



International Journal for the Psychology of Religion

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/hjpr20>

RESEARCH: "Orthodox, Humanitarian, and Science-Inspired Belief in Relation to Prejudice Against Jews, Muslims, and Ethnic Minorities: The Content of One's Belief Does Matter"

Frans W. P. van der Slik & Ruben P. Konig

Version of record first published: 16 Nov 2009

To cite this article: Frans W. P. van der Slik & Ruben P. Konig (2006): RESEARCH: "Orthodox, Humanitarian, and Science-Inspired Belief in Relation to Prejudice Against Jews, Muslims, and Ethnic Minorities: The Content of One's Belief Does Matter", International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 16:2, 113-126

To link to this article: http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327582ijpr1602_3

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae, and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand, or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

RESEARCH

Orthodox, Humanitarian, and Science-Inspired Belief in Relation to Prejudice Against Jews, Muslims, and Ethnic Minorities: The Content of One's Belief Does Matter

Frans W. P. van der Slik
Radboud University, Nijmegen

Ruben P. Konig
Radboud University, Nijmegen

In this study, we empirically explored the relation between (a) the content of people's orthodox, humanitarian, and science-inspired beliefs and (b) three measures of prejudice. Using survey data from a representative subsample of indigenous Dutch ($n = 582$), we found that orthodox, humanitarian, and science-inspired convictions that had different relations with prejudice could be discerned in The Netherlands. Most important, we found that humanitarian convictions could make people show compassion for their fellow human beings and could, thereby, work against the acceptance of prejudice. In contrast, orthodox convictions did not seem to work against the acceptance of prejudice against ethnic minorities, Muslims, and Jews. Science-inspired convictions were found to be unrelated to prejudice.

What if God was one of us
Just a slob like one of us
Just a stranger on the bus...?
—Eric Bazilian¹

Correspondence should be sent to Frans W. P. van der Slik, Radboud University, Department of Linguistics, P.O. Box 9103, 6500 HD Nijmegen, The Netherlands. E-mail: f.v.d.slik@let.ru.nl

¹ONE OF US. Words and Music by ERIC BAZILIAN © 1995, 1996 HUMAN BOY MUSIC. All Rights Administered by WB MUSIC CORP. All Rights Reserved. Used by Permission.

Almost half a century ago Allport (1954) wrote, "The role of religion is paradoxical. It makes prejudice and it unmakes prejudice" (p. 444). He meant that most religions teach a theory of neighborly love and a brotherhood of man, whereas the practice of these religions often leads to exclusion and violence, an observation that, unfortunately, has lost nothing of its actuality. Students of religion have frequently reported that religion and prejudice go hand in hand (Batson, Schoenrade, & Ventis, 1993; Gorsuch & Aleshire, 1974; Hunsberger, Owusu, & Duck, 1999), and a number of explanations for this intriguing paradox have been suggested (Hunsberger, 1995). However, all of these explanations seem to have one feature in common. They all are, in their own way, concerned with the way in which people believe and not so much with the actual content of people's belief (Laythe, Finkel, & Kirkpatrick, 2001). Essentially, however, Allport's paradox is only a paradox when the content of people's beliefs matters. Without "thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," the paradox would be nonexistent, and although in most of his work, Allport has concentrated on the way people are religious as related to prejudice, he clearly suggested that theological positions might be responsible for prejudice and intolerance as well (Allport & Ross, 1967, p. 433). In other words, the content of one's theology does matter when it comes to prejudice and, especially, its absence. In this study, we, therefore, concentrated on what is easily forgotten: an explanation of the relation between the content of people's beliefs and prejudice.

THEORY

It will hardly come as a surprise when we state that Christians do not all share the same convictions. They sometimes even differ on every jot and tittle. Therefore, it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to identify a comprehensive set of convictions that empirical researchers could use to measure the extent to which all Christians adhere to the content of their beliefs. Subsequently, it would be equally difficult to correlate such a measure to measures of prejudice. Therefore, we concentrated on three different sets of convictions or beliefs to which people could adhere: orthodox convictions, humanitarian convictions, and science-inspired convictions.

