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EDITOR’S NOTE

It is with pleasure that I am able to publish this unique, thematic issue of the journal on the topic of religious orientation and authoritarianism in cross-cultural perspective. If research such as that published in this journal issue were extended to other cultures and peoples, it would facilitate international dialogue about the research on religious orientation, which has been a cornerstone of Western, empirical psychology of religion for the past 30 years. The articles assembled in this issue of the journal present data from non-Western populations and the results of a translation of religious orientation measures into a language other than English.

Data sets in the four articles in this issue come from Canada, Ghana, The United States, and Poland. Duck and Hunsberger explore the relation between religious orientation, authoritarianism, and social desirability in a sample of Canadians. Hunsberger, Owusu, and Duck present two studies on the relation between religion and prejudice toward homosexuals and women, one on a sample of Canadians and one on a sample of Ghanaians. Watson, Morris, Hood, Miller, and Waddell assess the relation between religious orientation and constructive and destructive thinking, based on cognitive-experiential self-theory, in a sample of American undergraduate students. Socha presents a thorough, detailed analysis of his translation of the English language measures of intrinsic, extrinsic, and quest religious orientations into the Polish language and compares his data from Polish students and adults to Batson’s data on American undergraduates.

One of the commonly asked questions about the findings of research in the psychology of religion conducted on English-speaking populations concerns how the findings would come out if the research were extended to other peoples and cultures. The present thematic issue of the journal reflects this research. It is intended to stimulate further research as well.

Raymond F. Paloutzian
Editor, IJPR
Westmont College
Religious Orientation and Prejudice: The Role of Religious Proscription, Right-Wing Authoritarianism, and Social Desirability

Robert J. Duck and Bruce Hunsberger

Department of Psychology
Wilfrid Laurier University

University students were surveyed regarding their religious orientation, prejudice, and the extent to which specific prejudices were proscribed or nonproscribed by their religious community. Racism was typically perceived as a religiously proscribed prejudice, and possessing negative attitudes towards homosexuals was regarded as nonproscribed. Support was found for Batson, Schoenrade, and Ventis' (1993) hypothesized relations between personal prejudice and intrinsic, extrinsic, and quest religious orientations for both proscribed prejudice and nonproscribed prejudice. That is, proscribed prejudice was negatively correlated with intrinsic and quest, and positively correlated with extrinsic. When prejudice was nonproscribed, intrinsic was a positive predictor, and extrinsic and quest were negative predictors. The association between right-wing authoritarianism and religious orientation was positive for intrinsic and negative for extrinsic and quest. Controlling for (a) proscription, and (b) right-wing authoritarianism, supported suggestions that authoritarianism might play an important role in the religion-prejudice association, and furthermore, that its impact appears to be greater than that of religious community proscription of specific prejudice. A second study essentially replicated these findings, using more extensive proscription measures, and also indicated that for the intrinsically religious, personal prejudice is likely more influenced by authoritarian attitudes than by a disposition to respond in a socially desirable way.
Recent work has confirmed that religion is linked to prejudice, although the relation is not so simple as once thought (see Hood, Spilka, Hunsberger, & Gorsuch, 1996; Hunsberger, 1995). More than 30 years ago, Allport and Ross (1967) reported that people with an intrinsic (i.e., end) religious orientation tend not to be prejudiced, but people with an extrinsic (i.e., means) orientation are less tolerant. Although this generalization has become firmly embedded in the psychological literature (see, e.g., Gorsuch, 1988; Spilka, Hood, & Gorsuch, 1985), questions have been raised (see, e.g., Hood et al., 1996; Hunsberger, 1995). There is also evidence to suggest that a religious quest orientation is negatively linked to prejudice (see Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992; Batson & Schoenrade, 1991a, 1991b; Batson et al., 1993; McFarland, 1989) and that religious fundamentalism, possibly as a manifestation of right-wing authoritarianism (RWA), is positively related to prejudicial attitudes (e.g., Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992; Hunsberger, 1995, 1996; Kirkpatrick, 1993; McFarland 1989).

However, little empirical attention has been directed at the possibility that the formal and informal stances of religious groups on issues relating to prejudice might affect the self-reported attitudes of members of those groups. That is, church teachings that discourage or prohibit specific prejudiced attitudes might be effective in decreasing such attitudes among adherents, and members of religious groups that tolerate or even encourage specific prejudices might feel reasonably comfortable holding prejudiced views in those areas.

In this regard, Batson et al. (1993) suggested that prejudices such as racism are typically proscribed, or condemned, by religious communities, but other prejudices, such as homophobia, might be nonproscribed, that is, tolerated or even encouraged, by some religious groups. Batson et al.’s (1993) review of related research seems to support their position and was interpreted in terms of a social desirability factor (see, e.g., Batson, Naifeh, & Pate, 1978). Specifically, it was suggested that intrinsically religious individuals might be more inclined to present themselves in socially desirable ways when overt measures of prejudice (such as questionnaires) are used. However, with covert, less obvious measures of prejudice, the underlying prejudicial attitudes would tend to surface. This seemed to be the case when Batson et al. (1978) controlled for social desirability psychometrically and even more so when a behavioral control was used.

In keeping with this interpretation, Batson et al. (1993) reported data from various studies that seem to reveal a negative link between an intrinsic religious orientation and proscribed prejudice and a positive relation between an intrinsic orientation and nonproscribed prejudice on overt measures of prejudice, such as

---

1 Suggestions that individuals are influenced by the position of their (religious) group, with respect to specific prejudices, have been made before (e.g., Herek, 1987; McFarland, 1989). However, here we have used the Batson et al. (1993) presentation of this position as the basis for our own work because it is a recent, comprehensive, well-articulated statement that considers much related research.
questionnaires. They argued that intrinsically religious people might be inclined to follow the prohibitions of their respective religious community under some (socially desirable) circumstances. Using more covert measures of prejudice (e.g., Batson, Flink, Schoenrade, Fultz, & Pych, 1986) the negative relation between intrinsicness and proscribed prejudice seemed to disappear. Similarly, Batson et al. (1978) reported that the perception of personal cost also tended to eliminate the relation between proscribed prejudice and intrinsic orientation.

