social relations. A person in this stage usually asks,

"But what does it mean?" Many people tend to complete only half of this stage. For example, a person may form an executive ego but be unable to break her shared value system with others (Fowler, 1981).

Stage 5: Conjunctive Faith rarely occurs before mid-life. Fowler (1981) states, "The person of Stage 5 makes her own experience of truth the principle by which other claims to truth are tested. But she assumes that each genuine perspective will augment and correct aspects of the other, in a mutual movement toward the real and the true" (p. 187). In Stage 4, a person struggles with what she has learned and known all of her life. She must let go of her old images and representations. In Stage 5, on the other hand, she is able to integrate opposites or paradoxes into her center(s) of beliefs and values. Her dedication to justice is liberated from the views of others, and she is able to observe and understand the identities and meanings that others have derived. She is able to accommodate her own meanings and her group's meanings, while knowing that they are relative to one's reality (Fowler, 1981).

Stage 6: Universalizing Faith occurs infrequently, and a person who reaches Stage 6 has "generated faith compositions in which her felt sense of an ultimate environment is inclusive of all being. She has become an incarnator and an actualizer of the spirit of an inclusive and fulfilled human community" (Fowler, 1981, p. 200). Others who are more structured may feel threatened by her views. People in Stage 6 may die for their values and beliefs at the hands of the very people they hope to enlighten, and they are often honored after their deaths. Examples of people who have met criteria for Stage 6 include Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Jr., and Mother Teresa. A person does not need to be deemed perfect to reach Stage 6 (Fowler, 1981).

Research on Fowler's Faith Development Theory

Fowler (1981) developed the Faith Development Interview Guide, which consists of four parts: life history, relationships, values and commitments, and religion. From 1972 to 1981, he conducted 359 interviews. For the most part, ages coincided with stages of faith. There were some interesting findings, including that those in the 21-30 age group were best described by Stage 4, while those in the 31-40 age group were best described by Stage 3. Fowler (1981) states this may have been due to sampling bias or generational differences in experiences. Based on these findings, the ages are arbitrary in relationship to the stages, and the fact that this study will focus less on stages corresponding to certain age ranges.

Streib (2005) looks at Fowler's faith development and the studies that have focused on it over time. He found that most research focuses on the qualitative aspect of faith development, emphasizing Fowler's interview. The interview, however, takes approximately two hours, and is time-consuming to code (Fowler, 1981). There have been several faith development measurements or scales developed, but more research is needed. The validity and reliability of many of these instruments need more testing. Streib (2005) notes that the Faith Development Scale (FDS) presents data that supports its validity, but its focus is relegated to Christian beliefs and values (Leak, 1999; 2003; Streib, 2005).

Leak, Loucks and Bowlin (1999) found that the FDS is negatively associated with Stages 2 and 3 of Fowler's Stages of Faith Development, while it is positively associated with Stages 4 and 5. This indicates that those who score high on the FDS tend to have more mature faith. Leak's (2003) longitudinal and cross-sectional study further supports

the validity of the FDS because he shows that the FDS is sensitive to change in faith development over time. Leak (2003) did a pre-test with freshmen and later administered a post-test with the same freshmen who were seniors four years later. He found significant differences in their scores, indicating that their level of faith development had increased. Leak's (2003) finding that there are differences between freshmen and seniors in their faith development indicates the FDS is able to detect differences between groups and within groups over time.

Leak and Randall (1995) use two theories of faith maturity by Fowler and Allport to measure the relationship between faith maturity and authoritarianism. They found that faith maturity is negatively related to RWA. More specifically, RWA is positively correlated with lower levels of faith development, such as Stages 2 and 3, while RWA is negatively correlated with more advanced stages of faith development (Leak & Randall, 1995).

The present study attempts to expand the research on faith development by focusing not only on the relationship of faith development and RWA, as Leak and Randall (1995) did, but on measures such as RF, SDO, PP, and prejudice against specific target groups, including ethnic minorities, homosexuals, and women. The study also examines an individual's relationship between faith development and perceptions of prejudice from a religious denomination versus prejudice from an individual.

Critiques of Fowler's Theory of Faith Development

Steib (2005) states that Fowler's faith development theory does not account for dynamic processes. In other words, the theory views people only as moving forward, without the ability to go back and forth between stages. Fowler's faith development may

overly emphasize the "structuring power of the formally describable operations of knowing and construing that constitute the stages" (Fowler, 2001, p.169). Additionally, most research emphasizes structural evaluation and tends to ignore other elements of Fowler's model such as life history and life changing events. Limitations of Fowler's model are similar to those of Piaget's cognitive development, such as excluding the unconscious (Streib, 2005). Reich (1993) criticized Fowler's faith development theory (FDT) for not being rigid on his spectrum of cognitive-developmental approaches, which suggests that the stages in the FDT have less predictive power but may have a wider scope of application. It also makes FDT more difficult to measure empirically with instruments (Leak et al., 1999).

Theologically, Fowler's theory of faith development is only a partial account of spirituality (McDargh, 2001). In attempting to encompass faith as a common thread that runs through all of humanity, Fowler misses what makes faith unique, especially in Christianity (Avery, 1990; Joy, 1983 as cited in McDargh, 2001; McDargh, 1984; Nelson & Aleshire, 1986, as cited in McDargh, 2001). Ford-Gabrowsky (1986, 1988, as cited in McDargh, 2001) criticized Fowler for adhering to psychological explanations more than theological concepts, such as grace transforming a person's life. Fowler does not focus on "fundamental transformations of affectivity and of a sense of relationship to a trustworthy divine other" (Ford-Gabrowsky, 1986, 1988, as cited in McDargh, 2001, p. 192). Thus, Fowler has difficulty explaining both the psychological and theological aspects of faith development in a sufficient way (McDargh, 2001).

Southern Baptists and Faith

Southern Baptists, who make up the second largest religious group in the United States ("Southern Baptist Convention," n.d.), support 4,946 missionaries in 153 different countries and 5,081 missionaries in North America ("About Us—Meet Southern Baptists," 2007). They have considerable influence in many areas in society, including politics, entertainment, and women's issues. Baptists are also known for being fundamental, orthodox, and authoritarian (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992). They tend to view faith development differently than Fowler, and these differences should be taken into consideration. This is also one limitation of the study; however, Fowler's theory of faith development serves as an umbrella of faith development to both the religious and the nonreligious.

Faith development, from a Southern Baptist perspective, "describes the process of moving from the natural state to a consistent and mature state" (Rogers, 2007, p. 1). The natural state includes people who are "unregenerated," meaning they are incapable of having a relationship with God because sin separates them from God (Rogers, 2007, p. 1). The "regenerated" person has been forgiven of his or her sins and is able to have a relationship with God (Rogers, 2007, p. 1). Therefore, he or she can mature as a Christian. Once a person becomes a Christian, the process of moving from a spiritual infant to an adult begins. The faith development process is dependent on the person's desire, as well as resources available to him. The person's desire can be described as a hunger for having knowledge of God, a decrease in former temptations, a realization of his own sinful nature and God's holiness, service to others, participation in a church, an increase in spiritual knowledge, and a working knowledge and utilization of his spiritual

gifts. Resources include the Holy Spirit, scripture, church, teachers, spiritual gifts of fellow church members, and trials and suffering. Spiritual disciplines contribute to faith development. Spiritual disciplines include reading and studying the Bible, applying what is learned to one's life, prayer, worship, evangelism, serving, stewardship, and fasting. The mature regenerated person is able not only to implement the basic teachings of Southern Baptists and the Bible, but also to teach others. This person is consistent with scriptural teachings, even in difficult life trials, and has in-depth knowledge of the Bible (Chafer, 1997, as cited in Rogers, 2007; MacArthur, 1976; MacArthur, 1998; Rogers, 2007; Ryrie, 1976, as cited in Rogers, 2007; Whitney, 1991).

A common passage used from the Bible to describe maturity levels within faith development in Southern Baptists comes from 1 John 2:13,14:

> I am writing to you, fathers, because you know Him who has been from the beginning. I am writing to you, young men, because you have overcome the evil one. I have written to you, young men, because you know the Father. I have written to you, fathers, because you know Him who has been from the beginning. I have written to you, young men, because you are strong, and the word of God abides in you, and you have overcome the evil one.

Rogers (2007) explains that maturity of one's faith or faith development falls within three different levels. Spiritual infants lack discernment and doctrinal stability, but they have a fundamental understanding of their salvation. Spiritually mature adults have overcome the temptation of sin in parts of their lives, have knowledge of the Bible, are consistent in their spiritual walk with God, participate regularly in church activities, and can assist others in overcoming sin in their lives. Spiritually mature leaders are even more knowledgeable of the Bible and can readily apply its truths to their lives, are consistent in their spiritual walk with God, and are able to lead others in deepening their understanding and relationship with God. Thus, having a desire, resources, and adhering

to and being faithful in implementing the spiritual disciplines further faith development (Rogers, 2007).

Adsit (1996) uses the verses (1 John 2:13,14) to develop "four stages of growth: baby, child, adolescent, and adult" (p. 346). Adsit (1996) describes seven areas of Christian growth, including "prayer, the Word, witnessing, fellowship, personal growth, ministry, and family" (p. 347). Adsit (1996) explains each area of Christian growth in context of what it would look like for an infant, child, adolescent, and adult, indicating faith development for Christians. Adsit's areas of Christian growth are similar to the spiritual disciplines described by Rogers's.

From Rogers's and Adsit's conceptualization of faith development, it appears that individuals who progress in their faith development apply the Bible's teachings in their lives. Since the Bible emphasizes the equality of all ethnicities (Colossians 3:11), individuals with a mature faith should not be prejudiced toward ethnic minorities. However, Southern Baptists perceive the Bible as suggesting that homosexuality is a sin (Leviticus 18:22). Therefore, Southern Baptists with a mature faith will most likely have negative attitudes towards homosexuals. The Bible teaches a traditional view of women, which will most likely result in negative biases towards women (1 Corinthians 7:1-16; Ephesians 5:21-33).

In conclusion, there is little research on the relationship between faith development and prejudice. The present study explores whether faith development accounts for variance beyond other constructs that contribute to prejudice towards ethnic minorities, homosexuals, and women. These constructs include religious fundamentalism, right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, Christian

orthodoxy, and proscribed prejudice. Furthermore, the study focuses on Southern Baptists to explore prejudice within this particular religious group.

Research Questions and Objectives

1. What are the relationships among faith development (FD), religious fundamentalism (RF), Christian orthodoxy (CO), right-wing authoritarianism (RWA), social dominance orientation (SDO), and perceived proscribed prejudice (PP)?
2. Does FD account for a significant proportion of variance in prejudice beyond the variance accounted for by the other predictors—RF, CO, RWA, SDO and PP?
3. What are the contributions of FD, RF, RWA, SDO, and CO to individual prejudice towards ethnic minorities, homosexuals and women? What is the contribution of PP to individual prejudice towards ethnic minorities and homosexuals?

Hypotheses

H1: There is a negative relationship between faith development and the constructs of religious fundamentalism, Christian orthodoxy, right-wing authoritarianism, and social dominance orientation. H2: FD will account for a significant proportion of variance in prejudice beyond the variance accounted for by the other predictors.

H3: Higher scores on FD will be related to lower scores on prejudice toward ethnic minorities. Additionally, higher scores on FD will be related to lower scores on morally legitimized and non-morally legitimized attitudes toward homosexuals.

H4: Higher scores on RF, RWA, and SDO will be related to higher scores in prejudice toward ethnic minorities. After controlling for the other predictors (RF, RWA, and

SDO), higher scores on CO will be related to lower scores on prejudice toward ethnic minorities. Religious Proscription of Racism Scale (PRS) will be negatively correlated to prejudice toward ethnic minorities.