As to empirical research on the relation between religious content and prejudice, research has typically focused on the measurement of orthodox, creed-like convictions. This set of orthodox convictions has involved, among other convictions, the belief in a transcendent realm and a God who is involved with every individual personally. Measurement instruments for the subscription to this set of convictions were constructed by, for instance, Glock and Stark (1966), King and Hunt (1969), Batson and Ventis (1982), Fullerton and Hunsberger (1982), and Felling, Peters, and Schreuder (1991). Sample items from these scales include (a) "I believe in life after death" (Batson & Ventis, 1982), (b) "God hears all our prayers"

and “Through the life, death and resurrection of Jesus, God provided a way for the forgiveness of people’s sins” (Fullerton & Hunsberger, 1982), and (c) “There is a God who cares for every individual personally” and “There is a God who revealed himself through Jesus Christ” (Felling, Peters, & Schreuder, 1991).

These measurement instruments appear to have two important qualities in common. First, they express the relationship of oneself or of others to God, whereas no reference is made to the relationship of oneself to other people. Second, orthodox religious convictions have shown a positive correlation with indicators of prejudice in a vast majority of empirical studies (Batson et al., 1993; Gorsuch & Aleshire, 1974).

As to the first common feature, the absence of a reference to connectedness of oneself to other people indicates that these instruments tap a belief content that may be labeled *individualistic* (van der Slik, 1994). These statements appear to express a personal relationship of God with every single individual, a relationship that in the end, could lead to personal salvation. Scoring high on these instruments does not imply that one has to love one’s neighbor as oneself, as the concern for other people is not included in this set of individualistic orthodox convictions. That is not to say that people scoring high on these scales are not interested in other people. It merely means that whether or not people are interested in or show compassion for other people is not covered by the set of orthodox convictions in these measurement instruments. That means that people who, for one reason or another, come to hold prejudice against outgroups (e.g., Jews, Muslims, members of ethnic minority groups) may or may not combine this prejudice with these individualistic orthodox convictions. The content of the orthodox convictions in these measurement instruments neither prevents one from holding prejudice nor does it make one prejudiced. Hence, these propositions seem to imply that prejudice and orthodox convictions (as measured with these instruments) are unrelated.

However, the second common feature of these measurement instruments for orthodox convictions is their positive correlation with prejudice, as found in the vast majority of empirical studies. Yet, a positive correlation does not necessarily mean that adherence to orthodox beliefs causes prejudice. The relation may very well be spurious, caused by other characteristics of people who combine individualistic orthodox convictions with prejudice. Authoritarianism or dogmatism is a fine candidate in this respect. Authoritarianism makes people prone to prejudice, and it is mostly positively correlated to measures of orthodox beliefs (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950; Altemeyer, 1988; Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992; Eisinga, Felling, & Peters, 1990b, 1991; Eisinga, Konig, & Scheepers, 1995; Heinz & Geiser, 1971; Hoge & Carroll, 1975; Lutterman & Middleton, 1970; Middleton, 1973, 1976; Panahi, 1980; Rokeach, 1960). To check for this spuriousness, we also included authoritarianism in our research.

Next to these individualistic orthodox convictions, there is another set of beliefs that is central at least to Christian religion but perhaps to other major religions as

well: convictions concerning neighborly love and the belief that God may reveal himself in the relationship between human beings. Such humanitarian convictions put the relationships with other people to the fore. Therefore, the content of such a humanitarian theology should engender compassion for fellow human beings, and therefore, it could prevent people from holding prejudice. However, as far as we know, this has never been tested. Humanitarian convictions have yet to be correlated to prejudice.

Both theologians and social scientists have emphasized the importance of humanitarian convictions as supplementaries or even alternatives to individualistic orthodox convictions. Batson, Beker, and Clark (1973), for example, stressed that the teachings of Christ are not meant to offer comfort for the individual who is searching for personal salvation by means of a rigid adherence to the Scripture but should be taken as a challenge by those who try to meet their fellowmen in their own reality. Several theologians have stressed that such immanent interpretations of transcendence are present in Christian tradition as well (Borg, 1997; Neville, 1980; Schillebeeckx, 1980; Van Buren, 1963), occasionally by pointing to the walk to Emmaus (Luke 24: 13–35) as an example. Various students of the social sciences have tried to operationalize such other-directed beliefs, although none have provided a scale measuring humanitarian belief. Stark and Glock (1968) identified a new theology (ethicalism), which is “manifested less in what one believes about God than what one believes about goodness, justice, and compassion” (p. 217). Davidson (1975) focused on horizontal beliefs, indicated by items referring to helping one’s fellow man and the need to love one’s neighbor. Felling, Peters, and Schreuder (1986) designed a common humanity scale, which measures values such as tolerance, justice, mutual understanding, and helpfulness. Although these scales may be useful when measuring religiously inspired ethics, the main objection against these scales is that they do not refer explicitly to transcendent reality, which is an essential part of every religious worldview. In this study we used a humanitarian belief scale that did refer to transcendent reality and simultaneously focused on the relationships between people. In contrast to the results of most studies on the relation between religious belief and prejudice, we expected to find a negative relation between this humanitarian belief scale and various forms of prejudice.