Furthermore, Batson et al. (1993) pointed out that extrinsic religious orientation scores are generally positively correlated with proscribed prejudice, apparently because extrinsically motivated individuals tend to have knowledge, but not acceptance, of church teachings, and they may even be rejecting of those teachings. Finally, these authors' conceptualization of the religious quest suggests that individuals motivated by this religious orientation should be negatively associated with prejudice, whether it is proscribed or not by one's religious community because the quest orientation is associated with openness and overall tolerance.

The social desirability interpretation of this effect has been questioned (see, e.g., Gorsuch, 1988). In addition, the evidence amassed to support Batson et al.'s (1993) proposals comes from bits and pieces from many different investigations. Apparently no study has attempted to confirm the characterization of racism as proscribed prejudice and homophobia as nonproscribed prejudice. No one has gone on to assess the hypothesized relations between such proscribed and nonproscribed prejudice and measures of religious orientation or explored possible reasons for those relations. In Study 1, we attempted to do so by focusing on the role of authoritarianism as a possible explanatory factor in the expected relations.

Evidence suggests that the personality variable RWA is a moderate to strong correlate of an individual's personal prejudice (e.g., Altemeyer, 1988; Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992; Duckitt, 1991, 1992; Hunsberger, Owusu, & Duck, this issue; Wylie & Forest, 1992). Altemeyer and Hunsberger (Altemeyer, 1996; Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992; Hunsberger, 1996) suggested that the concept of RWA might help us to understand the relations between religion and prejudice, and Petropoulos (1979), some time ago, suggested that the testing of any association between religion and prejudice should control for authoritarianism. For example, Altemeyer (1988, 1996) concluded that religion and authoritarianism often reinforce each other. "One often finds religious elements in authoritarian thinking" (Altemeyer, 1996, p. 149). At the same time it is surprising "how easily religious beliefs enable high RWAs to erase their guilt, thereby

---

2 It should be noted that studies have certainly examined the relation between different religious orientations and different types of prejudice (e.g., Herek, 1987; Kirkpatrick, 1993; McFarland, 1989). But these investigations did not involve a comprehensive test of Batson et al.'s (1993) predictions, they did not attempt to assess religious proscription, and they did not compare the importance of factors, such as social desirability and RWA, in these relations.
probably facilitating their authoritarian aggression" (Altemeyer, 1996, p. 149). That is, at least some of the tendency for measures of religiousness to be related to measures of prejudice might be attributable to the authoritarianism that is also associated with religion.

Here, we specifically investigated the possibility that RWA might serve as an alternate explanation of the religious proscription and prejudice findings, which Batson et al. (1993) attributed to social desirability. It might also be the source of tolerance/intolerance that Batson et al. mentioned in the context of the negative quest-prejudice association.

**STUDY 1**

Study 1 was devised to assess the predictions made by Batson et al. (1993) concerning proscribed or nonproscribed prejudice and their relations to intrinsic, extrinsic, and quest orientations and also to investigate the possible role of RWA in understanding these relations.

First, we investigated the extent to which racism and homophobia were perceived to be religiously proscribed and nonproscribed prejudices, respectively. Batson et al. (1993) suggested that racial prejudice would usually be proscribed by Christian religious groups, but negative attitudes towards homosexuals\(^3\) would more typically be nonproscribed.

Second, we assessed the direction and extent of relations between the three religious orientations (intrinsic, extrinsic, and quest) and our two types of prejudice (i.e., based on attitudes towards minority racial groups and homosexuals). On the basis of Batson et al.'s (1993) predictions, the intrinsic orientation was expected to correlate negatively with prejudice when the attitudes at issue were proscribed by a respondent's religious community (i.e., racism), and positively when the prejudice was nonproscribed (i.e., homophobia). Extrinsic religiosity was expected to be positively correlated with proscribed prejudice and not correlated with nonproscribed prejudice. Finally, it was hypothesized that the quest orientation would be negatively associated with both proscribed and nonproscribed prejudice.

Third, we investigated the possibility that RWA might serve as a viable, alternative explanation for the relations between religious orientation and prejudice. We expected that controlling for self-reported religious proscription would not eliminate the association between each religious orientation and prejudice. However, we predicted that controlling for RWA would generate substantial changes in

---

\(^3\)Current APA policy suggests that the terms *gay men* and *lesbians* are preferred to *homosexuals*. In this article, we continue to use the term "homosexuals" because it is consistent with the content and terminology of the Attitudes Toward Homosexuals (ATH) scale, which does not distinguish between gay men and lesbians.
the correlations. Specifically, controlling for RWA should reduce the positive associations or increase the negative correlations among intrinsic religiosity and both proscribed and nonproscribed measures of prejudice. For both the extrinsic and quest religious orientations, we expected that controlling for RWA would increase positive correlations or decrease negative associations.

Method

Participants and procedure. Eight hundred and thirty-two introductory psychology students (325 men, 488 women, 19 gender unknown) at Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, completed two social attitude surveys, which included material relevant to several investigations. The first questionnaire was administered in October 1994 and the second in February 1995, both during regularly scheduled class time. Student identification (ID) numbers were used to match responses from the two questionnaires and to give participation credit. Bonus course credit was provided for participation in each survey, in accordance with departmental policy.

From this sample, 363 students (249 women; 114 men) were selected for inclusion in the present analyses if they self-reported identification with a religious community and if they also completed survey items pertaining to religious proscription. Persons who reported that they belonged to “no religion” or who had a “personal religion” were excluded from this sample because we needed to assess respondents’ perceptions of their respective religious community’s teachings concerning various social issues, necessarily requiring that these people identify with a religious group. The vast majority of our respondents reported either Protestant (47.1%) or Catholic (42.4%) affiliation. Ages ranged from 17 to 56 years ($M = 19.78, SD = 3.58$).

Measures. Responses to scale items were marked directly on a computer scoring sheet, using a nine-point Likert-type response format that ranged from $-4$ (strongly disagree) to $+4$ (strongly agree). Scoring for con-trait items was reversed. Responses were then converted to a one-to nine-point scoring system by adding the constant five to each score, and the appropriate items were summed to determine scale scores. Scales relevant to the present study included the measures described in the following.