H5: Higher scores on RF, RWA, SDO, and CO will be related to higher scores on prejudice toward homosexuals. However, higher scores on RWA and SDO will be related to higher scores on non-morally legitimized attitudes toward homosexuals, while higher scores on RF and CO will be related to higher scores on morally legitimized attitudes toward homosexuals. Additionally, Religious Proscription of Homophobia Scale (PHS) will be negatively related to prejudice toward homosexuals.

H6: Higher scores on FD will be related to lower scores on both the hostile and benevolent sexism scales. Higher scores on religious group beliefs of women (on the demographic survey) will be related to lower scores on the hostile sexism scale and higher scores on the benevolent sexism scale.

H7: Higher scores on RF and RWA will be related to higher scores on the benevolent sexism scale, while higher scores on SDO will be related to higher scores on the hostile sexism scale. Higher scores on CO will be related to higher scores on the benevolent sexism scale but not on the hostile sexism scale.

Chapter 3

Methods

Participants

Participants were solicited from Southern Baptist organizations and churches in the United States and by word of mouth from adult volunteers. Of the 172 participants, 41% were male and 59% were female. Participants ranged in age from 20 to 64 years

(M = 37.26, SD = 11.62). Most participants were affiliated with the Southern Baptist denomination, 97.6%; however, 2.4% were excluded from the study due to being atheist, Lutheran, or non-denominational. Participants were 66.9% Caucasian, 3.5% Black American, 3.5% Asian American, 2.3% Hispanic American, 1.7% Native American, and 9.9% other; 12.2% did not specify their ethnicity. Of the participants, 55.7% were from the Midwest (Illinois, Kansas, Michigan, and South Dakota), 40.1% were from the south (Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma, and Texas), and 2.2% were from the west (Washington and Oregon); 2% did not specify their state. Most participants were married at 62.2%, 30.2% were single, 6.2% were divorced, and 1.2% did not specify their partner status. Participants' education ranged from high school to doctoral degrees, with 52.9% having an undergraduate degree, 16.9% master's degree, 15.7% having some college education, 7% doctorate degree, and 5.2% high school. Another 2.3% did not report educational level. Occupations included business (24.4%), health care (12.6%), homemaker (10.7%), education/teachers (10%), ministry (8.9%), engineers (7.7%), students (5.9%), retired (4%), university professors (2.3%), scientists (1.8%), and other (9.3%). The majority of participants (66.9%) reported attending church activities 2-4 times per week. Attendance for others was weekly 27.3%; 2-3 times a month, 2.3%; and of participation once or twice a year, 1.7%; another 1.2% did not specify their frequency of participation.

Instruments

A demographic survey was used. This instrument obtained information regarding age, gender, ethnicity, marital status, education level, occupation, region, denomination, and participation in church. Other instruments included The Faith Development Scale,

The Revised-Religious Fundamentalism Scale, Right-Wing Authoritarianism Scale, Social Dominance Orientation Scale, Christian Orthodoxy Scale (Short Version), the Manitoba Prejudice Scale, the Religious Proscription of Racism Scale, the Attitudes Toward Homosexuals Scale, the Religious Proscription of Homophobia Scale and the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory. The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory was supplemented with questions on the demographic survey that addressed the beliefs Southern Baptists have about women, as no instrument was found that measured this.

The Faith Development scale (Leak, Loucks, & Bowlin, 1999). The FDS measures global faith development or faith style. It contains eight items arranged in a forced-choice format, with one option keyed for relatively mature faith (Stage 4 or 5), while its alternative reflects less mature faith (Stage 2 or 3). Scores range from 0 to 8. The scale has an internal consistency of coefficient alpha = .71 to .75 in three different studies. The Cronbach's alpha for this study is .52 for FDS.

Evidence of construct validity exists. The FDS is correlated with several measures of religious motivation. For example, it correlates positively with the Quest scale and negatively with extrinsic religious orientation. The FDS also significantly and positively correlates with Openness to Experience and is unrelated to Neuroticism, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness and Extraversion on the NEO personality traits. Additionally, the correlations between self and peer-ratings are approximately .50. Results suggest that the FDS measures advanced faith development. There are some concerns, however. For instance, the FDS is uncorrelated with the single-item measure of religious maturity. There is no relationship found with intrinsic religious orientation and with the composite Religious Acts measure. In addition, the nonsignificant

associations with Neuroticism and Agreeableness are troubling, especially with Agreeableness because it possesses many characteristics that are important to people with a mature faith. Therefore, FDS may only measure some aspects of mature faith development (Leak et al., 1999).

Leak's (2003) longitudinal study further supports validity of FDS. FDS is able to detect changes in faith development in college students from their freshmen year to their senior year. However, only 25% of the original sample completed the posttest. Therefore, the results should be viewed with caution. Leak (2003) conducted a cross-sectional study and found that seniors are more likely to endorse the relatively mature faith development.

Revised Religious Fundamentalism scale (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 2004). The RF measures a person's attitudes about his or her religious beliefs. It is a 12-item measure with a 7-point scale, ranging from 1 (*very strongly disagree*) to 7 (*very strongly agree*). Higher scores indicate higher levels of fundamentalism. The 20-item Religious Fundamentalism scale has strong psychometric properties, with a mean interim correlation of .37 and an alpha reliability of .92. It is correlated with RWA and prejudice toward ethnic minorities (Atlemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992). Because it is lengthy, the revised version is used.

A principal axes factor analysis of the 12-item scale found one factor with eigenvalues over 1.0, accounting for 53.5% of the variance (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 2004). For two factors, all the pro-trait items fall on Factor I, and the con-trait items fall on Factor II. The two factors account for 60.4% of the variance and correlated .80. The alpha reliability coefficients are .91 for students and .92 for parents, as compared to the

20-item version, which is .91 for students and .93 for parents (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 2004). Additionally, correlations found between the 20-item version and the 12-item version with RWA and other constructs are not found to be significantly different (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 2004). In this study, the alpha reliability is .69.

Right-wing authoritarianism scale (Altemeyer, 1996). The RWA measures three components of authoritarianism: authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression and conventionalism. This version was shortened from Altemeyer's previous 30-item measure. It is a 20-item measure with a nine-point scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 9 (*strongly agree*). Higher scores indicate higher levels of authoritarianism. This scale has high degrees of reliability and construct validity (Altemeyer, 1988, 1996; Christie, 1991). Altemeyer (1981, 1988, 1996) found that Cronbach's alphas fell between .83 and .91. RWA correlated with fundamentalism, prejudice, and an anti-radical measure, indicating that it has construct validity (Altemeyer, 1996). The Cronbach alpha for this study is .87.

Social Dominance Orientation scale (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). The SDO scale measures the level of social dominance orientation that a person displays. This is a 16-item measure using a seven-point scale, ranging 1 (*strongly disagree*) and 7 (*strongly agree*). Higher scores indicate higher levels of SDO. The reliability alpha ranges from .83 to .87. (Pratto et al., 1994). The reliability alpha for this study is .87.

Short Christian Orthodoxy scale (Hunsberger, 1989). The CO measures "acceptance of well-defined, central tenets of the Christian religion" (Fullerton & Hunsberger, 1982, p. 318). It is a 6-item measure using a 7-point scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Higher scores suggest higher levels of

orthodoxy. The short version maintains the psychometric properties of the longer version, and Cronbach's alpha ranges between .98 to .93 in four different population samples. In factor analyses, only one factor has been found that accounts for at least 74% of the variance and mean inter-correlations have ranged from .69 to .78 (Hunsberger, 1989). The reliability alpha for this study is .61.

The Manitoba Prejudice scale (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992). This 20-item scale measures tolerance or intolerance of immigrants and minorities, especially racial groups. It uses a 9-point scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 9 (*strongly agree*). The internal consistency reliability is good, with Cronbach's alpha ranging from .88 to .89 (Altemeyer, 1988; Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992). Laythe et al. (2001) modified the scale to be used with an American sample, since the scale originated in Canada. The questions that used "Canada" or "Canadian" were changed to "America" or "American." One question was deleted because there was not an appropriate equivalent in the United States. This question was "Canada should guarantee that the French language rights should exist across the country." In Laythe et al.'s (2001) study, all the scales, including the adjusted Manitoba Prejudice Scale, had high internal consistency reliability, with alpha coefficients ranging from .88 to .93. This study will make the same substitutions, except "America" will be changed to the "United States," as it is more specific and reduces possible confusion between North or South America. In one of the questions, Metis was deleted and aboriginals were replaced with American Indians due to differences in ethnic minorities in the United States versus Canada. The alpha coefficient for this study is .89.

Religious Proscription of Racism scale (Duck & Hunsberger, 1999). This 7-item scale measures participants' perceptions of their religious groups attitudes toward ethnic minorities. It uses a 9-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 9 (*strongly agree*). It has three pro-trait and four con-trait items. Its Cronbach's alpha in Duck and Hunsberger's (1999) study is .77. The Cronbach's alpha for this study is .65. If the mean is above the midpoint of 35, it indicates that the participant is religiously proscribed. As stated earlier, proscribed prejudice occurs when religious denominations attempt to eliminate prejudiced attitudes toward ethnic minorities (Duck & Hunsberger, 1999).

The Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gays scale (Herek, 1987). The ATGL is a 20-item scale that measures intolerance or prejudice towards homosexuals. There are two components: attitudes toward gays (ATG) and attitudes toward lesbians (ATL). It uses a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Higher scores suggest negative attitudes toward gays or lesbians. Previous validation studies indicate that this scale has adequate internal consistency alphas, from .91 to .89 for the ATG scale and .86 to .77 for the ATL scale (Herek, 1987, 1994). Correlations are found with traditional sexual values, beliefs in traditional family ideology, orthodoxy, religious conservatism and fundamentalism. There is also a correlation with lack of positive contact with homosexuals. These correlations indicate that construct validity is found for both the ATG and ATL (Herek, 1994).

The study from Fulton et al. (1999) indicates that the ATGL scale used 9-items as morally rationalized anti-homosexual items (e.g. "Homosexuality is a perversion"), and 9-items as nonmorally rationalized items (e.g. "A person's homosexuality should not be

the cause for job discrimination."). The non-morally and morally rationalized anti-homosexual scales had alphas of .86 and .87, respectively. Fulton et al. (1999) uses an 18-item scale modification to the ATGL to determine prejudice towards homosexuals and to clarify whether prejudice is nonproscribed within the religious denomination or if it surpasses the religious denomination's beliefs and lies within the individual. This format is used in the study, except using homosexuals is replaced with lesbians and gays to correspond with Herek's (1987) original measure because there is little information on the validity and reliability of the modified measure by Fulton et al. (1999). The non-morally and morally rationalized anti-homosexual scales are combined in the present study due to being highly correlated. The alpha reliability for this study is .87.

Religious Proscription of Homophobia scale (Duck & Hunsberger, 1999). The 7-item scale measures participants' perceptions of their religious denomination's proscriptive or nonproscriptive positions on homosexuality. It uses a 9-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 9 (*strongly agree*). The Cronbach's alpha is .84 (Duck & Hunsberger, 1999). The Cronbach's alpha for this study is extremely low at .42. If the mean is below the midpoint of 35, it indicates that the participant is religiously nonproscribed. As stated earlier, nonproscribed prejudice occurs in situations in which a religious denomination does not attempt to negate prejudice and may actually support prejudice against certain groups such as homosexuals (Duck & Hunsberger, 1999).

Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick & Fiske, 1996). The ASI is a 22-item scale that is divided into two scales measuring the hostile sexism (HS) and benevolent sexism (BS). Hostile sexism measures negative attitudes toward women, while benevolent sexism measures positive attitudes toward women. Nevertheless, both hostile and

benevolent sexism address power, gender differentiation, and sexuality, and both emphasize patriarchy and traditional roles for women. It uses a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (*disagree strongly*) to 5 (*agree strongly*). Higher scores on both scales result in higher levels of sexism toward women. The alpha reliability coefficients range from .92 to .90 for six population samples for the ASI (Glick & Fiske, 1996). The alpha reliability coefficient for ASI in this study is .78. The alpha reliability coefficient for hostile sexism in this study is .81 and .62 for benevolent sexism. In addition, the alpha reliability coefficients range from .92 to .80 for six population samples for HS, and from .73 to .85 for BS. The ASI correlates well with other measures of sexism. Also, social desirability does not appear to have a significant effect on the measure, as there is a significant but weak relationship between the ASI and Impression Management (Glick & Fiske, 1996).