However, there is yet another set of convictions to which believers may subscribe. More than ever before, contemporary man faces a competing worldview presented by science. Science promulgates a worldview that propagates evolution and the laws of nature as explanations for the existence of mankind. Some believers may completely reject such a science-inspired worldview, but many others try to accommodate their faith to the knowledge of science. We deemed it important not to ignore this facet of modern life in our study and, therefore, operationalized this science-inspired belief as well. Because, logically, no moral values can be derived from this science-inspired worldview, we did not expect this worldview to be

correlated to prejudice. Like orthodox convictions, science-inspired convictions should neither make one prone to prejudice nor should they prevent people from holding prejudice.

RESEARCH GOALS

In this study, we first tried to show that orthodox, humanitarian, and science-inspired convictions could be measured as distinct sets of convictions. In doing so, we did not confine ourselves to the operationalization of Christian convictions *per se*, and we believe that the statements might be meaningful to believers in other major religions as well. Second, we tested the robustness of these distinct sets of convictions by repeating these analyses for church members and nonmembers separately. Third, we related these belief scales with measures of prejudice. In other words, we tried to demonstrate that the content of orthodox and science-inspired convictions were inconsequential to prejudice, whereas the content of humanitarian convictions could prevent people from holding prejudice.

METHOD

Participants and Analyses

We used data from the national Dutch survey Social and Cultural Developments in The Netherlands. A stratified probability sample of the Dutch population between 18 and 70 years of age ($N = 2,019$; response rate = 51.5%)² was interviewed in face-to-face situations with a computer-assisted standardized questionnaire in the winter of 1995 to 1996. Additionally, the respondents were asked to fill out a self-administered questionnaire in the week following the interview and to return it by mail (return rate = 1,646 or 81.6%).³ This self-administered questionnaire contained the religious belief statements presented in this study. Questions pertaining to prejudice and related subjects were administered only to a random subsample of indigenous Dutch ($n = 703$). Consequently, our study pertained only to the population of indigenous Dutch. For more details on the sample, questionnaires, and other aspects of the survey, refer to Eisinga, Konig, Peters, and Scheepers (1999).

²As Mangione (1995) pointed out, additional work has to be done when the response rate is between 50 and 60% because a low response rate may seriously affect the representativeness of the sample. Fortunately, comparison with census data (CBS, 1996) revealed that our sample was representative of the Dutch population as to region and degree of urbanization of the place of residence, sex, and marital status.

³Additional analysis, not presented here, showed that compared to the entire sample, no systematic nonresponse occurred as to sex, marital status, and age.

To reach our research goals, we commenced as follows. First, we excluded respondents who had 25% or more missings on the religious belief statements. As a result, 1,528 (92.8%) respondents remained for the analysis. We then imputed the missing data on the belief statements of these 1,528 respondents by means of the expectancy maximization algorithm (EM; Rubin, 1987), included in Schafer's (1999) data imputation program NORM. To meet our first research objective, we performed principal axis factoring (oblique rotation) with the conventional extraction criteria: (a) an eigenvalue greater than one and (b) a scree test for this entire sample and for the subsamples of church members and non-members. Next, with regard to the subsample of indigenous Dutch, we excluded respondents who had more than 25% missings on the prejudice and authoritarianism statements. As a result, 582 (= 82.7%) respondents remained for the final analyses. Again, we imputed their missing data by means of NORM. To reach our third research goal, we performed hierarchical multiple-regression analyses using information from these 582 respondents.