The Religious Orientation Scale (Allport & Ross, 1967) contains 20 items, 9 to assess intrinsic religiosity (religion as an end in itself), and 11 to measure extrinsic traits (religion as a means to an end). The Intrinsic subscale scores can range from 9 to 81, and the Extrinsic scores can range from 11 to 99. The conceptualization and psychometric properties of both the Intrinsic and (especially) Extrinsic scales have been questioned and criticized (e.g., Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992; Batson et al.,
1993; Donahue, 1985a, 1985b; Kirkpatrick & Hood, 1990). Typical Cronbach’s \( \alpha \) are .65 to .75 for the Extrinsic scale and .75 to .85 for the Intrinsic scale (Batson & Schoenrade, 1991b). The Intrinsic scale includes items such as, “I try hard to carry my religion over into all my other dealings in life.” An example of an Extrinsic item is, “The primary purpose of prayer is to gain relief and protection.”

The Quest scale (Batson & Schoenrade, 1991a, 1991b) consists of 12 items (10 pro-trait and 2 con-trait), with the total possible score ranging from 12 to 108. Cronbach’s \( \alpha \) are reportedly in the .78 to .81 range (Batson & Schoenrade, 1991b). The scale was designed to measure self-criticism and perception of religious doubts as positive, readiness to face existential questions, and openness to change. A sample item is, “For me, doubting is an important part of what it means to be religious.”

The Racism measure, originally called The Manitoba Prejudice Scale (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992), is a balanced, 20-item scale that assesses respondents’ tolerance/intolerance of immigrants and minorities, especially racial groups. Scores can range from 20 to 180. Typical Cronbach’s \( \alpha \) are .88 to .89 (Altemeyer, 1988; Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992). A sample con-trait item is, “Canada should open its doors to more immigration from the West Indies.”

The 12-item ATH scale (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992) is balanced for response set. Scores can vary from 12 to 108, with higher scores indicating more homophobic attitudes. A Cronbach’s \( \alpha \) of .89 was reported by Altemeyer and Hunsberger. A typical item is, “I won’t associate with known homosexuals if I can help it.”

The RWA scale developed by Altemeyer (1981, 1988, 1996) measures three attitudinal clusters:

1. Authoritarian submission.
2. Authoritarian aggression.
3. Conventionalism.

Total scores on this 30-item, balanced scale range from 30 to 270, with higher scores indicating higher levels of authoritarianism. Typical Cronbach’s \( \alpha \) are in the low .90s (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992). A sample item is, “What our country really needs, instead of more ‘civil rights,’ is a good stiff dose of law and order.”

Eight additional items (which used the same –4 to +4 response format described before) were designed to measure respondents’ perceptions of their religious community’s proscriptive or nonproscriptive positions on various issues. Four of the items were relevant to the present study. Participants were asked,

Think for a moment of your religious group, and what its position is on the following issues. In general, to what extent does your religious group approve or disapprove of the following?

1. Allowing greater numbers of immigrants into Canada.
2. Treating all racial minorities as equal in every way to White people.
3. Homosexuality.
4. Equal rights for gay (homosexual) persons.

Our items, therefore, allowed participants to define their own “religious community.” However, because everyone included in our data analyses had reported identifying with a specific religious group or denomination, we expected that they would use that group (or possibly their specific church congregation) as their “religious community” reference point. We purposely did not base our analyses on denominational affiliation in light of the difficulty in, for example, (a) determining denominational positions on racism and homosexuality; (b) ascertaining whether participants could and would accurately report denominational positions; and (c) clarifying and understanding substantial differences in “proscription,” even within denominations (e.g., rural vs. urban congregations).

Results

The psychometric properties of the scales used in this study are presented in Table 1. Cronbach’s $\alpha$ ranged from .72 to .92, revealing reasonably strong internal consistency for all but the extrinsic measure, a finding that is consistent with previous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Inter-Item Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s $\alpha$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44.58</td>
<td>14.49</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43.32</td>
<td>16.16</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51.85</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49.83</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quest</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61.55</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60.18</td>
<td>13.43</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racism</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73.05</td>
<td>22.93</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>68.60</td>
<td>21.97</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATH</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43.60</td>
<td>20.22</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39.55</td>
<td>18.44</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWA</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>129.62</td>
<td>33.41</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>138.42</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proscription (racism)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43.28</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27.54</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proscription (homophobia)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 363$ (Study 1); $N = 400$ (Study 2); ATH = Attitudes Towards Homosexuals; RWA = Right-Wing Authoritarianism.
criticisms regarding the weak psychometric properties of the Extrinsic scale (e.g., Batson et al., 1993).

**Religious proscription.** As expected, the two proscription items regarding immigration and treatment of racial minorities correlated positively, $r = .34, p < .001$, as did the two items dealing with homosexuality, $r = .74, p < .001$. Mean scores below 5 on each item (the neutral point) indicate the perception that the church “disapproves,” and mean scores above 5 suggest perceived approval by the religious community. The (pro) immigration and racial equality items were generally reported as being approved by one’s church ($M = 5.92$ and $7.91; SD = 1.87$ and $1.70$, respectively), and the two homosexuality items were generally perceived as being disapproved of by one’s religious community ($M = 3.21$ and $3.96; SD = 2.32$ and $2.57$, respectively). In light of the above correlations and means, the immigration and racial equality items were combined to form a Proscription of Racial Prejudice index, and the two homosexuality items were combined to form a Proscription of Homosexuality index.

As expected, the two-item racism proscription index score was negatively correlated with the racism scale scores, $r = -.36, p < .001$. Similarly, the proscription index for homosexuality was negatively correlated with ATH scores, $r = -.31, p < .001$. The two indexes were themselves unrelated, $r = -.02$.

**Relations between religious orientation and prejudice.** Table 2 (top panel) shows the intercorrelations among the two prejudice scales and the three religious orientation measures. Racism scores (our measure of proscribed prejudice) were significantly negatively correlated with Intrinsic ($-.14, p < .01$) and Quest ($-.14, p < .01$) scores and significantly positively correlated with Extrinsic scores ($.23, p < .001$). ATH scores (nonproscribed prejudice) correlated significantly and positively with Intrinsic ($.25, p < .001$) and negatively with Extrinsic ($-.12, p < .05$) and Quest ($-.37, p < .001$) scores.

Five of these six relations were consistent with Batson et al.’s (1993) predictions, the exception being the weak negative association ($-.12, p < .05$) between Extrinsic and ATH scores, where no relation was expected in the nonproscribed context. See Table 3 for a comparison between predicted and observed relations between religious orientation and both proscribed and nonproscribed prejudice.