Procedures

The study was submitted to and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Oklahoma, Norman campus. The researcher approached Southern Baptist organizations and churches to participate in the study. Additionally, adult volunteers who know the researcher obtained participants by word of mouth (snowball method). A convenience sample was used. The researcher discussed the purpose and relevance of the study with those in charge of the organization, church, or with adult volunteers. Consent to announce the study was sought verbally, and the instruments and consent form were shown to the organization. Participants were invited to obtain research packets from the researcher or from adult volunteers to complete at their convenience; however, these packets were not completed at the religious

organization or church. Participants also had an opportunity to fill out the questionnaires via the Internet, and a website was provided. The packets included an informed consent form, a demographic questionnaire, the instruments, and a page for identifying information (name and address) if the participant chose to participate in the drawing for a gift certificate. In addition, a pre-stamped envelope was included for the participant to mail all forms back to the researcher. Participants were advised not to include any identifying information on any of the measures. If a participant chose to use the website after reading a brief description of the study, he or she had the choice of continuing to participate in the study by completing the measures online. The answers from the information were anonymous and coded so that scores on each test could be associated for the purpose of data analysis. It took participants approximately 45 minutes to one hour to complete the packets or fill out the study over the website.

Participants had the opportunity to enter their names and addresses in a drawing to win one of five $20.00 gift certificates or one of ten $10.00 gift certificates to various department stores or eating establishments, such as Wal-Mart, Target, and Applebee's. Participants who completed a packet had their names and addresses separated immediately after the researcher received the packet. These materials were kept in a locked cabinet to ensure confidentiality. After submitting their responses, participants who used the website had the choice to fill out additional information including their names and addresses to be eligible for the drawing. Once the drawings took place, all names and addresses of participants were deleted or shredded. Gift certificates were sent to the participant by mail directly from the researcher to ensure anonymity of the

participant once all data was collected. All data was entered into the computer, and confidentiality was kept by using computer-protected passwords.

Data Analysis

FD, RF, RWA, SDO, CO, and PP are predictors, while prejudice towards ethnic minorities, homosexuals and woman are the criterion measures. Descriptive statistics were computed to organize and summarize the data set. Pearson correlations among the variables are presented. Pearsons correlations were conducted to examine the relationships between faith development, RF, RWA, SDO, CO, and PP, to ensure that faith development is measuring something different than the other predictors. Hierarchical multiple regression analyses were used to assess the contributions of faith development, RF, RWA, SDO, CO, and PP in accounting for variance in prejudice against ethnic minorities, homosexuals, and women. RF, RWA, and SDO were entered into a hierarchical multiple regression first, and then PP and FD followed because research has already suggested that RWA, RF, and SDO account for variance in prejudice. Because less research has been done on PP and FD, they were entered last. There is no measurement of prejudice found regarding the denomination's beliefs toward women, so two open-ended questions on the demographic sheet were added to address this problem.

Results

There was no variability among the sample population for CO. Therefore, CO was eliminated from this study as a predictor. Means and standard deviations for the measures are provided in Table 2. The FDS mean ($M = 4.44$, $SD = 1.56$) is similar to the mean ($M = 4.9$, $SD = 2.1$) from Leak et al. (1999). Participants who scored above 35, fell

in the religiously proscribed range on the Religious Proscription of Racism Scale, while participants who scored below 35, fell in the religiously nonproscribed range on the Religious Proscription of Homophobia Scale. These results correspond with Duck & Hunsberger's study (1999).

Research Question 1

What are the relationships among faith development (FD), religious fundamentalism (RF), right-wing authoritarianism (RWA), social dominance orientation (SDO), Christian orthodoxy (CO), and perceived proscribed prejudice (PP)? Pearson correlations for the predictors are shown in Table 3. Faith Development was significantly and negatively correlated (r = -.324, p < .01) with right-wing authoritarianism. Thus, higher scores on faith development are related to lower levels of right-wing authoritarianism. Religious fundamentalism was significantly and positively correlated (r = .423, p <.01) with right-wing authoritarianism, indicating that higher scores on religious fundamentalism also correspond to higher scores on right-wing authoritarianism. Religious fundamentalism was also significantly and positively correlated (r = .168, p < .05) with religious proscription of racism, suggesting that there was a positive relationship between religious fundamentalism and religious proscription of racism. Right-wing authoritarianism was significantly and positively correlated (r = .342, p <.01) with social dominance orientation, indicating a positive relationship between the two. Religious proscription of homophobia was significantly and positively correlated (r = .515, p < .01) with religious proscription of racism.

Research Question 2

Does FD account for a significant proportion of variance in prejudice beyond the variance accounted for by the other predictors—RF, RWA, SDO, CO, and PP? Hierarchical multiple regression analyses were used to determine whether FD accounts for a significant proportion of variance in prejudice towards ethnic minorities, homosexuals, and women after accounting for RF, RWA, SDO, and PP. Results are summarized in Table 4, 5, and 6. RF, RWA, and SDO accounted for 25.2% of the variance in estimating prejudice toward ethnic minorities in Step 1, $F(3,144) = 16.136$, $p < .001$. In Step 2, the overall model was statistically significant, $F(4,143) = 17.667$, $p < .001$. The predictors, including Religious Proscription of Racism Scale (PRS), accounted for an additional 7.9% of variance in prejudice toward ethnic minorities, $F(1,143) = 16.911$, $p < .001$, $R^2_{chg} = .079$. In Step 3, the overall model was statistically significant, $F(5,142) = 14.282$, $p < .001$. The predictors, including FD, accounted for an additional 0.4% of variance in prejudice toward ethnic minorities, $F(1,142) = .828$, $p = .364$, $R^2_{chg} = .004$, as shown in Table 4.

RF, RWA, and SDO accounted for 46.7% of the variance in estimating prejudice toward homosexuals in Step 1, $F(3,145) = 42.422$, $p < .001$. In Step 2, the overall model was statistically significant, $F(4, 144) = 33.417$, $p < .001$. The predictors, including Religious Proscription of Homophobia Scale (PHS) accounted for an additional 1.4% of variance in prejudice toward homosexuals, $F(1,144) = 3.878$, $p = .051$, $R^2_{chg} = .014$. In Step 3, the overall model was statistically significant $F(5, 143) = 26.991$, $p < .001$. The predictors, including FD, accounted for an additional 0.4% of variance in prejudice toward homosexuals, $F(1,143) = 1.148$, $p = .286$, $R^2_{chg} = .004$, shown in Table 5.

Table 6 indicates that RF, RWA, and SDO accounted for 30.7% of the variance in indicating prejudice toward women in Step 1, $F(3,149) = 22.038$, $p < .001$. In Step 2, the overall model was statistically significant, $F(4, 148) = 16.724$, $p < .001$. The predictors, including FD, accounted for an additional 0.4% of variance in estimating prejudice toward women, $F(1,148) = .848$, $p < .358.$, $R^2_{chg} = .004$. Therefore, FD does not account for a significant amount of variance beyond the variance accounted for by the other predictors.

Research Question 3

What are the contributions of FD, RF, RWA, SDO and CO to individual prejudice towards ethnic minorities, homosexuals and women? What are the contributions of PP to individual prejudice towards ethnic minorities and homosexuals? FD did not contribute a significant amount of variance toward prejudice toward any of the target groups (see Research Question 2). Among RF, RWA, and SDO, there was a significant amount of variance accounted for in prejudice towards ethnic minorities, homosexuals, and women (see Research Question 2). However, there were some differences among these three constructs, depending on the target group. For example, RF did not contribute a statistically significant amount of variance for prejudice toward ethnic minorities ($t = -1.372$, *ns*) and women ($t = .051$, *ns*), but RF was statistically significant for prejudice toward homosexuals ($t = 3.493$, $p <.01$). RWA contributed a statistically significant amount of variance for prejudice towards ethnic minorities ($t = 3.634$, $p < .001$), homosexuals ($t = 7.372$, $p < .001$), and women ($t = 4.795$, $p < .001$). SDO also contributed a statistically significant amount of variance for prejudice towards ethnic minorities ($t = 3.914$, $p < .001$) and women ($t = 4.060$, $p < .001$) but not towards

homosexuals (t = .985, *ns*). PRS accounted for a statistically significant amount of variance for prejudice toward ethnic minorities (t = -4.031, p < .001), while PHS also accounted for a significant unique contribution to the prediction of prejudice toward homosexuals (t = -2.020, p < .05).

Hypotheses

H1: There is a negative relationship between faith development and the constructs of religious fundamentalism, right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, and Christian orthodoxy. A negative relationship existed between FD with RF (r = -.142, *ns*), RWA (r = -.324, p < .01), and SDO (r = -.104, *ns*); however, the negative relationship was only statistically significant with RWA.

H2: FD will account for a significant proportion of variance in prejudice beyond the variance accounted for by the other predictors. FD did not make a significant unique contribution to the prediction of prejudice toward ethnic minorities, homosexuals, or women (see Research question 2).

H3: Higher scores on FD will be related to lower scores on prejudice toward ethnic minorities. Additionally, higher scores on FD will be related to lower scores on morally legitimized and non-morally legitimized attitudes toward homosexuals. Higher scores on FD were significantly and negatively correlated (r = -.207, p < .05) with lower scores of prejudice toward ethnic minorities. Morally legitimized attitudes and non-morally legitimized attitudes toward homosexuals were highly correlated (r = .820, p < .01). Thus, these two subscales were combined for the purposes of this study due to the high correlation. Higher scores on FD were negatively correlated (r = -.157,

ns) with lower scores on prejudiced attitudes toward homosexuals, although no statistically significant relationship was found, as shown in Table 2.

H4: Higher scores on RF, RWA, and SDO will be related to higher scores on prejudice toward ethnic minorities. After controlling for the other predictors (RF, RWA, and SDO), higher scores on CO will be related to lower scores on prejudice toward ethnic minorities. Higher scores on PRS will be related to lower scores of prejudice toward ethnic minorities. Scores on RWA ($r = .407$, $p < .01$) and SDO ($r = .369$, $p < .01$) were significantly and positively correlated to scores of prejudice toward ethnic minorities, while scores on PRS ($r = -.317$, $p < .01$) were significantly and negatively related to lower scores of prejudice toward ethnic minorities, as shown in Table 2.

H5: Higher scores on RF, RWA, SDO, and CO will be related to higher scores on prejudice toward homosexuals. However, higher scores on RWA and SDO will be related to higher scores on non-morally legitimized attitudes toward homosexuals, while higher scores on RF and CO will be related to higher scores on morally legitimized attitudes toward homosexuals. Additionally, PHS will be negatively related to prejudice toward homosexuals. Higher scores on RF ($r = .453$, $p < .01$), RWA ($r = .654$, $p < .01$), and SDO ($r = .252$, $p < .01$) were significantly related to higher scores of overall prejudice toward homosexuals. There was no significant correlation between PHS and prejudice toward homosexuals ($r = -.142$, $p = .083$); however, in a 1-tailed correlation, PHS was significantly and negatively related to prejudice toward homosexuals ($r = -.142$, $p = .041$).

H6: Higher scores on FD will be related to lower scores on both the hostile and benevolent sexism subscales. Higher scores on religious group beliefs of women (on the

demographic survey) will be related to lower scores on the hostile sexism scale and higher scores on the benevolent sexism scale. No relationship was found between FD with the hostile (r = -.099, *ns*) and benevolent (r = -.062, *ns*) sexism scales. Higher scores on the religious group beliefs of women were significantly and positively correlated with higher scores on the hostile sexism scale (r = .168, $p < .05$).