Measurement Instruments

Orthodox, humanitarian, and science-inspired beliefs. Fifteen 5-point-items in the self-administered questionnaire, ranging from 1 (*not convinced at all*) to 5 (*entirely convinced*), measured orthodox, humanitarian, and science-inspired beliefs (see Table 1). We adopted the majority of these statements from previous research by van der Slik (1994). Six items constituted the Orthodox Theology scale. This scale was developed to measure the degree to which people believe that God is concerned with every individual personally and that there is a transcendent reality. The items originated from Fullerton and Hunsberger (1982), Felling et al. (1991), and from the Dutch version of Hunt's (1972) Literal, Anti-literal, and Mythological (LAM) scales (Van der Lans, 1991).

In addition, six items represented humanitarian convictions. This Humanitarian Theology scale was designed to measure the degree to which people believe that God reveals Himself in the actual contact between people; thus, this expresses a simultaneous orientation to both God and the relationship with one's fellow human beings on the basis of mutual trust. The majority of these items was newly developed. One item (Item 12 in Table 1) originated from the Dutch version of Hunt's LAM scales. The items referred to what might be called *transcendent-immanent* and *immanent* images of God (cf. Borg, 1997; Schillebeeckx, 1980; Van Buren, 1963). Because of the rather close connection between transcendent reality and the relationship between people that is expressed in the belief that God may reveal himself in the relationship between human beings, transcendence and immanence were strongly intertwined in our operationalization of a humanitarian theology.

Finally, two of the three items that expressed science-inspired beliefs originated from Felling et al. (1991), whereas the third one was newly developed.

TABLE 1
Factor Analysis of Orthodox, Humanitarian,
and Science-Inspired Convictions

	1	2	3	h^2
<i>Orthodox convictions</i>				
To me God is like a person who sees and hears me in all I am doing.	<u>.97</u>	-.01	.06	.86
God hears all our prayers.	<u>.96</u>	-.02	.02	.88
God made man out of dust in His own image and breathed life into him.	<u>.86</u>	-.00	-.03	.77
God judges our actions.	<u>.83</u>	-.01	-.06	.76
There is a God who concerns Himself with every individual personally.	<u>.76</u>	.04	-.07	.67
In heaven we meet again our beloved ones.	<u>.55</u>	.21	-.08	.52
<i>Humanitarian convictions</i>				
To me God is what is worthwhile in people	-.04	<u>.87</u>	-.00	.72
To me God is a symbol of what is good in humankind.	.07	<u>.84</u>	-.01	.76
God is where people trust each other.	.14	<u>.82</u>	-.05	.82
I encounter God in the real meeting with my fellowmen.	.11	<u>.74</u>	-.06	.65
To me believing means to have faith in people.	-.11	<u>.59</u>	.04	.30
Heaven is where people realize part of God's kingdom.	.36	<u>.52</u>	-.00	.58
<i>Science-inspired convictions</i>				
Life is merely an evolutionary process.	.06	-.03	<u>.83</u>	.64
Ultimately our lives are determined by the laws of nature.	.03	.01	<u>.76</u>	.55
It is pure coincidence that human life developed on earth.	-.25	.05	<u>.45</u>	.37

Notes. $n = 1,528$; KMO = .93; Explained variance = 65.7%; oblique rotation was used. Maximum loading for each variable is underlined

Prejudice against Jews, Muslims, and ethnic minorities. Prejudice against Jews was measured with five 5-point items, (scale ranged from 1 [*don't agree at all*] to 5 [*agree entirely*]) derived from Eisinga et al. (1995) and König, Eisinga and Scheepers (2000) and had a Cronbach's alpha of .91. A sample item was "Jews have too much power in the financial world." Prejudice against Muslims was measured with four new 5-point items (identical scale). A typical item was "Muslims misuse their religion for political aims." Cronbach's alpha was .81 for this scale. Prejudice against ethnic minorities was measured with four 5-point items (identical scale) derived from Scheepers, Felling, and Peters (1989) and Eisinga, Felling, and Peters (1990a, 1990b). A sample item was "Gypsies are never to be trusted". Cronbach's alpha of this scale was .75. We used these scales as measures of distinct forms of prejudice because principal axis factor analyses with conventional extraction criteria (eigenvalue-larger-than-one and a scree-test) revealed that the items of the three prejudice scales represented three correlated but nevertheless distinct concepts (correlations = .50-.60).