A partial correlation procedure was used to determine if the relations between religious orientation and prejudice were changed by removing the effects of religious proscription. Table 4 (Columns 1–3, Study 1) shows that the correlations between both prejudice measures and the three religious orientations changed very little when the effects of proscription were controlled statistically. In particular, the negative relations between Quest and
TABLE 2
Intercorrelations Among Religious Orientations, Prejudice Measures, Right-Wing Authoritarianism, and Social Desirability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Intrinsic</th>
<th>Quest</th>
<th>ATH</th>
<th>Racism</th>
<th>RWA</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study 1</td>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>-0.29***</td>
<td>0.34***</td>
<td>-0.12*</td>
<td>0.23***</td>
<td>0.25***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>-0.13*</td>
<td>0.25***</td>
<td>-0.14**</td>
<td>0.48***</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quest</td>
<td>-0.37***</td>
<td>-0.14**</td>
<td>-0.38***</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATH</td>
<td>-0.13*</td>
<td>0.51***</td>
<td>0.62***</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Racism</td>
<td>-0.14**</td>
<td>0.31***</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extrinsic</th>
<th>Quest</th>
<th>ATH</th>
<th>Racism</th>
<th>RWA</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>-0.42***</td>
<td>0.30***</td>
<td>-0.16*</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
<td>-0.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>-0.10*</td>
<td>0.21***</td>
<td>-0.20***</td>
<td>0.39***</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quest</td>
<td>-0.15**</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.27***</td>
<td>-0.12*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATH</td>
<td>-0.15**</td>
<td>0.50***</td>
<td>0.33***</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Racism</td>
<td>-0.15**</td>
<td>0.57***</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RWA</td>
<td>-0.10*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 363 (Study 1); N = 400 (Study 2); ATH = Attitudes Towards Homosexuals; RWA = Right-Wing Authoritarianism; NA = Not Applicable; SD = Social Desirability.

* p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p < .001.

TABLE 3
Direction of Predicted and Observed Correlations Between Proscribed/Nonproscribed Prejudice and Religious Orientations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Proscription Status</th>
<th>Religious Orientation</th>
<th>Predicted Correlation</th>
<th>Observed Study 1</th>
<th>Observed Study 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proscribed</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>Neutral or negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quest</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Neutral*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATH</td>
<td>Nonproscribed</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quest</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative*</td>
<td>Negative*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ATH = Attitudes Towards Homosexuals.

*Observed relationship was not consistent with prediction.

the two prejudice measures remained virtually unchanged following the partial correlation procedure. The positive Extrinsic–Racism relation decreased slightly from zero-order to proscription-controlled correlations. For nonproscribed prejudice (ATH scores), the weak but significant negative correlation (−.12) with Extrinsic scores reduced slightly (−.09), becoming nonsignificant. Similarly, the weak but significant negative relation
TABLE 4
Zero-Order and Partial Correlations, Controlling Proscription, Right-Wing Authoritarianism, and Social Desirability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Study 1 (N = 363)</th>
<th>Study 2 (N = 400)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racism</td>
<td>No Control</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proscription Index</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proscription Scale</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWA</td>
<td>-.35***</td>
<td>.30***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATH</td>
<td>No Control</td>
<td>.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proscription Index</td>
<td>.20***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proscription Scale</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWA</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ATH = Attitudes Towards Homosexuals; RWA = Right-Wing Authoritarianism; SD = Social Desirability.

*p < .05, ***p < .01, ****p < .001.

between Racism and Intrinsic scores (−.14, p < .01) was reduced to nonsignificance (−.06) by controlling for proscription. For ATH and Intrinsic scores, the positive correlation dropped slightly when proscription was controlled, but it remained significant.4

Right-wing authoritarianism. As shown in Table 2, RWA scores correlated positively with both Racism (.31) and ATH (.62) scores, as expected. Also as predicted, RWA scores correlated positively with Intrinsic (.48) and negatively with Extrinsic (−.25) and Quest (−.38) scores. (All of these correlations were significant, p < .001.)

To assess the possibility that authoritarianism could play an important role in the link between religion and prejudice, partial correlations controlled for the effects of RWA in the religious orientation–prejudice associations. These partials (see Table 4) resulted in a pattern of substantial changes in the correlations in the predicted directions. Controlling for RWA produced an increase in the negative

4 We agree with our reviewers that it would be best to statistically evaluate the differences between our zero-order and partial correlations. However, there does not seem to be any appropriate test available for such a comparison, and standard tests for differences between correlations are not applicable to partial correlations as they are used here (see, e.g., Bruning & Kintz, 1997). Therefore, we relied on the size of changes in the correlation, as well as the patterns of those changes, when third variables were controlled, in our subsequent interpretation of the influence of various third variables.
correlation between Intrinsic and proscribed prejudice (Racism) scores, from $r = -0.14$ to $-0.35$. For the association between Intrinsic and nonproscribed prejudice (ATH) scores, controlling for RWA resulted in a decrease from $r = 0.27$ to $-0.05$. For the Extrinsic–Racism (proscribed) relation, the significant zero-order positive relation $r = -0.23$ increased to $0.32$ when RWA scores were controlled. The Extrinsic–ATH (nonproscribed) correlation decreased from $r = -0.12$ to $r = 0.03$ when RWA was controlled. Finally, the weak, yet significant, zero-order negative association between Quest and Racism scores ($-0.14$) became nonsignificant ($-0.03$), and the moderate negative relation between Quest and ATH (nonproscribed) scores ($-0.35$) remained significant, but dropped somewhat (to $-0.20$) when the effects of RWA were controlled.

Discussion

Batson et al. (1993) suggested that, in general, contemporary North American mainstream religious communities discourage or prohibit racism. On the other hand, negative attitudes toward homosexuality are typically tolerated or even encouraged. Our data support this position because, on average, our items that were intended to tap participants’ perceptions of their churches’ positions showed perceived disapproval of racism and weak approval of negative attitudes toward homosexuality. Thus, in our subsequent analyses, we have treated racism as religiously proscribed prejudice and homophobia as nonproscribed prejudice, consistent with Batson et al.’s (1993) position.

Batson et al. (1993) made specific predictions about the direction of correlations between proscribed/nonproscribed prejudice and each of three religious orientations (intrinsic, extrinsic, and quest). Our data provided support for five of the six relations. The intrinsic orientation was indeed negatively correlated with proscribed prejudice (Racism), but positively related to nonproscribed prejudice (ATH). Quest was negatively correlated with both types of prejudice, and the extrinsic orientation was positively related to proscribed prejudice. The only prediction that was not confirmed was the proposal that extrinsic would be uncorrelated with ATH (nonproscribed prejudice). In fact, this prediction was almost correct because Extrinsic and ATH were only very weakly (but significantly) correlated ($-0.12$). Overall, we are led to conclude that Batson et al.’s (1993) predictions were indeed very accurate.