H7: Higher scores on RF and RWA will be related to higher scores on the benevolent sexism scale, while higher scores on SDO will be related to higher scores on the hostile sexism scale. Higher scores on CO will be related to higher scores on the benevolent sexism scale but not on the hostile sexism scale. Higher scores on RF (r =.188, $p < .05$), RWA (r = .502, $p < .01$), and SDO (r = .398, $p < .01$) were significantly and positively correlated with higher scores on the hostile sexism subscale. Higher scores on RWA (r = .262, $p < .01$) and SDO (r = .296, $p < .01$) were significantly and positively correlated with higher scores on the benevolent sexism scale.

Supplemental Analyses

Three questions were asked on the demographic sheet regarding beliefs about women (M = 14.29, SD = 4.06). Two open-ended questions were asked about the participants' beliefs about the role of women in his or her religious affiliation (Question 1: Within your religious affiliation, what are the beliefs about the role of women?) and the individuals' beliefs about the role of women (Question 2: Do your beliefs about the role of women differ? If not, why? If so, how?). For Question 1, 147 responses were congruent with Southern Baptist beliefs about the role of women. Seven responses were incongruent with Southern Baptist beliefs, and three participants chose not to answer the question. For Question 2, 107 responses agreed with Southern Baptist

beliefs about the role of women, suggesting that they concurred with leadership positions within the church and the role of women in regard to husband and family, while 50 responses had differing opinions about the role of women. There were eight responses where no conclusive evidence was indicated either way regarding roles of women, and eight participants chose not to answer the question.

A one-way between-groups multivariate analysis of variance was performed to investigate gender differences between the variables used in the present study. Ten dependent variables were used: beliefs about women, faith development, religious fundamentalism, right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, religious proscription of ethnic minorities, religious proscription of homophobia, prejudice towards ethnic minorities, prejudice towards homosexuals, and prejudice towards women. The independent variable was gender. No serious violations were found. There was a statistically significant difference between males and females on the combined dependent variables: $F(10,134) = 2.16$, $p = .024$; Wilks' Lambda = .86; partial eta squared = .139. When the results for the dependent variables were considered separately, using a Bonferroni adjusted alpha level, no significant differences were found. However, the mean scores indicated that males reported higher levels of SDO ($M = 46.9$, $SD = 16.72$) than females ($M = 40.86$, $SD = 15.07$).

Discussion

The results of this study indicated that faith development does not contribute a significant amount of variance in prejudice towards ethnic minorities, homosexuals, and women. However, some significant relationships were found between faith development and the other variables used in this study. There was a negative relationship between

faith development and right-wing authoritarianism, indicating that those with higher faith development tended to be less authoritarian. This finding was consistent with previous research on the relationship between FD and RWA, although the correlation was higher in the previous study than in the present study (Leak & Randall, 1995). No significant relationship was found between faith development and the other predictors. These results added to the information about the Faith Development Scale, as previous research did not address the relationship between FD, RF, SDO, and PP (Leak et al., 1999). Additionally, faith development was negatively correlated to prejudice toward ethnic minorities, as predicted, while higher scores on faith development failed to be significantly related to lower scores of prejudice toward homosexuals or women. Although many of the findings were not statistically significant, faith development did have a negative relationship with the other predictors, indicating that participants with higher faith development had lower levels of prejudice.

The FDS mean for this study was slightly lower than a previous study using the FDS (Leak et al., 1999). The mean age for this study was 37.26, while the mean age in Leak et al.'s (1999) study was 20.9. The participants in Leak's study were psychology students who were mostly Catholic (Leak et al., 1999); the present study included participants who were older, not in college, and were Southern Baptist. These differences may have affected the results. Furthermore, it is possible that the measure used for FD is not adequate to use with this population sample, as the Cronbach alpha = .52, suggesting that it does not have good internal reliability. Perhaps using Fowler's Faith Development Interview would be more representative of Fowler's conceptualization of faith development (Fowler, 1981).

As predicted, the combination of RF, RWA, and SDO contributed to a significant amount of variance in prejudice toward all three target groups (ethnic minorities, homosexuals, and women). Yet only RWA individually accounted for a significant amount of variance in all three target groups, indicating those who scored higher on RWA also scored higher on the prejudice measures. It appeared that RWA was the most important individual predictor of prejudice. Past research suggests that RWA is a viable predictor of prejudice (Hunsberger et al., 1999; Hunsberger & Jackson, 2005). However, one criticism of the RWA measure was that many items tended to measure prejudice rather than authoritarianism. RWA was strongly and positively associated with prejudice towards ethnic minorities, homosexuals, and women. The moderate association between RWA and RF was lower than expected, considering past research, which found that they are strongly related (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992; Hunsberger, 1996). This may be due to having less variability within the population sample. The relationship between RWA and SDO was strongly associated, which corresponds with previous research (Crowson et al., 2005; Ekehammar et al., 2004; Heaven & Connors, 2001; McFarland, 2005; Van Hiel & Mervielde, 2002); however, other studies report that the correlations between RWA and SDO are generally lower (Altemeyer, 1998, 2004; Duckitt et al., 2002, as cited in Roccato & Ricolfi, 2005; Whitley, 1999).

Hostile sexism was more highly related to RWA than benevolent sexism. This makes sense, as RWA was linked to all forms of prejudice, and benevolent sexism really accounted for more traditional roles of women, not necessarily negative biases such as hostile sexism. Additionally, Altemeyer (in press) modified his 1997 study to compare his 30-item RWA version to his new 20-item RWA version, which indicated that parents

(M = 88.3) had higher scores on RWA than college students (M = 73). The scores on RWA for the present study were higher than Altemeyer's study (see Table 2). This may have occurred because Altemeyer's (2004) study indicates that right-wing authoritarians are religious and are religiously fundamental, and the population sample consisted of Southern Baptists who are known for being conservative and religiously fundamental in nature.

RF accounted for a significant amount of variance in prejudice toward homosexuals, and there was a strong and positive association between RF and prejudice toward homosexuals. This finding was not surprising, as religious fundamentalism measures the way one believes in his religious teachings, which is the Bible for Southern Baptists. Generally, Southern Baptists consider God's Word or the Bible as being inerrant and infallible. They also consider the Bible to be "written by men divinely inspired and is God's revelation of Himself to man" (The Baptist Faith and Message, 2000, p. 7). Southern Baptists would most likely see homosexuality as a sin, because the Bible states "Do not lie with a man as one lies with a woman…" (Leviticus 18:22). There was a significant positive correlation between RF and prejudice toward women, hostile sexism towards women, and PRS, although the associations were weak. This study supported previous studies that found RF was related to prejudice toward women (Kirkpatrick, 1993; Hunsberger & Jackson, 2005).

RF was related to religious proscription of ethnic minorities, indicating that those who scored higher on RF perceived the Southern Baptist denomination as attempting to eliminate prejudice toward ethnic minorities. Since Southern Baptists tend to adhere to

the teachings of the Bible and *The Baptist Faith and Message*, and both admonish prejudice toward ethnic minorities, this result was not unexpected.

SDO made a unique contribution in prejudice toward ethnic minorities and women, and it was moderately and positively correlated with prejudice towards ethnic minorities and women, including hostile and benevolent sexism. The association between SDO and prejudice toward homosexuals was weak. Previous studies indicated that higher scores on SDO were associated with prejudiced attitudes toward ethnic minorities and homosexuals (Altemeyer, 1998; McFarland & Adelson, 1996, 1997; Pratto et al., 1994; Sidanius et al., 1994, 1996; Whitley & Lee, 2000). It was somewhat surprising that SDO did not make a significant contribution toward prejudice against homosexuals, especially since sexual orientation seems recently to be a prevalent topic in the political arena. Since homosexuals already face social inequality in many aspects, perhaps participants did not see homosexuals as a threat to their desire for group-based dominance. However, it seems that SDO did make a significant difference for ethnic minorities and women. These results may be consistent with Duckitt's (2006) study, which indicates that SDO predicts prejudice towards socially subordinate groups. It should be noted that the majority of participants were Caucasian, and it would be interesting to see if there would be differences in SDO among ethnic minorities within the denomination. Furthermore, there may have been generational or age effects. Prejudice towards women is discussed later.

PRS and PHS both made significant contributions to the prediction of prejudice. There was a moderate and negative association with PRS and prejudice toward ethnic minorities. In other words, those who scored higher on PRS tended to have lower scores

on prejudice toward ethnic minorities. Participants' perceptions of the Southern Baptist denomination indicated that the denomination attempts to eliminate prejudiced attitudes toward ethnic minorities. These results supported the hypothesis, as they corresponded with beliefs of the Southern Baptist denomination. Additionally, PHS had a weak and negative association with prejudice toward homosexuals. Southern Baptist beliefs and values may tend to endorse negative attitudes toward homosexuals. From a Southern Baptist perspective, homosexuality is seen as a sin and sexually immoral in the Bible (e.g., Genesis 19:5; Jude 7). PRS and PHS were significantly related to each other, although each focuses on different groups, ethnic minorities and homosexuals.

Prejudice towards women was measured by hostile and benevolent sexism, as well as by three questions about religious beliefs toward women and two open-ended questions about Southern Baptist beliefs about the roles of women. The results partially supported the hypothesis that RF, RWA, and SDO are related to prejudice toward women. RF was weakly and positively associated with hostile sexism, while RWA was strongly and positively associated with hostile sexism. SDO was moderately and positively correlated with hostile sexism. RWA and SDO were weakly and positively correlated to benevolent sexism. These results are contrary to an earlier study by Christopher and Mull (2006), which found that RWA is strongly related to benevolent sexism and SDO is strongly related to hostile sexism. Christopher and Mull's (2006) study has a mean age of 54.77, they collected data from Michigan, and they did not gather information about religious affiliation. Age effects, regional differences, or religious belief influences may affect the differences observed. A relationship between RF and benevolent sexism was not found, which did not correspond with the hypothesis.

This study defined prejudice toward women as maintaining patriarchy and traditional gender roles (Glick & Fiske, 1997). Southern Baptist beliefs have a definite division between the role of men and women and adhere to traditional gender roles. Therefore, it was not unforeseen that RWA, RF, and SDO were associated with prejudice towards women. The religious group beliefs about women (three questions on the demographic survey) were weakly and positively related to hostile sexism, suggesting that the roles of women within the Southern Baptist denomination are traditional in nature. The open-ended questions addressed Southern Baptists' beliefs about the role of women and the individual's beliefs about the role of women. Approximately two-thirds of the participants agreed with Southern Baptist beliefs about the role of women, while a third had more liberal and diverse ideas about the role of women.

Southern Baptists would likely argue that the instrument used did not fully measure their definition of prejudice toward women, as patriarchy and traditional roles for women are not forms of prejudice from their perspective. However, it should be noted that those with ideologies of RWA and SDO seemed to be more prone to negative attitudes toward women. This may be an area that should be addressed within the denomination, not necessarily the view of traditional roles, but the issue of women being inferior to men. From teachings of Southern Baptist beliefs and values, "men and women have equal worth before God" (The Baptist Faith and Message, p. 21).

Implications

The relationship between religiosity and prejudice is an important topic to explore because both have shaped our society in positive and negative ways. This study attempted to focus on one conservative religious group to better understand the dynamics

of faith development and prejudice. Although faith development was not found to be a significant predictor of prejudice, there was an association with right-wing authoritarianism, which was a significant predictor in this study. Perhaps faith development is a distal cause of prejudice. Faith development should not be discounted from further research on prejudice. Because few instruments measure this construct, more emphasis should be put on instruments to measure faith development. If this is done, an association may be found between faith development and prejudice.