Authoritarianism. Authoritarianism was measured by a short version of the California *F* Scale (Adorno et al., 1950). A typical item was "There are two sorts of people: the strong and the weak." This Likert scale consisted of four 5-point items, ranging from 1 (*don't agree at all*) to 5 (*agree entirely*), and had a Cronbach's alpha of .72.

Sociodemographic variables. Additional information about sex, age, highest education completed, and occupational status (Ganzeboom, De Graaf, & Treiman, 1992) was also collected.

RESULTS

Factor Analyses

A principal axis factor analysis (see Table 1) showed that orthodox, humanitarian, and science-inspired beliefs could indeed be discerned. Both the scree-test and the eigenvalue-larger-than-one criteria pointed in the direction of three factors. Score sums were computed for all three factors. Internal consistency for the resulting Likert scales was meritorious for science-inspired convictions (Cronbach's $\alpha = .75$) and excellent for orthodox and humanitarian convictions (Cronbach's α s = .94 and .90, respectively; see Table 2). The means of these scales were just below the midpoint of the range, which corresponded to answering patterns dominated by the categories *unconvinced* and *in uncertainty*. This was in line with a vast body of literature on the fairly secularized Dutch society (Lechner, 1996).

These sets of convictions, or beliefs, were not at all independent from each other. The Orthodox Theology scale and the Humanitarian Theology scale were highly correlated ($r = .55$). Because neighborly love is as central a tenet of Christianity, as is the belief in a personal relationship with God, this was hardly surprising. People's beliefs, whether strong or weak, usually involved both orthodox and humanitarian convictions. In contrast, the science-inspired convictions scale was negatively correlated to both the Humanitarian Theology scale and, particularly, the Orthodox Theology scale (r s = $-.18$ and $-.53$, respectively; see also Konig & van der Slik, 2004).

We repeated these analyses for subsamples of members of Christian churches and nonmembers. Factor analyses (not shown here) revealed similar solutions. For both church members and nonmembers, separate scales for the orthodox, humanitarian, and science-inspired convictions could be discerned. The psychometric qualities of the scales for these two subsamples were satisfactory (Cronbach's α s = .63–.92). Church members scored much higher than the nonmembers on both the Orthodox Theology scale ($t = 30.08$, $p < .001$) and Humanitarian Theology scale (t

TABLE 2
 Hierarchical OLS Regressions of Prejudice Against Jews, Muslims,
 and Ethnic Minorities on Orthodox, Humanitarian, and Science-Inspired
 Convictions; Authoritarianism; and Sociodemographic Factors:
 Standardized Beta Coefficients and R^2 Statistics

	<i>Prejudice Against</i>		
	<i>Jews</i>	<i>Muslims</i>	<i>Ethnic Minorities</i>
Model 1			
Orthodox convictions	.25***	.27***	.34***
Humanitarian convictions	-.08	-.15***	-.12**
Science-inspired convictions	.13**	.16***	.16**
R^2	.03	.04	.06
Model 2			
Orthodox convictions	.03	.07	.11*
Humanitarian convictions	-.04	-.11**	-.08*
Science-inspired convictions	-.01	.03	.00
Authoritarianism	.51***	.46***	.56***
R^2	.27	.23	.34
Model 3			
Orthodox convictions	.02	.05	.10*
Humanitarian convictions	-.04	-.09*	-.09*
Science-inspired convictions	-.00	.02	.01
Authoritarianism	.43***	.41***	.47***
Sex	-.06	.02	.01
Age	-.14***	.01	-.17***
Education	.07	.10*	.04
Occupational status	.03	.06	.03
R^2	.30	.25	.36

Note. $n = 582$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$, one-tailed.

= 16.43, $p < .001$), whereas the reverse was found for the Science-Inspired Belief scale ($t = -16.01$, $p < .001$). The mean scores of the church members on the Orthodox Theology scale ($M = 24.1$, $SD = 5.6$) and the Humanitarian Theology scale ($M = 21.4$, $SD = 5.0$) indicated that they tended to adhere to these convictions, whereas the scores of the nonmembers indicated that they were inclined not to adhere to these convictions ($M = 15.7$, $SD = 5.3$, and $M = 16.8$, $SD = 5.7$, respectively). For the science-inspired convictions, the opposite was found. Mean scores for church members and nonmembers were 8.5 ($SD = 2.9$) and 10.8 ($SD = 2.6$), respectively. Clearly, the three belief scales were quite robust and discriminated rather well between members and nonmembers.