Thus, Quest scores do seem to be consistently associated with lower prejudice scores, whether or not the specific prejudicial attitudes are proscribed by one’s religious community, and this is consistent with Batson et al.’s (1993) conceptualization of quest as indicating a general openness, tolerance, and acceptance. However, as Batson et al. pointed out, “...it seems premature to suggest that the quest dimension is a source of increased acceptance and tolerance. It may only be a symptom” (p. 330).
Furthermore, it appears that intrinsically religious people tend to espouse attitudes concerning specific prejudices similar to the perceived norms of their religious group, whereas those who are extrinsically motivated do not. We do not know whether extrinsically motivated people are not accepting of (or possibly rejecting of) church teachings as Batson et al. (1993) suggested, or are simply less concerned about their religious communities' dictates.

Consistent with the aforementioned conclusions, Gorsuch (1988) suggested that high intrinsics are "trying to follow the internalized norms of their group" (p. 215). Although Gorsuch did not discuss the implications of his internalization hypothesis for the extrinsically motivated, it might follow that high extrinsics do not internalize religious group norms. It could also be argued that Gorsuch's internalization proposal is simply another way of saying that conforming to church teachings may be at least partially determined by an (intrinsic) individual's need to act in socially desirable ways. A measure of social desirability was, therefore, included in our second study.

Here, however, we investigated the role of RWA in the religion-prejudice relation. Although reports of the extent of the perceived proscription/nonproscription of specific prejudices did indeed predict personal prejudice scores for both the Racism and ATH scales, partialling out the effect of proscription from the religion-prejudice correlations did not change the direction or intensity of the relations much. A very different picture emerged when we partialled out the effects of RWA from the same religion-prejudice correlations.

As predicted, RWA was positively correlated with Intrinsic and negatively associated with both Extrinsic and Quest. This is consistent with previous findings that RWA is positively associated with measures of religious fundamentalism and orthodoxy (which in turn are associated with Intrinsic), but negatively correlated with Quest (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992; Hunsberger, 1995). However, substantial shifts occurred in the intensity of the relations when we controlled for the effects of authoritarianism. The negative relation between Quest and proscribed prejudice disappeared, and that with nonproscribed prejudice decreased in intensity. On the other hand, there was a considerable increase in the negative relation between Intrinsic and proscribed prejudice scores, and the positive association between Intrinsic and nonproscribed prejudice scores disappeared. Extrinsic scores seemed least affected when controlling for RWA, but even here there was a reduction in the positive correlation between Extrinsic and Racism scores, and the weak, negative association between Extrinsic and ATH scores disappeared.

These changes in correlations are understandable in terms of the components of the RWA scale. The tendency for intrinsics to concur with the teachings of their religious communities fits nicely into both the conventionalism and authoritarian submission facets of Altemeyer's (1981, 1988, 1996) conceptualization of RWA. And the authoritarian aggression component might be seen as helping to justify negative attitudes toward religiously "nonproscribed" minority groups, such as
homosexuals. Extrinsicly motivated people tend to score lower on the RWA scale, but the changes in the correlations for the Extrinsic scale tended to be small, possibly because this is a weak (but significant) tendency. Finally, the Quest scale's moderate negative correlation with RWA scores suggests that the inclination of individuals scoring high on Quest to be low authoritarians might be related to their tendency to be more tolerant of minority groups. When one removes the RWA component from the Quest-prejudice correlations, they decrease substantially (although the negative association between Quest and ATH scores remained significant).

None of this disproves Batson et al.'s (1978, 1993) social desirability explanation of the religious orientation-prejudice relationship. However, our findings, which are consistent with earlier conclusions (e.g., Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992; Hunsberger, 1995), suggest that authoritarianism is a potentially powerful component in these associations, possibly acting as a moderating variable. Especially in light of the changes in the correlations when RWA scores were controlled, and the apparently lesser effects of controlling for perceived religious proscription status of specific prejudices, we suspect that authoritarianism is the more powerful explanatory variable. Motivation for compliance with church dictates might be directly proportional to one's authoritarianism. However, we believed that a stronger measure of proscription/nonproscription was needed before firm conclusions could be drawn. Finally, research that directly compares the social desirability versus RWA "explanations" of these findings was needed. Study 2 addressed these issues.

STUDY 2

Study 2 was designed to replicate the correlational findings of Study 1 and also to test the Batson et al. (e.g., 1978, 1993) social desirability hypothesis concerning the religious orientation-prejudice relationship. These authors suggested that the tendency for Intrinsic scale scores to be negatively associated with racial prejudice is probably a reflection of a propensity for highly intrinsic individuals to respond in a socially desirable way. Furthermore, and possibly related to this inclination toward social desirability, high intrinsics are inclined to follow the dictates of their respective religious communities. That is, intrinsicness is associated with (the appearance of) greater racial tolerance, not because highly intrinsic individuals are less prejudiced, but rather because most North American Christian denominations strictly prohibit racial intolerance. Similarly, the tendency for intrinsic scores to be positively associated with prejudice directed toward homosexuals is likely a result of negative Christian attitudes concerning homosexuality. Indeed, Batson et al. (1993) did provide indirect evidence that supported their proscription hypothesis. However, these authors offered little evidence to suggest that social desirability can adequately explain the pattern of relationship.
We, therefore, included the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability (SD) scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964) in an effort to test the predicted positive association between SD and intrinsicness (Batson et al., 1993). Furthermore, we used a partial correlation procedure to determine the influence of SD on the religious orientation-prejudice relations. Here we predicted that SD scores would have little or no influence on the pattern of relationship between religious orientation and prejudice. Again, we expected that RWA scores would provide an explanation for the pattern of religion-prejudice relations that was predicted and tested in Study 1.

Finally, we developed two new scales to measure participants’ perceptions of religious proscription concerning racist and homophobic attitudes. In light of our findings in Study 1, we hoped that using more extensive measures of proscription would provide additional support for the Batson et al. (1993) suggestion that certain prejudices are religiously proscribed, whereas others are nonproscribed. However, as observed in Study 1, we did not expect proscription scores to substantially affect the pattern of religious orientation-prejudice relationship.