Even though faith development failed to account for a significant amount of variance in prejudice and Fowler's conceptualization of faith development is criticized for being too abstract and global, his theory offers a framework that can be beneficial to various fields (Paloutzian, 1996). Fowler's faith development emphasizes that one cannot live apart from faith because it brings meaning to our experiences, is relational, shapes our identities, and shapes a person's images and, therefore, shapes his or her perceptions, commitments and passions (Fowler, 1981; Lownsdale, 1997). If this is the case, then understanding faith development across the lifespan may be beneficial for therapists and those in ministry, as it provides a framework for addressing "spiritual and psychological growth" (Lownsdale, 1997, p. 60). Even though Fowler's theory addresses nonreligious faith as well as religious faith, the United States is a nation that tends to believe in God and adheres to religion as a source of strength. The Gallup Poll indicates that in 2006, 60% of people believe that religion can solve all of today's problems, 72% of people are certain that there is a God, and 55% say religion is very important to them (Gallup Poll). Thus, religion and faith seem to be significant to a large portion of the population.

Two studies indicate that authoritarianism and social dominance orientation increase positive attitudes toward violence in the Middle East (Henry, Sidanius, Levin, & Pratto, 2005; McFarland, 2005), and a study by Altemeyer (1996) found that university students score Hitler to be high on both right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation. Altemeyer (1996) describes those who score high on both right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation as being the most prejudiced people, and they are likely to become leaders of right-wing movements (Altemeyer, 2004). If we are able to identify ideologies such as right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation in individuals that contribute to prejudice, then it gives us a starting point to work in attempting to reduce prejudice toward others.

Results of this study suggest there are areas Southern Baptists can address regarding prejudice toward ethnic minorities, homosexuals, and women. Perhaps the fundamental teachings of opposing prejudice toward ethnic minorities and of seeing women as having equal worth in God's eyes should be emphasized. Although homosexuality is seen as a sin by the belief system of Southern Baptists, does this warrant keeping homosexuals from legally marrying or adopting children? There are many political aspects involving each of these groups, and it is important to remember that religious groups or one religious person has the ability to bring about social changes. Additionally, even though this study focused on one religious group, past research has indicated that Christians, in general, tend to be more prejudiced than the general public (Adorno et al., 1950; Allport & Kramer, 1946; Glock & Stark, 1966; Gorsuch & Aleshire, 1974). Therefore, other Christian religious groups may want to examine their

religious teachings, how individuals perceive these teachings, and how the teachings are applied in individuals' lives.

Limitations of the Study

This study specifically focused on one Protestant group, Southern Baptists; the findings on the predictors were somewhat skewed by this group's conservatism in its religious beliefs and values. Retrospective review suggests that adding other religious affiliations to increase the variability within the sample population might eliminate these problems. Several relatively new measures were used in this study, and there were problems with the alpha reliability with some, including The Faith Development scale ($\alpha = .52$), the Religious Proscription of Racism and Homophobia scales ($\alpha = .65$, $\alpha = .42$, respectively), and the Benevolent scale ($\alpha = .62$). The alpha reliabilities may be low in this study due to the limited amount of variability in the population sample. Studies that examine the validity and reliability of these instruments are mainly composed of university students. These instruments may not be generalizable to participants in this study. For example, this study included only those in a certain religious group, the mean age was 37, and most of the participants were not university students. Since little research has been done using these measures, they may not be adequate for this sample.

Another limitation is the difference between Fowler's conceptualization of faith development and Southern Baptists' conceptualization of faith development. Even though Fowler's faith development encompasses Christianity, it does not fully coincide with Southern Baptist faith development. This may present problems when trying to measure faith development of Southern Baptists.

Future Research

There are very few quantitative studies of faith development, mainly due to limited instruments. More studies could be done using the Faith Development scale with other sample populations to see whether it is a viable measure. Developing a new faith development measure is another possible path for furthering research in this area. Administering Fowler's Faith Development Interview may be yet another avenue, although it is a qualitative measure that takes about two hours to complete (Fowler, 1981). Other measures or constructs may be more appropriate to use in understanding prejudice in religious groups, such as the Quest scale or measuring aspects such as religious ethnocentrism. Since this study did not take into account mediation, using a path model may be more useful in addressing whether or not there is an association between FD and prejudice.

Conclusions

The present study furthered research by focusing on the relationship between faith development and prejudice, and by concentrating on Southern Baptists. In addition, there have been few studies on prejudice toward women (Glick & Fiske, 1997). While faith development failed to account for a significant amount of variance as a predictor of prejudice, it was negatively associated with right-wing authoritarianism and prejudice toward ethnic minorities. Since the alpha reliability was questionable in the measure used for faith development, further research is needed to clarify the precise nature of the relationship between faith development and prejudice. Among the other predictors, right-wing authoritarianism had the strongest association and accounted for more variance in prejudice towards ethnic minorities, homosexuals, and women. Having

knowledge of the relationships between faith development, religiosity, ideologies, and prejudice may not only further our understanding of prejudice, but may also suggest ways to decrease prejudice within others and ourselves.

References

Abrams, J. (2006). *House rejects marriage ban amendment*. The Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life, from http://pewforum.org/news/display.php?NewsID=10910.

About SBC. (1999-2007). *About Us—Meet Southern Baptists*. Retrieved January 15, 2007, from http://www.sbc.net/aboutus/default.asp.

Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D.J., & Sanford, R.N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper.

Adsit, C.B. (1996). *Personal disciple-making a step-by-step guide for leading a Christian from new birth to maturity*. Orlando, Florida: Campus Crusade for Christ Integrated Resources.

Allport, G.W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison.

Allport, G.W., & Kramer, B.M. (1946). Some roots of prejudice. *Journal of Psychology, 22*, 9-39.

Allport, G.W., & Ross, J.M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5*, 432-443.

Altemeyer, B. (1981). *Right-wing authoritarianism*. Winnipeg, Ontario, Canada: University of Manitoba Press.

Altemeyer, B. (1988). *Enemies of freedom: Understanding right-wing authoritarianism*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Altemeyer, B. (1996). *The authoritarian specter*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Altemeyer, B. (1998). The other "authoritarian personality." *Advances in Experimental*

Social Psychology, 30, 47-92.

Altemeyer, B. (2004). Highly dominating, highly authoritarian personalities [Electronic version]. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 144*, 421-447.

Altemeyer, B., & Hunsberger, B. (1992). Authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, quest, and prejudice [Electronic version]. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 2*, 113-133.

Avery, W.O. (1990). A Lutheran examines James W. Fowler. *Religious Education, 85*, 69-83.

Barnett, M., Gaines, S., Hawkins, S., Hernandez, R.A., Kelley, C.S., King, H., Land, R.D., Luter, F., Mohler, R.A., Pinckney, T.C., Price, N., Rogers, A., Spradlin, R., Tsoi, S., & Vines, J. (2000). *The Baptist Faith and Message*. Nashville, TN: LifeWay Christian Resources.

Batson, C.D., Flink, C.H., & Schoenrade, P.A, Fultz, J., & Pych, V. (1986). Religious orientation and overt versus covert racial prejudice[Electronic version]. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*, 175-181.

Batson, C.D., Naifeh, S.J., & Pate, S. (1978). Social desirability, religious orientation, and racial prejudice. *Journal of Scientific Study of Religion, 17*, 31-41.

Batson, C.D., Schoenrade, P.A., & Ventis, L.W. (1993). *Religion and the individual*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Benson, P.L., & Vincent, S. (1980). Development and validation of the sexist attitudes toward women scale (SATWS). *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 5*, 276-291.

Burn, S.M., & Busso, J. (2005). Ambivalent sexism, scriptural literalism, and Religiosity [Electronic version]. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 29*, 412-418.

Burtoft, L. (1994). *Setting the record straight: What research really says about the social consequences of homosexuality*. Focus on the Family, Colorado Springs, CO, p. 74-78. ReligiousTolerance.org. Retrieved March 17, 2007, from http://www.religioustolerance.org/hom_pare3.htm.

Christie, R. (1991). Authoritarianism and related constructs. In J.P. Robinson, P.R. Shaver, & L.S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes* (pp. 501-572). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Christopher, A.N., & Mull, M.S. (2006). Conservative ideology and ambivalent sexism [Electronic version]. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 30*, 223-230.

Crowson, H.M., DeBacker, T.K., & Thoma, S.J. (2005). Does authoritarianism predict Post-9/11 attitudes? *Personality and Individual Differences, 39*, 1273-1283.

Cunningham, J., Dollinger, S.J., Satz, M., & Rotter, N. (1991). Personality correlates of prejudice against AIDS victims. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 29*, 165-167.

Donahue, M.J. (1985). Intrinsic and extrinsic religiousness: Review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48*, 400-419.

Duck, R.J., & Hunsberger, B. (1999). Religious orientation and prejudice: The role of religious proscription, right-wing authoritarianism, and social desirability [Electronic version]. *The International Journal of the Psychology of Religion, 9*, 157-179.

Duckitt, J. (2001). A dual-process cognitive-motivational theory of ideology and prejudice. In M.P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 33, pp. 41-113). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Duckitt, J. (2006). Differential effects of right wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation on outgroup attitudes and their mediation by threat from and competitiveness to outgroups [Electronic version]. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*, 684-696.

Duriez, B., & Van Hiel, A. (2002). The march of modern facism: A comparison of social dominance orientation and authoritarianism [Electronic version]. *Personality and Individual Differences, 32*, 1199-1213.

Ekehammar, B., Akrami, N., Gylje, M., & Zakrisson, I. (2004). What matters most to prejudice: Big five personality, social dominance orientation, or right-wing authoritarianism? [Electronic version]. *European Journal of Personality, 18*, 463-482.

Esses, V., Jackson, L., & Armstrong, T. (1998). Intergroup competition and attitudes toward immigrants and immigration: An instrumental model of group conflict. *Journal of Social Issues, 54*, 699-724.

Farley, J.E. (2000). *Majority-Minority Relations* (4th Ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall. Retrieved March 17, 2007, from http://www.delmar.edu/socsci/rlong/race/far-02.htm

Fisher, R.D., Derison, D., Polley, C.F., Cadman, J., & Johnston, D. (1994). Religiousness, religious orientation, and attitudes towards gays and lesbians. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 24,* 614-630.

Ford-Gabrowsky, M. (1986). What developmental phenomenon is Fowler studying? *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 5*, 513.

Ford-Gabrowsky, M. (1988). The journey of a pilgrim: An alternative to Fowler. *Living Light, 24*, 242-254.

Fowler, J. (1981) Stages of Faith: *The Psychology of Human Development and the Quest for Meaning*. San Francisco: Harper Collins Publishers

Fowler, J. (2001). Faith development theory and the postmodern challenges [Electronic version]. *TheInternational Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 11*, 159-172.

Frenkel-Brunswik, E. (1948). A study of prejudice in children. *Human Relations, 1*, 295-306.

Fromm, E. (1941). *Escape from Freedom*. Oxford, England: Farrar & Rinehart.

Fulton, A., Gorsuch, R., & Maynard, E. (1999). Religious orientation, antihomosexual sentiment, and fundamentalism among Christians [Electronic version]. *Journal of the Scientific Study of Religion, 38*, 14-22.

Gale, Thomson. 1997. The Life of Martin Luther King, Jr. The Seattle Times, from http://seattletimes.nwsource.com/mlk/king/biography.html.

Gallup, G. (2006). *Religion*. The Gallup Poll, Retrieved March 6, 2007, from www.galluppoll.com/content.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. (1996). The ambivalent sexism inventory: Differentiating Hostile and benevolent sexism [Electronic version]. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 491-512.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S.T. (1997). Hostile and benevolent sexism: Measuring ambivalent sexist attitudes toward women [Electronic version]. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21*, 119-135.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S.T. (2001). *Ambivalent sexism*. In M.P. Zanna (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology. San Diego: Academic Press.

Glick, P., Diebold, J., Bailey-Werner, B., & Zhu, L. (1997). The two faces of Adam: Ambivalent sexism and polarized attitudes toward women [Electronic version]. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23*, 1323-1334.

Glock, C.Y., & Stark, R. (1966). *Christian beliefs and anti-semitism*. New York: Oxford Univeristy Press.

Gorsuch, R.L., & Aleshire, D. (1974). Christian faith and ethnic prejudice: A review and interpretation of research. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 13*, 281-307.