Hierarchical Regression Analyses

We performed hierarchical Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression analyses to assess whether the three belief scales uniquely contribute to the prediction of

prejudice against Jews, Muslims, and ethnic minorities, that is, when we controlled for authoritarianism and sociodemographic factors (sex, age, education, and occupational status). In Table 2, we report the standardized regression coefficients (β s) and the amount of explained variance (R^2) when the belief scales were simultaneously added in Model 1, the authoritarianism scale were added in the second model, and when the sociodemographic factors were added in Model 3.

The results presented in Table 2 (Model 1) reveal, as expected, that the associations of orthodox beliefs with prejudice against Jews, Muslims, and ethnic minorities were all significantly positive. This was in line with a large body of previous research. Seemingly, Allport's (1954) paradox has lost nothing of its actuality. Controlled for authoritarianism (see Model 2), however, the effects of orthodox beliefs on prejudice were reduced substantially. In fact, when we additionally took the effect of sociodemographic factors into account, only the effect of orthodox beliefs on prejudice against ethnic minorities remained significant ($\beta = .10$, $p = .02$). The content of orthodox theology did not seem to invoke prejudice against Jews or Muslims, although it did not seem to prevent people from holding such prejudice either. Our hypothesis that orthodox beliefs were not related to prejudice against ethnic minorities was refuted; we were left with a significant, although weak, effect.

Not only did we expect orthodox beliefs to be independent of prejudice; we also expected science-inspired beliefs to be independent of prejudice. The outcomes presented in Model 1, however, showed that we might have been wrong (β s = .13–.16, p s < .01). However, bringing in authoritarianism as a control variable (Model 2) resulted in a diminution of these effects to insignificance, a picture that was not altered when we controlled for sociodemographic factors (Model 3). Thus, science-inspired beliefs did not seem to invoke prejudice against Jews, Muslims, and ethnic minorities, nor did it seem to prevent people from holding prejudice.

With respect to humanitarian beliefs, we expected that they would instigate neighborly love and compassion for one's fellow human beings. We, therefore, expected to find a negative effect of humanitarian convictions on measures of prejudice. Table 2, Model 1, shows the expected negative relation, although the negative effect of humanitarian convictions on prejudice against Jews was not significant. Adding authoritarianism (Model 2) and sociodemographic factors (Model 3) as additional controls reduced the effects of a humanitarian theology on prejudice against Muslims and ethnic minorities but they remained significant ($\beta = -.09$, $p = .02$, and $\beta = -.09$, $p = .02$, respectively). Therefore, we concluded that humanitarian beliefs could somewhat prevent people from endorsing prejudiced views about ethnic minorities and Muslims. Humanitarian beliefs, however, did not seem to work against prejudice against Jews, although they did not seem to invoke such prejudice either.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In this study, we explored the relation between the content of people's beliefs and measures of prejudice against Jews, Muslims, and ethnic minorities. With the use of data from a national Dutch survey, we showed that both orthodox and humanitarian convictions and science-inspired convictions could be discerned in The Netherlands and that these convictions had different relations with prejudice among indigenous Dutch. Most important, we showed that humanitarian convictions were negatively associated with prejudice against Muslims and ethnic minorities when we controlled for authoritarianism and sociodemographic factors. Thus, the content of humanitarian beliefs could indeed have made people show compassion for their fellow human beings and, thereby, could have worked against the acceptance of prejudice. These convictions involved neighborly love and relationships with other people. Further, we showed that the relation between orthodox convictions and prejudice could be spurious, caused largely, but not entirely, by authoritarianism. Finally, we found that science-inspired convictions were unrelated to prejudice.