Method

Participants and procedure. In the fall of 1996, a questionnaire was administered to 617 introductory psychology students (391 women, 213 men, and 13 gender unknown). From this initial sample, 400 students (258 women, 133 men, and 9 gender unknown) met our inclusion requirements of identification with a specific religious group and completion of questions pertaining to religious proscription. Again, the majority of participants reported Protestant (49.5%) or Catholic (36.5%) affiliation. Students received token bonus course credit for participating. The questionnaire, containing a battery of measures, was completed during regularly scheduled class times, typically within 1 hr. Again, students put their ID number on the questionnaire so that responses in a follow-up study (not relevant to this article) could be matched to their original survey and also so that they could be given their experimental (course) credit for participating.

Measures. As in Study 1, the questionnaire used in Study 2 included the following measures: Intrinsic and Extrinsic subscales of the Religious Orientation scale (Allport & Ross, 1967); Quest scale (Batson & Schoenrade, 1991a, 1991b); Racism scale (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992); ATH scale (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992); RWA scale (Altemeyer, 1996); Religious Proscription indexes; and single-item questions regarding church attendance, childhood religion, and present religion.

In addition, two new proscription scales were developed as a self-report instrument of religious proscription. The Religious Proscription of Racism (RPR) scale
RELIGIOUSLY PROSCRIBED/NONPROSCRIBED PREJUDICE

consisted of seven items relating to racial attitudes, and the Religious Proscription of Homophobia (RPH) scale, consisted of seven items concerning attitudes about homosexuals. Both scales had three pro-trait and four con-trait items. Parallel wording of items was used to facilitate comparisons of measures (e.g., “My religious group tries hard to make all people feel welcome regardless of their ethnic background” and “My religious group tries hard to make all people feel welcome regardless of their sexual orientation.”) The complete scales are presented in the Appendix.5

The 33-item Marlowe–Crowne Social Desirability scale was also included. It was designed to “measure individual differences in social-desirability response bias” (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964, p. 20). There are 18 pro-trait and 15 con-trait items, which use a true/false response format. The scale can range from 0 to 33, with higher scores indicating more socially desirable responding. A sample item is, “Before voting, I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates.”

Participants responded on computer scoring sheets using the −4 to +4 response format described in Study 1 for all scales except SD, for which participants entered 0 for “false” and 1 for “true” on a separate section of the scoring sheet.

Results

Table 1 shows the psychometric properties of the scales. Cronbach’s alphas indicated moderate to good internal consistency for all measures, with the Extrinsic scale (.74), the Quest scale (.75), and the RPR scale (.77) at the lower end of the range. Internal consistency for the two new proscription scales was acceptable, with Cronbach’s α being .84 for RPH and .77 for RPR.

Religious proscription. As in Study 1, the two proscription index items pertaining to minority groups were positively correlated (.36, p < .001) as were the two homophobia items (.78, p < .001). Similarly, the racism item means were above the midpoint of 5, indicating that they were perceived as religiously proscribed, on average (M = 6.22, SD = 1.87 for immigration; M = 8.01, SD = 1.58 for equal racial minority rights). The homophobia item means were again below the midpoint, indicating perceived nonproscription (M = 3.57, SD = 2.32 for homosexuality; M = 4.31, SD = 2.50 for equal gay rights). Again, the related items were combined to form two-item

5Both the RPR and RPH scales were originally intended to have eight items. However, low inter-item correlations for one item (i.e., the parallel item that appeared in each scale) and the resulting split of each scale into two factors argued for discarding the problematic item from each scale. This improved Cronbach’s α in each case, and resulted in one-factor solutions in factor analyses. The problematic item was, “My minister/priest/rabbi would chastise me if I stated that I didn’t like Blacks/homosexuals.”
rascism \((M=14.23, SD=2.85, \text{scale midpoint}=10)\) and homophobia \((M=7.90, SD=4.55, \text{scale midpoint}=10)\) indexes of proscription. Similarly, responses to the two new proscription scales indicated that racism was perceived by respondents to be religiously proscribed \((M=43.28, SD=9.72, \text{scale midpoint}=35)\), and homophobia was nonproscribed \((M=27.54, SD=10.46, \text{scale midpoint}=35)\).

Both the index and the scale of racism proscription correlated negatively with Racism scale scores \((-0.41, p < .001, \text{and} r=-0.28, p < .001, \text{respectively})\), as expected. Similarly, for homophobia proscription, ATH scale scores were associated with both the proscription index, \(r=-0.35, p < .001\), and scale, \(r=-0.31, p < .001\). The index and scale of proscribed racism were, themselves, positively correlated \((0.39, p < .001)\), as were the two measures of proscribed homophobia \((0.75, p < .001)\). The two proscription indexes were not significantly related to each other \((-0.04\)). However, there was a positive association between the two proscription scales \((0.24, p < .001)\).

Also, Racism scale scores and ATH scores were positively correlated \((0.50, p < .001)\).

**Relations between religious orientation and prejudice.** The pattern of relations between religious orientation and the measures of prejudice was similar to that found in Study 1 (see Table 2, bottom panel). Again, there was a negative relation between Intrinsic scale scores and Racism (proscribed prejudice) scale scores, and a positive relation between Intrinsic and ATH (nonproscribed prejudice) scale scores. For the Extrinsic scale, the reverse was true; Extrinsic was positively associated with proscribed prejudice (Racism) and negatively associated with nonproscribed prejudice (ATH). Finally, Quest scale scores were significantly and negatively related to ATH scores, but not significantly related to Racism (although the nonsignificant correlation was in the predicted negative direction).

Table 3 shows the religious orientation–prejudice predicted and observed directional relations for both studies. Generally, the pattern corresponds with that proposed by Batson et al. (1993), with the exceptions of, in Study 2, the observed neutral Quest–proscribed prejudice (Racism) and the negative Extrinsic–nonproscribed prejudice (ATH) relations.