Haddock, G., Zanna, M.P., & Esses, V.M. (1993). Assessing the structure of prejudicial attitudes: The case of attitudes toward homosexuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65*, 1105-1118,

Haslanger, S., & Tuana, N. (2004). Topics in Feminism. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Retrieved March 30, 2007, from http//:plato.standford.edu/entries/Feminism-topics/.

Heaven, P.C.L., & Connors, J.R. (2001). A note on the value correlates of social dominance orientation and right-wing authoritarianism [Electronic version]. *Personality and Individual Differences, 31*, 925-930.

Heaven, P.C.L., & St. Quintin, D. (2003). Personality factors predict racial prejudice [Electronic version]. *Personality and Individual Differences, 34*, 625-634.

Henry, P.J., Sidanius, J., Levin, S., & Pratto, F. (2005). Social dominance orientation,

authoritarianism, and support for intergroup violence between the Middle East and America [Electronic version]. *Political Psychology, 26*, 569-583.

Herek, G. (1987). Religious orientation and prejudice: a comparison of racial and sexual attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychological Bulletin, 13*, 34-44.

Herek, G. (1994). Assessing heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: a review of the empirical research with the ATLG scale. In B. Greene, and G.M. Herek, (Eds.). *Lesbian and gay psychology: Theory, research and clinical applications;* Vol. 1 (pp. 206-228). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Herek, G. (2003). The psychology of sexual prejudice. In L.D. Garnets & D.C. Kimmel (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives on lesbian, gay, and bisexual experiences* (2nd ed., pp. 157-164). New York: Columbia University Press.

Herek, G., Gillis, J., & Cogan, J. (1999). Psychological sequelae of hate crime victimization among lesbian, gay, and bisexual adults [Electronic version]. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *67*, 945-951.

Hunsberger, B. (1995). Religion and prejudice: The role of religious fundamentalism, quest, and right-wing authoritarianism [Electronic version]. *Journal of Social Issues, 51*, 113-129.

Hunsberger, B., & Jackson, L. (2005). Religion, meaning and prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues*, *61*, 807-826.

Hunsberger, B., Owusu, V., & Duck, R. (1999). Religion and prejudice in Ghana and Canada: Religious fundamentalism, right-wing authoritarianism, and attitudes toward homosexuals and women [Electronic version]. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 9*, 181-194.

Hunsberger, B., & Platonow, E. (1986). Religion and helping charitable causes. *Journal of Psychology, 120*, 517-528.

Jackman, M.R. (1994). *The velvet glove: Paternalism and conflict in gender, class, and race relations.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Jackson, L.M., & Hunsberger, B. (1999). An intergroup perspective on religion and prejudice. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *38*, 509-523.

Joy, D. (Ed.). (1983). *Moral development foundations: Judeo-Christian alternatives to Piaget/Kohlberg*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon.

Kirkpatrick, L.A. (1989). A psychometric analysis of the Allport-Ross and Feagin Measures of intrinsic-extrinsic religious orienation. In M.L. Lynn & D.O. Moberg (Eds.), *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion* (Vol. 1, pp. 1-31). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Kirkpatrick, L.A. (1993). Fundamentalism, Christian orthodoxy, and intrinsic religious orientation as predictors of discriminatory attitudes. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 32,* 256-268.

Kirkpatrick, L.A., & Hood, R.W., Jr. (1990). Intrinsic-extrinsic religious orientation: The boon or bane of contemporary psychology of religion*?* [Electronic version]. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 29*, 442-462.

Kohlberg, L. (1973). Continuities in childhood and adult moral development revisited. In P.B. Baltes & K.W. Schaie (Eds.), *Life-span developmental psychology: Personality and socialization* (pp. 180-204). New York: Academic Press.

Kristiansen, C.M., & Hotte, A.M. (1996). Morality and the self: Implications for the when and how of value-attitude-behavior relations. In C. Seligman, J.M. Olson,

and M.P. Zanna (Eds), *The psychology of values* (p. 77-105). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lambert, A.J., & Chasteen, A.L. (1997). Perceptions of disadvantage vs. conventionality: Political values and attitudes toward the elderly vs. Blacks. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23*, 469-481.

Laythe, B., Finkel, D., & Kirkpatrick, L.A. (2001). Predicting prejudice from religious fundamentalism and right-wing authoritarianism: A multiple-regression approach. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 40*, 1-10.

Leak, G.K. (2003). Validation of the faith development scale using longitudinal and cross-sectional designs [Electronic version]. *Social Behavior and Personality, 31*, 637-642.

Leak, G.K., & Randall, B.A. (1995). Clarification of the link between right-wing Authoritarianism and religiousness: The role of religious maturity [Electronic version]. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 34*, 245-252.

Leak, G.K., Loucks, A.A., & Bowlin, P. (1999) Development and initial validation of an objective measure of faith development [Electronic version]. *The International Journal of Psychology of Religion, 9*, 105-124.

Levinson, D.J. (1978). *The seasons of a man's life.* New York: Knopf.

MacArthur, J.F. (1976). *Keys to spiritual growth: Unlock the door to spiritual maturity.* Fleming H. Revell Company.

MacArthur, J.F. (1998). *Pillars of Christian character: The basic essentials of living faith.* Crossway Books: Wheaton, Illinois.

McDargh, J. (1984). Faith development theory at ten years. *Religious Studies Review, 10*, 339-343.

McDargh, J. (2001). Faith development theory and the postmodern problem of foundations [Electronic version]. The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 11, 185-199.

McFarland, S.G. (1989). Religious orientations and the targets of discrimination. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 28*, 324-336.

McFarland, S.G. (1990). *Religiously oriented prejudice in communism and Christianity: The role of Quest.* Paper presented at the annual convention of the Southeastern Psychological Association, Atlanta, GA.

McFarland, S.G. (2005). On the eve of war: Authoritarianism, social dominance, and American students' attitudes toward attacking Iraq. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*, 360-367.

McFarland, S.G., & Adelson, S. (1996). *An omnibus study of individual differences and prejudice*. Paper presented at the meeting of International Society of Political Psychology, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

McFarland, S.G., & Adelson, S. (1997). *Toward a typology of prejudiced persons*. Paper presented at the meeting of the International Society for Political Psychology, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

Mitchell, M., & Sidanius, J. (1995). Social hierarchy and the death penalty: a social dominance perspective. *Political Psychology, 16*, 591-619.

Morris, R.J., Hood, R.W., & Watson, P.J. (1989). A second look at religious orientation, social desirability and prejudice. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 27*, 81-84.

Nanda, B.R. (1987). *Gandhi's Life in 5000 Words*, from http://www.mkgandhi.org/bio5000/bio5index.htm.

National Commission On Terrorist Attacks Upon The United States. (n.d.). The 9/11 Commission Report. Retrieved March 30, 2007, from http://www.9-11commission.gov/report/911Report.pdf.

Nelson, C.E., & Aleshire, D. (1986). Research in faith development. In C. Dykstra & S. Parks (Eds.), *Faith development and Fowler* (pp. 180-201). Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press.

Niebuhr, R. (1972). *Experiential Religion*. New York: Harper and Row.

Niebuhr, R. (1960). *Radical Monotheism and Western Culture*. New York: Harper and Row.

Noonan, J.R., Barry, J.R., & Davis, H.C. (1970). Personality determinants in attitudes toward visible disability. *Journal of Personality, 38*, 1-15.

Oyamot, C.M., Borgida, E., & Fisher, E.L. (2006). Can values moderate the attitudes of right-wing authoritarians? [Electronic version]. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*, 486-500.

Paloutzian, R.F. (1996). Invitation to the psychology of religion. (2nd Ed.). Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon.

Peterson, B.E., Doty, R.M., & Winter, D.G. (1993). Authoritarianism and attitudes toward contemporary social issues. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 19*, 174-184.

Piaget, J. (1970). Piaget's theory. In P.H. Mussen (Ed.), Carmichael's manual of child Psychology (Vol. 1, 3rd ed.) (pp. 703-732), New York: Wiley.

Pratto, F. (1996). Sexual politics: The gender gap in the bedroom, the cupboard, and the Cabinet. In D.M. Buss & N.M. Malamuth (Eds.), *Sex, power, and conflict* (p. 179-230). New York: Oxford University Press.

Pratto, F. (1999). The puzzle of continuing group inequality: piecing together psychological, social and cultural forces in social dominance theory. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 31,* 191-263.

Pratto, F., Stallworth, L.M., & Conway-Lanz, S. (1998). Social dominance orientation and the ideological legitimization of social policy [Electronic version]. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 28*, 1853-1875.

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L.M., & Malle, B.F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social political attitudes [Electronic version]. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 741-763.

Pratto, F., Stallworth, L.M., & Sidanius, J. (1997). The gender gap: Differences in political attitudes and social dominance orientation [Electronic version]. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 36*, 49-68.

Reich, K.H. (1993). Cognitive-developmental approaches to religiousness: what version for what purpose? *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 3*, 145-171.

Reynolds, K.J., Turner, J.C., Haslam, S.A., & Ryan, M.K. (2001). The role of personality and group factors in explaining prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 37*, 427-434.

Roccato, M., & Ricolfi, L. (2005). On the correlation between right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation [Electronic version]. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 27*, 187-200.

Rogers, R. (2007). *Faith and Spiritual Development Paradigm For A Southern Baptist Church.* Unpublished manuscript.

Rowatt, W.C., & Franklin, L.M. (2004). Christian orthodoxy, religious fundamentalism, and right-wing authoritarianism as predictors of implicit racial prejudice [Electronic version]. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 14,* 125-138.

Sidanius, J. (1993). The psychology of group conflict and the dynamics of oppression: a social dominance perspective. In S. Iyengar, & W. McGuire, *Explorations in political psychology* (pp. 183-219). Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1993). The inevitability of oppression and the dynamics of social dominance. In P. Sniderman, P. Tetlock, & E.G. Carmines (Eds.), *Prejudice, politics, and the American dilemma* (pp. 173-211). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., & Bobo, L. (1994). Social dominance orientation and the political psychology of gender: a case of invariance? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 998-1011.

Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., & Bobo, L. (1996). Racism, conservatism, affirmative action, and intellectual sophistication: A matter of principled conservatism or group dominance? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 476-490.

Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., Van Laar, C., & Levin, S. (2004). Social dominance theory: its agenda and method [Electronic version]. *Political Psychology, 25*, 845-880.

Smith, W. C. (1963). *The Meaning and End of Religion*. New York: Macmillan.

Snell, M. (2007). *Crusades Basics*. About: Medieval History. Retrieved March 30, 2007, from http://historymedren.about.com/od/crusades/p/crusadesbasics.htm.

Snook, S.C., & Gorsuch, R.L. (1985). *Religion and racial prejudice in South Africa*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles.

Spilka, B., Kojetin, B., & McIntosh, D. (1985). Forms and measures of personal faith: questions, correlates and distinctions. *Journal of the Scientific Study of Religion, 24*, 437-442.

Streib, H. (2005). Faith development research revisited: Accounting for diversity in structure, content, narrativity of faith [Electronic version]. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 15*, 99-121.

Tillich, P. (1957). *Dynamics of Faith*. New York: Harper and Row.

The Heritage Foundation (2007). Marriage in the 50 States. Retrieved March 28, 2007, from http://www.heritage.org/Research/Family/Marriage50/index.cfm.

The Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life. (2000-2007). *Gay Marriage*. Retrieved March 17, 2007, from http://pewforum.org/gay-marriage /?gclid= CNrby67w _4oCFQM8SAodR GNEFQ.

Urdang, L. (1995). *The American Century Dictionary*. New York: Warner Books, Inc.

Van Hiel, A., & Mervielde, I. (2002). Explaining conservative beliefs and political preferences: A comparison of social dominance orientation and authoritarianism. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32*, 965-976.

Van Hiel, A., & Mervielde, I. (in press). Openness to experience and boundaries in the mind: relationships with cultural and economic conservative beliefs. *Journal of Personality*.