This study had several limitations. First, we confined ourselves to self-reported measures of prejudice. As a consequence, it remains an open question as to whether one's humanitarian convictions can really put the lid on prejudice. Instead of a paper-and-pencil method, observational designs are needed to come to more conclusive answers to this question (see Darley & Batson, 1973). Second, we confined ourselves to a sample of indigenous Dutch. Although The Netherlands is one of the most secularized nations in the Western world (Lechner, 1996), "it is nevertheless historically a Christianized society, and therefore, the people who happened to fill out these nonsectarian belief items come from that kind of history, whatever they may or not may believe at the present time" (R. F. Paloutzian, personal communication, September 17, 2003). The items of the Orthodox Theology scale and the Humanitarian Theology scale do not seem unique to Christianity, however, and they might be meaningful to believers of other major religions. It would, therefore, be advisable to replicate this study in other nations, among Christian and non-Christian, to test whether the negative relation between prejudice and humanitarian beliefs could be found there as well. Finally, we used a shortened version of the *F* scale to measure authoritarianism. According to Ray (1988, 1990), Adorno's *F* scale may measure an old-fashioned outlook rather than authoritarianism. Although such an interpretation is not incompatible with the outcomes of this study, one has to bear in mind that our hypotheses are based on theories about authoritarianism or dogmatism. We, therefore, recommend the use of a less ambiguous measure for authoritarianism in future research.

Despite these limitations, this study produced the novel finding that humanitarian convictions could prevent people from holding prejudice. This implies that

Allport's paradox should no longer be conceived of as a paradox. The relevance of these findings is, however, not restricted to the study of the relation between religion and prejudice. The outcomes also relate that the study of the content of belief in relation to other spheres of life should not be restricted to orthodox convictions. To only measure orthodox belief would render an incomplete and, therefore, distorted image of people's beliefs. Putting humanitarian convictions on the research agenda might do justice to the beliefs of large groups not studied adequately in the past.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors express their gratitude to Hans Van der Ven, Ray Paloutzian, and the anonymous reviewers for the *IJPR* for their helpful comments on an earlier version of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswick, E., Levinson, D. L., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Allport, G. W., & Ross, J. M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5, 432–443.
- Altemeyer, B. (1988). *Enemies of freedom: Understanding right-wing authoritarianism*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Altemeyer, B., & Hunsberger, B. E. (1992). Authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, quest, and prejudice. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 2, 113–133.
- Batson, C. D., Beker, J. C., & Clark, W. M. (1973). *Commitment without ideology: The experience of Christian growth*. London: SCM.
- Batson, C. D., Schoenrade, P., & Ventis, W. L. (1993). *Religion and the individual: A social-psychological perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Batson, C. D., & Ventis, W. L. (1982). *The religious experience: A social-psychological perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Borg, M. J. (1997). *The God we never knew: Beyond dogmatic religion to a more authentic contemporary faith*. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco.
- CBS. (1996). Bevolking van Nederland naar burgerlijke staat, geslacht en leeftijd, 1 januari 1995 [Population of The Netherlands as to marital state, sex, and age, January 1, 1995]. *Maandstatistiek van de Bevolking*, 44, 17–20.
- Darley, J. M., & Batson, C. D. (1973). "From Jerusalem to Jericho": A study of situational and dispositional variables in helping behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 10, 211–23.
- Davidson, J. D. (1975). Glock's model of religious commitment: Assessing some different approaches and results. *Review of Religious Research*, 16, 83–93.