Again, a partial correlation procedure was used to test the impact of proscription on the religious orientation–prejudice relations (see Table 4, columns 4–6, Study 2). First, we controlled for the effect of the proscription indexes. The negative Intrinsic–proscribed prejudice relation remained significant, as did the positive Intrinsic–nonproscribed prejudice association. The Quest–proscribed (Racism) and Quest–nonproscribed (ATH) correlations remained virtually unchanged after partialling out the effect of the respective proscription indexes—the lack of an association with proscribed prejudice and the significant negative relation with nonproscribed prejudice persisted. The comparable changes for the Extrinsic–prejudice correlations were also very small. However, both the positive correlation with proscribed prejudice and the negative correlation with nonproscribed prejudice were no longer significant.
Next we controlled for the effect of proscription by using our two new scales. Table 4 shows that the pattern of resulting partial correlations was virtually identical to that reported previously for the indexes, with one minor exception: The nonsignificant, negative relation between Quest and proscribed prejudice scores remained weak (−.11), but slipped into the realm of statistical significance.

**Right-wing authoritarianism and social desirability.** As predicted, RWA scores were positively correlated with both proscribed (Racism; $r = .33$) and nonproscribed (ATH) prejudice (.57). Authoritarian attitudes were also positively associated with Intrinsic scores (.39) and negatively associated with both Extrinsic (−.23) and Quest (−.27) scores (see Table 2, lower panel). All of these correlations were significant at $p < .001$.

SD scores were not significantly correlated with the measures of either proscribed prejudice (Racism) or nonproscribed prejudice (ATH). The intrinsic–SD association was significantly positive, as Batson et al. (1978) previously reported, but it was weak (.12, $p < .05$). Similarly, a significant, negative relation between Quest scores and SD was weak (−.12, $p < .05$). SD was unrelated to Extrinsic or RWA scores.

Partial correlation procedures were used to assess the Batson et al. (1993) hypothesis that SD plays an important role in the relation between intrinsicness and self-reported proscribed prejudice, as well as the alternative that RWA is important in this same relationship. These results are presented in Table 4. We found no change at all in the religious orientation–prejudice correlations for either proscribed (Racism) or nonproscribed (ATH) prejudice when SD was controlled. SD did not appear, at least for this sample, to have any impact on the respective relations. However, when we controlled for the effect of authoritarianism, there were sizeable shifts in the zero-order versus partial correlations. As was the case in Study 1, the negative relation between Intrinsic scale scores and proscribed prejudice (Racism) increased (from $r = −.20$ to $−.38$), and the positive association of Intrinsic with nonproscribed prejudice was eliminated (from $r = .21$ to $−.03$). Controlling for RWA also increased the significant, positive relation between Extrinsic scores and proscribed prejudice (Racism), from $r = .13$ to $−.23$, and eliminated the zero-order negative relation with nonproscribed prejudice (ATH; from $r = −.16$ to $−.04$). Finally, the nonsignificant association between Quest and Racism scores did not change (from $r = −.07$ to $−.02$), and the significant negative relationship between Quest and ATH scores was eliminated (from $r = −.15$ to $−.00$).6

---

6A reviewer suggested that our findings might somehow be contaminated by the inclusion of non-Christian affiliates in our sample. We recalculated all zero-order and partial correlations, including only current Protestants and Catholics ($N = 249$, in Study 1 and $N = 340$ in Study 2). The resulting table of correlations was very similar to Table 4, and the few correlations that changed slightly would not have affected our overall interpretation or conclusions.
Discussion

Study 2 replicated our previous findings that participants, on average, tend to perceive racial or ethnic prejudice as religiously proscribed and homophobic attitudes as nonproscribed. This was true for both the proscription indexes and the new proscription scales. The two proscription scales yielded acceptable Cronbach's alphas, and scores correlated positively with the respective proscription indexes that were also used in Study 1.

Of course, we do not know whether parishioners correctly interpreted and reported (or even knew) what their respective religious communities’ attitudes and teachings were concerning the specific prejudices tested. It is possible that some respondents—for example, to legitimize their own prejudiced attitudes—might have reported perceptions that are reflections of their own world views rather than those of their religious community. However, participants' self-reported perceptions of proscription/nonproscription served here as an important starting point for our research, and as such, provide an initial test of expected relationship with religious orientations.

Our findings here, again, support Batson et al.'s (1993) hypothesized relationship between religious orientation and prejudice, with two qualifications. First, it was predicted that there would be no relationship between extrinsic orientation and nonproscribed prejudice, whereas a weak but significant negative association appeared (as it did in Study 1). Second, the expected negative relationship between a quest orientation and proscribed prejudice reached significance only in Study 1. However, of 12 tests of the Batson et al. predicted relationship, 9 were correct, and the other 3 might be termed “near misses.”

Were intrinsically oriented individuals inclined to present themselves in a socially desirable way? SD scores were very weakly (but significantly) positively correlated with Intrinsic scores (.12), which is consistent with (but much weaker than) Batson et al.'s (1978) finding. Also, consistent with Batson et al.'s (1993) prediction, extrinsic orientation was not significantly related to social desirability in the present sample. Thus, although intrinsic and extrinsic “behaved as expected” with respect to SD, the size of the Intrinsic–SD association was very weak.

Further, SD and Quest were (very weakly, but significantly) negatively correlated, indicating that higher “questers,” on average, were less concerned about “self-presentation” in a socially desirable way, as measured by the Marlowe–Crowne instrument. It is possible that this tendency is linked to Watson, Morris, Fisher and Hood’s (1986) finding that high quest scores were associated with “private self-consciousness” (inner feelings) but not with “public self-consciousness” (awareness of oneself as a social object).

More important, we investigated the extent to which SD might help to “explain” the religion–prejudice links. However, statistically controlling for the effect of SD yielded virtually no change in any of our religious orientation–prejudice re-
These findings do not support Batson’s contention that intrinsicness is negatively related to racial intolerance because of a tendency for high intrinsic scorers to respond in socially desirable ways, which in our study means providing responses that conform to the dictates of their religious community.

These (SD) findings must be put in context, however. The psychometric properties of the SD scale were weak in the present study (e.g., average inter-item correlation was just $r = .09$), and the relevant literature has called into question the validity of the SD scale (see Batson et al., 1993; Watson et al., 1986). Thus, although we were convinced that this was the most appropriate social desirability measure available, it might be argued that a “better” measure (or possibly a specific measure of SD at the religious community level, or a covert behavioral measure) would lead to different findings. The resolution of this issue must be left to future research.

The results confirmed the positive link between RWA and both dependent measures of prejudice. In addition, RWA was positively associated with Intrinsic scores, and it correlated negatively with Extrinsic and Quest scores. These findings are consistent with the results reported in Study 1.