Van Hiel, A., Pandelaere, M., & Duriez, B. (2004). The impact of need for closure on conservative beliefs and racism: Differential mediation by authoritarian submission and authoritarian dominance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*, 824-837.

Wikepedia. Southern Baptist Convention. Retrieved March January 15, 2007, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Southern_Baptist_Convention.

Whitley, B.E. (1998). *Authoritarianism and social dominance orientation as independent dimensions of prejudice*. Paper presented at the 106th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, San Fransisco.

Whitley, B.E. (1999). Right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation and prejudice [Electronic version]. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*, 126-134.

Whitley, B.E., & Lee, S.E. (2000). The relationship of authoritarianism and related constructs to attitudes toward homosexuals. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30*, 144-170.

Whitney, D.S. (1991). *Spiritual disciplines for the Christian life*. Navpress Publishing Group.

Appendix A

Faith Development Scale

This survey asks you to choose between two different ways of looking at religious issues. For items 1 through 8, both of the choices available may seem valid to you, or both may seem inadequate; however, it is important that you select the one of the two options that comes the closest to reflecting how you feel about the religious issue involved. If you think option "A" best reflects your viewpoint, circle "A"; if "B" is best, circle B for that particular item.

1. A. I believe totally (or almost totally) the teachings of my church.
   B. I find myself disagreeing with my church over numerous aspects of my faith.

2. A. I believe that my church offers a full insight into what God wants for us and how we should worship him.
   B. I believe that my church has much to offer, but that other religions can also provide many religious insights.

3. A. It is very important to me to critically examine my religious beliefs and values.
   B. It is very important for me to accept the religious beliefs and values of my church.

4. A. My religious orientation comes primarily from my own efforts to analyze and understand God.
   B. My religious orientation comes primarily from the teachings of my family and church.

5. A. It does not bother me to become exposed to other religions.
   B. I don't find value in becoming exposed to other religions.

6. A. My personal religious growth has occasionally required me to come into conflict with my family or friends.
   B. My personal religious growth has not required me to come into conflict with my family or friends.

7. A. It is very important that my faith is highly compatible with or similar to the faith of my family.
   B. It isn't essential that my faith be highly compatible with the faith of my family.

8. A. The religious traditions and beliefs I grew up with are very important to me and do not need changing.
   B. The religious traditions and beliefs I grew up with have become less and less relevant to my current religious orientation.

Appendix B

The Revised 12-Item Religious Fundamentalism Scale

This survey is part of 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 filling in the blank.

Very strongly disagree Very strongly agree

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

___ 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 this 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 only 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 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 teachings. There is *no* perfectly true, right religion.

Appendix C

20-Item RWA Scale 1

Below are a series of statements with which you may agree or disagree. For each statement, please indicate the degree of your agreement/disagreement by filling in the blank of the appropriate number from "1" to "9."

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

___ 1. Our country desperately needs a mighty leader who will do what has to be done to destroy the radical new ways and sinfulness that are ruining us.

___ 2. Gays and lesbians are just as healthy and moral as anybody else.

___ 3. It is always better to trust the judgment of the proper authorities in government and religion than to listen to the noisy rabble-rousers in our society who are trying to create doubt in people's minds.

___ 4. Atheists and others who have rebelled against the established religions are no doubt every bit as good and virtuous as those who attend church regularly.

___ 5. The only way our country can get through the crisis ahead is to get back to our traditional values, put some tough leaders in power, and silence the troublemakers spreading bad ideas.

___ 6. There is absolutely nothing wrong with nudist camps.

___ 7. Our country needs free thinkers who will have the courage to defy traditional ways, even if this upsets many people.

___ 8. Our country will be destroyed someday if we do not smash the perversions eating away at our moral fiber and traditional beliefs.

___ 9. Everyone should have their own lifestyle, religious beliefs, and sexual preferences, even if it makes them different from everyone else.

___ 10. The "old-fashioned ways" and "old-fashioned values" still show the best way to life.

___ 11. You have to admire those who challenged the law and the majority's view by protesting for abortion rights, for animal rights, or to abolish school prayers.

___ 12. What our country really needs is a strong, determined leader who will crush evil, and take us back to our true path.

___ 13. Some of the best people in our country are those who are challenging our government, criticizing religion, and ignoring the "normal way things are supposed to be done."

___ 14. God's laws about abortion, pornography, and marriage must be strictly followed before it is too late, and those who break them must be strongly punished.

___ 15. There are many radical, immoral people in our country today, who are trying to ruin it for their own godless purposes, whom the authorities should put out of action.

___ 16. A "woman's place" should be wherever she wants to be. The days when women are submissive to their husbands and social conventions belong strictly in the past.

___ 17. Our country will be great if we honor the ways of our forefathers, do what the authorities tell us to do, and get rid of the "rotten apples" who are ruining everything.

___ 18. There is no "ONE right way" to live life; everybody has to create their own way.

___ 19. Homosexuals and feminists should be praised for being brave enough to defy "traditional family values."

___ 20. This country would work a lot better if certain groups of troublemakers would just shut up and accept their group's traditional place in society.

Appendix D

Social Dominance Orientation$_6$ Scale

Below are a series of statements with which you may either agree or disagree. For each statement, please indicate the degree of your agreement/disagreement by circling the appropriate number from '1' to '7.' Once again, remember that your first responses are usually the most accurate.

	Strongly Agree/Favor						Strongly Disagree/Disapprove
1. Some groups of people are just more worthy than others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. In getting what your group wants, it is sometimes necessary to use force against other groups	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. It's OK if some groups have more of a chance in life than others	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on other groups	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. If certain groups of people stayed in their place, we would have fewer problems	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. It's probably a good thing that certain groups are at the top and other groups are at the bottom	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Inferior groups should stay in their place	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Sometimes other groups must be kept in their place.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. It would be good if all groups could be equal.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Group equality should be our ideal.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. All groups should be given an equal chance in life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

13. We should increase social equality……..1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. We would have fewer problems if we treated different groups more equally. ……1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. We should strive to make incomes more equal. ……..……..1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. No one group should dominate in society..…1 2 3 4 5 6 7

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 you opinion on the line to the left of each statement, according to the amount of your agreement or disagreement, by using the following scale.

Strongly disagree Strongly agree

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

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 other 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.

Appendix F

Religious Proscription of Racism Scale and Religious Proscription of Homophobia Scale

Read each of the following statements and decide to what degree you agree or disagree with the statements. Put the number in the blank next to the statement that corresponds with your answer.

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

___ 1. My religious group tries hard to make all people feel welcome, regardless of their ethnic background.

___ 2. If a Native Indian became a leader in my church, some members would switch to a different church.

___ 3. Our minister would feel uncomfortable performing an interracial marriage.

___ 4. If I were to take a Black friend with me to church, some members of my church would avoid us.

___ 5. It would not be difficult for a Chinese person to be elected to a position of authority in my church.

___ 6. Even though I was taught in church that all people are equal regardless of their color, many people in my church don't believe what they preach.

___ 7. An activist concerned with Native American Rights would be welcomed as a guest speaker in our church.

___ 8. My religious group tries hard to make all people feel welcome regardless of their sexual orientation.

___ 9. If a homosexual became a leader in my church, some members would switch to a different church.

___ 10. Our minister would feel uncomfortable performing a same-sex marriage.

___ 11. If I were to take a known homosexual friend with me to church, some members of my church would avoid us.

___ 12. It would not be difficult for a homosexual to be elected to a position of authority in my church.

___ 13. Even though I was taught in church that all people are equal regardless of their sexual orientation, many people in my church don't believe what they preach.

___ 14. An activist concerned with gay rights would be welcomed as a guest speaker in our church.

Appendix G

"1990" Manitoba Prejudice Scale

Read each of the statements and fill in the blank with the number that best represents your feelings about each statement.

Strongly Disagree Strongly Agree

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

___ 1. There are entirely too many people from the wrong sorts of places being admitted into the United States now.

___ 2. In general, Indians have gotten less than they deserve from our social and anti-poverty programs.

___ 3. The United States should open its doors to more immigration from the West Indies.

___ 4. Certain races of people clearly do NOT have the natural intelligence and "get up and go" of the white race.

___ 5. The Vietnamese and other Asians who have recently moved to the United States have proven themselves to be industrious citizens, and many more should be invited in.

___ 6. It's good to live in a country where there are so many minority groups present, such as blacks, Asians, and American Indians.

___ 7. Arabs are too emotional and hateful, and they don't fit in well in our country.

___ 8. As a group American Indians are naturally lazy, promiscuous and irresponsible.

___ 9. The United States should open its doors to more immigration from Latin America.

___ 10. Black people as a rule are, by their nature, more violent than white people are.

___ 11. The people from India who have recently come to the United States have mainly brought disease, ignorance and crime with them.

___ 12. Jews can be trusted as much as everyone else.

___ 13. It is a waste of time to train certain races for good jobs; they simply don't have the drive and determination it takes to learn a complicated skill.

___ 14. The public needs to become aware of the many ways Blacks in the United States suffer prejudice.

___ 15. Every person we let into our country from overseas means either another American won't be able to find a job, or another foreigner will go on welfare here.

___ 16. The United States has much to fear from the Japanese, who are as cruel as they are industrious.

___ 17. There is nothing wrong with intermarriage among the races.

___ 18. Indians should keep on protesting and demonstrating until they get just treatment in our country.

___ 19. Many minorities are spoiled; if they really wanted to improve their lives, they would get jobs and get off welfare.

Appendix H

Attitudes Toward Lesbians and Gays Scale

Please read the following statements and fill in the blank with the number that corresponds to your degree of agreement or disagreement of the statement.

Strongly Disagree				Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

___ 1. Lesbians just can't fit into our society.

___ 2. A woman's homosexuality should not be a cause for job discrimination in any situation.

___ 3. Female homosexuality is detrimental to society because it breaks down the natural divisions between the sexes.

___ 4. State laws regulating private, consenting lesbian behavior should be loosened.

___ 5. Female homosexuality is a sin.

___ 6. The growing number of lesbians indicates a decline in American morals.

___ 7. Female homosexuality is a threat to many of our basic social institutions.

___ 8. Female homosexuality is an inferior form of sexuality.

___ 9. Lesbians are sick.

___ 10. Male homosexual couples should be allowed to adopt children the same as heterosexual couples.

___ 11. I think male homosexuals are disgusting.

___ 12. Male homosexuals should not be allowed to teach school.

___ 13. Male homosexuality is a perversion.

___ 14. Just as in other species, male homosexuality is a natural expression of sexuality in human men.

___ 15. If a man has homosexual feelings, he should do everything he can to overcome them.

___ 16. Homosexual behavior between two men is just plain wrong.

___ 17. The idea of male homosexual marriages seems ridiculous to me.

___ 18. Male homosexuality is merely a different kind of lifestyle that should *not* be condemned.

Appendix I

The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI)

Read each statement and mark the response that best describes your thoughts and feelings about the statement.

1	2	3	4	5
disagree strongly				agree strongly

___ 1. No matter how accomplished he is, a man is not truly complete as a person unless he has the love of a woman.

___ 2. Many women are actually seeking special favors, such as hiring policies that favor them over men, under the guise of asking for "equality."

___ 3. In a disaster, women ought not necessarily to be rescued before men.

___ 4. Most women interpret innocent remarks or acts as being sexist.

___ 5. Women are too easily offended.

___ 6. People are often truly happy in life without being romantically involved with a member of the other sex.

___ 7. Feminists are not seeking for women to have more power than men.

___ 8. Many women have a quality of purity that few men possess.

___ 9. Women should be cherished and protected by men.

___ 10. Most women fail to appreciate fully all that men do for them.

___ 11. Women seek to gain power by getting control over men.

___ 12. Every man ought to have a woman whom he adores.

___ 13. Men are complete without women.

___ 14. Women exaggerate problems they have at work.

___ 15. Once a woman gets a man to commit to her, she usually tries to put him on a tight leash.

___ 16. When women lose to men in a fair competition, they typically complain about being discriminated against.

___ 17. A good woman should be set on a pedestal by her man.

___ 18. There are actually very few women who get a kick out of teasing men by seeming sexually available and then refusing male advances.