- Eisinga, R., Felling, A., Konig, R., Peters, J., & Scheepers, P. (1999). *Religion in Dutch Society 95: Documentation of a national survey on religious and secular attitudes in 1995*. Amsterdam: NIWI-Steinmetz Archive.
- Eisinga, R., Felling, A., & Peters, J. (1990a). Church involvement, prejudice and nationalism: A research note on the curvilinear relationship between church involvement and ethnocentrism in The Netherlands. *Review of Religious Research*, 31, 417–433.
- Eisinga, R., Felling, A., & Peters, J. (1990b). Religious belief, church involvement, and ethnocentrism in The Netherlands. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 29, 54–75.
- Eisinga, R., Felling, A., & Peters, J. (1991). Christian beliefs and ethnocentrism in Dutch society: A test of three models. *Review of Religious Research*, 32, 305–319.
- Eisinga, R., Konig, R., & Scheepers, P. (1995). Orthodox Christian beliefs and anti-Semitism: A replication of Glock and Stark in The Netherlands. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 34, 214–223.
- Felling, A., Peters, J., & Schreuder, O. (1986). *Religion in Dutch Society: Documentation of a national survey on religious and secular attitudes in 1979*. Amsterdam: Steinmetz Archive.
- Felling, A., Peters, J., & Schreuder, O. (1991). *Dutch religion: The religious consciousness of The Netherlands after the cultural revolution*. Nijmegen, The Netherlands: Instituut voor Toegepaste Sociale Wetenschappen.
- Fullerton, J. T., & Hunsberger, B. (1982). A unidimensional measure of Christian orthodoxy. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 21, 317–326.
- Ganzeboom, H. B. G., De Graaf, P. M., & Treiman, D. J. (1992). A standard international socio-economic index of occupational status. *Social Science Research*, 21, 1–56.
- Glock, C. Y., & Stark, R. (1966). *Christian beliefs and anti-Semitism*. New York: Harper & Row.
- 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.
- Heinz, W. R., & Geiser, S. R. (1971). Eine kognitive Theorie des Antisemitismus im Kontext der religiösen Ideologie [A cognitive theory of anti-Semitism in the context of religious ideology]. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 32, 519–543.
- Hoge, D. R., & Carroll, J. W. (1975). Christian beliefs, nonreligious factors, and anti-Semitism. *Social Forces*, 53, 581–594.
- Hunsberger, B. (1995). Religion and prejudice: The role of religious fundamentalism, quest, and right-wing authoritarianism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 51, 113–129.
- 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. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 9, 181–194.
- Hunt, R. A. (1972). Mythological–symbolic religious commitment: The LAM scales. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 11, 42–52.
- King, M. B., & Hunt, R. A. (1969). Measuring the religious variable: Amended findings. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 8, 321–323.
- Konig, R., Eisinga, R., & Scheepers, P. (2000). Explaining the relationship between Christian religion and anti-Semitism in The Netherlands. *Review of Religious Research*, 41, 373–393.
- Konig, R. P., & van der Slik, F. W. P. (2004). Belief content in a secular society: A research note on The Netherlands. *The Netherlands' Journal of Social Sciences*, 24, 143–156.
- 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.
- Lechner, F. J. (1996). Secularization in The Netherlands? *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 35, 252–264.

- Luttermann, K. G., & Middleton, R. (1970). Authoritarianism, anomia, and prejudice. *Social Forces*, 48, 485–492.
- Mangione, T. W. (1995). *Mail surveys: Improving the quality*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Middleton, R. (1973). Do Christian beliefs cause anti-Semitism? *American Sociological Review*, 38, 33–52.
- Middleton, R. (1976). Regional differences in prejudice. *American Sociological Review*, 41, 94–117.
- Neville, R. C. (1980). *Creativity and God: A challenge to process theology*. New York: Seabury.
- Panahi, B. (1980). *Vorurteile: Rassismus, Antisemitismus, Nationalismus ... in der Bundesrepublik Heute: Eine Empirische Untersuchung* [Prejudice: Racism, anti-Semitism, nationalism ... in the Federal Republic of Germany nowadays: An empirical research]. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Fischer.
- Ray, J. J. (1988). Why the *F* scale predicts racism: A critical review. *Political Psychology*, 9, 671–679.
- Ray, J. J. (1990). The old-fashioned personality. *Human Relations*, 43, 997–1015.
- Rokeach, M. (1960). *The open and closed mind: Investigations into the nature of belief systems and personality systems*. New York: Basic Books.
- Rubin, D. B. (1987). *Multiple imputation for non-response in surveys*. New York: Wiley.
- Schafer, J. L. (1999). NORM: Multiple imputation of incomplete multivariate data under a normal model [Computer software for Windows]. University Park: Pennsylvania State University, Department of Statistics.
- Scheepers, P., Felling, A., & Peters, J. (1989). Ethnocentrism in The Netherlands: A typological analysis. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 12, 289–308.
- Schillebeeckx, E. C. F. A. (1980). *Christ: The Christian experience in the modern world*. London: SCM.
- Stark, R., & Glock, C. H. (1968). *American piety: The nature of religious commitment*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Van Buren, P. M. (1963). *The secular meaning of the Gospel, based on an analysis of its language*. London: SCM.
- Van der Lans, J. M. (1991). Interpretation of religious language and cognitive style: A pilot study with the LAM scale. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 1, 107–123.
- van der Slik, F. W. P. (1994). Measuring Christian beliefs: A review of two research lines and the introduction of a new scale. *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 7, 5–34.