Partialling out the effect of RWA from the religion–prejudice relations also replicated the findings reported in Study 1. That is, there were substantial shifts in correlations when RWA was controlled. For Intrinsic, the negative relation with proscribed prejudice (Racism) increased, and the positive relation with nonproscribed prejudice (ATH) was eliminated. For Extrinsic, the positive association with racism increased and the negative correlation with homophobic attitudes diminished, whereas for Quest, weak negative associations with both proscribed and nonproscribed prejudice were completely eliminated.

These findings suggest that RWA scores might act as a moderating variable between religious orientation and prejudice, possibly being more important for the intrinsic orientation. The RWA–Intrinsic link would almost certainly surprise Allport and Ross (1967) because their conceptualization of intrinsic religiosity gives no hint of anything resembling authoritarianism. However, our data not only confirm the existence of such a link, but they also suggest that authoritarian tendencies might serve as an “explanation” of the association of intrinsic with nonproscribed prejudice, and it might also, to some extent, suggest why the negative association of intrinsic with proscribed prejudice is not stronger. We are not the first researchers to note this RWA–intrinsic association (see Altemeyer, 1996), although its importance in helping us to understand the intrinsic–prejudice associations is emphasized by the partial correlations reported here. At the least, these findings suggest that a reconceptualization of intrinsic that takes into account this authoritarian component and its implications is in order. Also, these results are consistent with the possibility that at least some religion–prejudice links stem from the authoritarian aggression (here, prejudice) that is an important component of right-wing authoritarian thinking (see Altemeyer, 1996).
Although the relevant correlations are not quite as strong for RWA with Extrinsic or Quest, one might consider similar implications. For example, could at least some of the negative association of Quest with prejudice be due to the tendency for high questers to also be relatively nonauthoritarian in their attitudes? At least in our data, removing the effects of authoritarianism from the quest–prejudice relations resulted in essentially zero correlations.  

CONCLUSIONS

The findings from these studies, in combination, lend themselves to five conclusions:

1. In our two samples of introductory psychology students who identified with religious groups, racism (including negative attitudes toward immigrants and racial and ethnic groups) was reportedly perceived to be religiously proscribed, and negative attitudes toward homosexuality were perceived to be religiously nonproscribed, on average.

2. The pattern of associations between religious orientation (intrinsic, extrinsic, and quest) and prejudice (proscribed and nonproscribed) is generally consistent with that predicted by Batson et al. (1993).

3. Self-reported religious proscription status of specific prejudices is a significant predictor of self-reported attitudes regarding those issues. However, this must be qualified by our fourth conclusion.

4. RWA is apparently a stronger predictor of specific prejudices than is proscription status. This is consistent with previous findings of powerful links between authoritarianism and prejudice (e.g., Altemeyer, 1996), and it suggests that proscription may not be important in the prediction of prejudice, as hypothesized by Batson et al. (1993). Further, in light of the results of partial correlation analyses, RWA seems to be potentially important in helping us to understand religion–prejudice relationship.

5. Social Desirability, as measured by the Marlowe–Crowne SD scale, was not useful in explaining the religious orientation–prejudice relationship. However, it would not be appropriate to abandon the potential of the social desirability explanation entirely because a more specific measure (e.g., one that operates at the level of the religious “community,” or a covert behavioral measure) might prove useful in future research on religion and prejudice.

An anonymous reviewer pointed out that our findings are necessarily measure dependent, to some extent. Although our various measures did have generally good psychometric properties, it is possible that the emergence of RWA as an important moderating variable might result, at least partially, from its relatively strong internal consistency, as well as the specific content of some items. However, in light of its strong performance here, and in light of the findings reported previously, we would argue that our findings and correlations cannot be explained by these “measure–dependent” factors alone.
Many questions remain unanswered by the findings of the present study: Why do high intrinsics tend to score high on the RWA scale? Is it possible that high authoritarians tend to be drawn to more orthodox and fundamentalist religions, and low authoritarians tend to leave these religions, or at least join more liberal religious organizations? Or do those who see their religion as an end in itself tend to become more authoritarian? What other factors might be involved? Would strong church stands against intolerance of homosexuality actually decrease overt prejudice in this regard among the faithful? Is it possible to decrease authoritarian thinking, which seems to be more common in those scoring high on measures such as the intrinsic scale, and would this then tend to increase tolerance among high intrinsics? Others (e.g., Altemeyer, 1996; Hunsberger, 1995) have speculated on these issues, but such questions remain to be resolved.

Similarly, does a quest orientation incline one to become less authoritarian, or do low authoritarians tend to become questers, or is it neither? These cause and effect issues are, of course, difficult to resolve, but they are important to our understanding of the links between religion and prejudice. In addition, we must wonder about the extent to which the present findings generalize from the Canadian university student sample involved, and the specific kinds of proscribed (racism) and nonproscribed (homophobia) prejudice measured here, to other specific proscribed and nonproscribed prejudices. These issues need to be addressed in future research.
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APPENDIX

Religious Proscription of Racism Scale

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/synagogue, some members would switch to a different church/synagogue.
3. Our minister/priest/rabbi would feel uncomfortable performing an interracial marriage.
4. If I were to take a Black friend with me to church/synagogue, some members of my church/synagogue would avoid us.
5. It would not be difficult for a Chinese person to be elected to a position of authority in my church/synagogue.
6. Even though I was taught in church/synagogue that all people are equal regardless of their color, many people in my church/synagogue don’t believe what they preach.
7. An activist concerned with Native Canadian Rights would be welcomed as a guest speaker in our church/synagogue.

Religious Proscription of Homophobia Scale

1. My religious group tries hard to make all people feel welcome regardless of their sexual orientation.
2. If a homosexual became a leader in my church/synagogue, some members would switch to a different church/synagogue.
3. Our minister/priest/rabbi would feel uncomfortable performing a same-sex marriage.
4. If I were to take a known homosexual friend with me to church/synagogue, some members of my church would avoid us.
5. It would not be difficult for a homosexual to be elected to a position of authority in my church/synagogue.
6. Even though I was taught in church/synagogue that all people are equal regardless of their sexual orientation, many people in my church/synagogue don’t believe what they preach.
7. An activist concerned with gay rights would be welcomed as a guest speaker in our church/synagogue.

*Con-trait item for which scoring is reversed.
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