___ 19. Women, compared to men, tend to have a superior moral sensibility.

___ 20. Men should be willing to sacrifice their own well being in order to provide financially for the women in their lives.

___ 21. Feminists are making entirely reasonable demands of men.

___ 22. Women, as compared to men, tend to have a more refined sense of culture and good taste.

Appendix J

Demographic Questionnaire

Please fill in the blank or check mark the appropriate answer.

Gender: ___ Male ___ Female Age: ___

Marital status: ___ Single ___ Married ___ Divorced

State _____ City _____

Number of years school completed:

___ High School
___ Some College
___ Undergraduate degree
___ Master's degree
___ Doctorate degree

If you choose, you may leave this question blank.

___ Black American
___ Asian American
___ European American
___ Hispanic American
___ Native American
___ Other, please specify _____

Occupation: _____

Religious Affiliation: _____

How often do you attend religious or religious-related activities?

___ N/A
___ Once or twice a year
___ 2 to 3 times a month
___ Weekly
___ 2-4 times per week

Think about your religious group or affiliation and what its position is on the following issues. To what extent does your religious affiliation approve or disapprove of the following statements? Please circle to number from "1" to "7" that indicates the degree of your agreement or disagreement.

1. A woman should not be a preacher, minister or deacon within the church.

Strongly disagree Strongly agree

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. Women should stay home and take care of the children.

Strongly disagree Strongly agree

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. A wife is to submit herself to the servant leadership of her husband.

Strongly disagree Strongly agree

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Please answer the following questions.
Within your religious affiliation, what are the beliefs about the role of women?

Do your beliefs about the role of women differ? If not, why? If so, how?

Appendix K

The University of Oklahoma

OFFICE FOR HUMAN RESEARCH PARTICIPANT PROTECTION

IRB Number: 11379
Approval Date: July 14, 2006

July 18, 2006

Carrie Crownover
400 West Central Ave. #1912
Wichita, KS 67203

RE: Faith Development, Right-Wing Authoritarianism, Religious Fundamentalism, Social Dominance Orientation, and Christian Orthodoxy as Preditors of Prejudice

Dear Ms. Crownover:

On behalf of the Institutional Review Board (IRB), I have reviewed and granted expedited approval of the above-referenced research study. This study meets the criteria for expedited approval category 7. It is my judgment as Chairperson of the IRB that the rights and welfare of individuals who may be asked to participate in this study will be respected; that the proposed research, including the process of obtaining informed consent, will be conducted in a manner consistent with the requirements of 45 CFR 46 as amended, and that the research involves no more than minimal risk to participants.

This letter documents approval to conduct the research as described:

Survey Instrument Dated: June 23, 2006 Attitude Survey-Appendex N
Protocol Dated: June 23, 2006 Summary of Study Activities
Other Dated: June 23, 2006 Abstract
Consent form - Subject Dated: June 23, 2006
Survey Instrument Dated: June 23, 2006 Appendix G-Demographic Questionnaire
Survey Instrument Dated: June 23, 2006 Appendix H
Survey Instrument Dated: June 23, 2006 Appendix I
Survey Instrument Dated: June 23, 2006 Appendix J
Survey Instrument Dated: June 23, 2006 Appendix K
IRB Application Dated: June 23, 2006
Survey Instrument Dated: June 23, 2006 Appendix M
Survey Instrument Dated: June 23, 2006 Appendix O
Survey Instrument Dated: June 23, 2006 Appendix P
Survey Instrument Dated: June 23, 2006 Appendix Q
Survey Instrument Dated: June 23, 2006 Appendix R-Recruitment Information
Other Dated: June 23, 2006 Recruitment by Adult Volunteers-Appendix S
Other Dated: June 23, 2006 Recruitment by email-Appendix T
Other Dated: June 23, 2006 Business card advertisement for website
Survey Instrument Dated: June 23, 2006 Appendix L
Letter Dated: June 12, 2006 Apprval letter from River Community Church
Letter Dated: June 05, 2006 Approval letter Emmaus Baptist Church

As principal investigator of this protocol, it is your responsibility to make sure that this study is conducted as approved. Any modifications to the protocol or consent form, initiated by you or by the sponsor, will require prior approval, which you may request by completing a protocol modification form. All study records, including copies of signed consent forms, must be retained for three (3) years after termination of the study.

The approval granted expires on July 13, 2007. Should you wish to maintain this protocol in an active status beyond that date, you will need to provide the IRB with an IRB Application for Continuing Review (Progress Report) summarizing study results to date. The IRB will request an IRB Application for Continuing Review from you approximately two months before the anniversary date of your current approval.

Ltr_Prot_Fappv_Exp

660 Parrington Oval, Suite 316, Norman, Oklahoma 73019-3085 PHONE: (405) 325-8110 FAX: (405) 325-2373

If you have questions about these procedures, or need any additional assistance from the IRB, please call the IRB office at (405) 325-8110 or send an email to irb@ou.edu.

Cordially,



Lynn Davenport, Ph.D.
Vice Chair, Institutional Review Board

Ltr_Prot_Fappv_Exp

Table 1

Stages of Different Theories

Piaget's Stages of Cognitive Development	**Kohlberg's Stages of Moral Development**	**Erikson's Psychosocial Stages**	**Levinson's Eras**	**Fowler's Faith Stages**
Sensorimotor Preoperational Concrete Operations Formal Operations	1. Punishment and Obedience Orientation 2. Individualism, instrumental purpose, and Exchange 3. Mutual interpersonal expectations, relationships, and interpersonal conformity 4. Social system and Conscience (Law and Order)	Trust vs. Mistrust Autonomy vs. Shame & Doubt Initiative vs. Guilt Industry vs. Inferiority Identity vs. Role Confusion	Era of Infancy, Childhood & Adolescence	Undifferentiated Faith (Infancy) 1. Intuitive-Projective Faith (Early Childhood) 2. Mythic-Literal Faith (Elementary School Years) 3. Synthetic-Conventional Faith (Adolescence)
Formal Operations	3. Mutual interpersonal expectations, relationships, and interpersonal conformity 4. Social system and Conscience (Law and Order)	Intimacy vs. Isolation	First Adult Era	4. Individuative-Reflective Faith (Young Adulthood)
Formal Operations	3. Mutual interpersonal expectations, relationships, and interpersonal conformity 4. Social system and Conscience (Law and Order) 5. Social contract or Utility and Individual rights 6. Universal Ethical Principles	Generativity vs. Stagnation	Middle Adult Era	5. Conjunctive Faith (Mid-Life and Beyond)
Formal Operations	3. Mutual interpersonal expectations, relationships, and interpersonal conformity 4. Social system and Conscience (Law and Order) 5. Social contract or Utility and Individual rights 6. Universal Ethical Principles	Integrity vs. Despair	Late Adult Era	6. Universalizing Faith

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics of Variables

Variable	Description	Mean	SD
FD	Faith Development	4.44	1.56
RF	Religious Fundamentalism	71.78	10.08
RWA	Right-Wing Authoritarianism	121.26	25.91
SDO	Social Dominance Orientation	43.93	16.35
PRS	Religious Proscription of Racism Scale	42.23	8.94
PHS	Religious Proscription of Homophobia Scale	19.85	7.43
SCO	Christian Orthodoxy Scale—Short Version	41.51	1.98
Psum	The Manitoba Prejudice Scale	67.37	23.07
Lgsum	The Attitudes Towards Lesbians and Gays Scale	70.9	12.08
ASIsum	Ambivalent Sexism Inventory	63.12	11.54
Hsum	Hostile Sexism Scale	31.50	7.87
Bsum	Benevolent Sexism Scale	31.66	6.12

Table 3

Pearson product-moment correlation for predictors and criterion

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1—Faith Development										
2—Religious Fundamentalism	-.142									
3—Right-Wing Authoritarianism	-.324**	.423**								
4—Social Dominance Orientation	-.104	.101	.342**							
5—Religious Proscription of Racism	.094	.168*	-.083	.068						
6—Religious Proscription of Homophobia	.072	.066	-.084	.122	.515**					
7—Prejudice toward ethnic minorities	-.207*	.014	.407**	.369**	-.317**	-.075				
8—Attitudes toward Lesbian and Gays Scale	-.157	.453**	.654**	.252**	-.031	-.142	.370**			
9—Ambivalent Sexism Inventory	-.094	.193*	.480**	.425**	-.258**	-.100	.439**	.436**		
10—Benevolent Sexism Scale	-.062	.118	.262**	.296**	-.208*	-.030	.308**	.230**	.774**	
11—Hostile Sexism Scale	-.099	.188*	.502**	.398**	-.222**	-.124	.415**	.459**	.865**	.354**

Note. * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 4

Hierarchical multiple linear regression for prejudice toward ethnic minorities (N =149)

Model	R Square	Adj. R^2	F	Sig. F	R^2 Change	F Change	Sig. F Change
1	.252	.236	16.136	.000	.252	16.136	.000
2	.331	.312	17.667	.000	.079	16.911	.000
3	.335	.311	14.282	.000	.004	.828	.364

	Variable	*B*	*SE B*	β	t	Sig.
Step 1						
	RFsum	-.410	.182	-.179	-2.247	.026
	RWAsum	.353	.075	.396	4.694	.000
	SDOsum	.356	.108	.252	3.280	.001
Step 2						
	RFsum	-.240	.178	-.105	-1.352	.178
	RWAsum	.292	.073	.328	4.017	.000
	SDOsum	.406	.104	.288	3.917	.000
	PRSsum	-.753	.183	-.292	-4.112	.000
Step 3						
	RFsum	-.244	.178	-.107	-1.372	.172
	RWAsum	.274	.075	.308	3.634	.000
	SDOsum	.406	.104	.288	3.914	.000
	PRSsum	-.741	.184	-.287	-4.031	.000
	FDsum	-.977	1.074	-.066	-.910	.364

Table 5

Hierarchical multiple linear regression for prejudice toward homosexuals (N = 150)

Model	R Square	Adj. R^2	F	Sig. F	R^2 Change	F Change	Sig. F Change
1	.467	.456	42.422	.000	.467	42.422	.000
2	.481	.481	33.417	.000	.014	3.878	.051
3	.486	.486	26.991	.000	.004	1.148	.286

	Variable	*B*	*SE B*	β	t	Sig.
Step 1						
	RFsum	.259	.080	.216	3.231	.002
	RWAsum	.256	.033	.548	7.734	.000
	SDOsum	3.128E-02	.048	.042	.656	.513
Step 2						
	RFsum	.279	.080	.232	3.479	.001
	RWAsum	.244	.033	.524	7.352	.000
	SDOsum	4.713E-02	.048	.064	.983	.327
	PHSsum	-.197	.100	-.121	-1.969	.051
Step 3						
	RFsum	.279	.080	.233	3.493	.001
	RWAsum	.254	.034	.545	7.372	.000
	SDOsum	4.717E-02	.048	.064	.985	.326
	PHSsum	-.202	.100	-.124	-2.020	.045
	FDsum	.527	.492	.068	1.072	.286

Table 6

Hierarchical multiple linear regression for prejudice toward women (N = 154)

Model	R Square	Adj. R^2	F	Sig. F	R^2 Change	F Change	Sig. F Change
1	.307	.293	22.038	.000	.307	22.038	.000
2	.311	.293	16.724	.000	.004	.848	.358

	Variable	*B*	*SE B*	β	t	Sig.
Step 1						
	RFsum	3.932E-03	.086	.003	.046	.964
	RWAsum	.168	.036	.377	4.728	.000
	SDOsum	.209	.051	.296	4.069	.000
Step 2						
	RFsum	4.387E-03	.086	.004	.051	.960
	RWAsum	.178	.037	.399	4.795	.000
	SDOsum	.208	.051	.295	4.060	.000
	FDsum	.492	.534	.066	.921	.358