They Killed Our Lord: The Perception of Jews as Desecrators of Christianity as a Predictor of Anti-Semitism

KENNETH I. PARGAMENT
KELLY TREVINO
ANNETTE MAHONEY
ISRAELA SILBERMAN

Drawing on religious coping theory, we examined whether the appraisal that Jews desecrate Christian values (the stressor) is linked to anti-Semitic attitudes (the response). Further, we considered whether religious ways of understanding and dealing with this stressor (religious coping) mitigate or exacerbate the ties between religious appraisals of Jews and anti-Semitic responses. College students completed measures of desecration, anti-Semitism, and religious ways of coping with appraisals of Jews as desecrators of Christianity. Greater desecration was associated with greater anti-Semitism, after controlling for demographic variables and dispositional measures (e.g., particularism, pluralism, church attendance, Christian orthodoxy, fundamentalism, and authoritarianism). Religious coping in ways that emphasized expressions of Christian love were associated with lower anti-Semitism; ways of coping that emphasized being punished by God and Jews as demonic were tied to greater anti-Semitism. Perceptions of Jews as desecrators were predicted by higher levels of authoritarianism and religious orthodoxy, less closeness to Jews, greater exposure to messages of desecration, and less exposure to messages that counter the perception of desecration.

On Ash Wednesday of 2004, *The Passion of the Christ*, Mel Gibson's movie depicting his vision of the last 12 hours of the life of Jesus Christ, opened to a record-breaking audience. At the time of its release, many people, including Christian and Jewish religious leaders, found the movie disturbing (Goodstein 2004). Particularly troubling to some was the depiction of the role of Jews in the crucifixion of Christ and the possibility that this portrayal might promote anti-Semitism

The public debates triggered by *The Passion of the Christ* are popular cultural variants of questions social scientists have long raised about the links between religiousness and prejudice. However, theory and research on religion and prejudice do not speak directly to the issues that were provoked by this movie, namely, the links between perceptions of Jews as desecrators of Christianity and anti-Semitism. It could be argued that the point is moot because few people in today's world perceive Jews to be culpable for the death of Christ or, more generally, a threat to Christianity. Surveys, however, suggest otherwise. According to a survey by the Anti-Defamation League, over 20 percent of people from 12 European countries agreed that Jews are responsible for the death of Christ (Anti-Defamation League 2005a). In the United States, over 30 percent of people agreed with the same item, an increase of 5 percent since 2002 (Anti-Defamation League 2005b).

Are perceptions of Jews as desecrators of Christianity, in fact, associated with anti-Semitism? This study puts this question to test. Drawing on religious coping theory, we examine whether the appraisal that Jews desecrate Christian values (the stressor) is linked to anti-Semitic attitudes (the response). Further, we consider whether religious ways of understanding and dealing with

Kenneth I. Pargament is Professor of Psychology at the Department of Psychology, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio 43403. E-mail: kpargam@bgnet.bgsu.edu
Kelly Trevino is a graduate student in clinical psychology at Bowling Green State University.
Annette Mahoney is Professor of Psychology at Bowling Green State University.
Israela Silberman is Associate Research Scientist in Psychology at Columbia University.

Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion (2007) 46(2):143–158

this stressor (religious coping) mitigate or exacerbate the ties between these appraisals of Jews and anti-Semitic responses.

Prior Theory and Research

For a number of years, researchers have been puzzled by the peculiar link between religiousness and prejudice. How is it that many people who identify with religious institutions that espouse love, compassion, and forgiveness view disenfranchised, marginal, or minority groups with dislike, hostility, and contempt? In their efforts to answer this question, researchers have stressed the importance of distinguishing those forms of religiousness that promote prejudice from those that ameliorate it. They have found that greater religious fundamentalism (e.g., McFarland 1989), more frequent church attendance (e.g., Scheepers, Gijsberts, and Hello 2002), a more extrinsic religious orientation (Donahue 1985), and greater religious particularism in which people believe theirs is the only true religion (Scheepers et al. 2002) have all been associated with higher levels of self-reported prejudice, though the results have not been consistent. Conversely, a higher quest religious orientation in which religion is viewed as an ongoing search for meaning has been tied to lower levels of prejudice (Batson, Schoenrade, and Ventis 1993).

Researchers have also considered whether certain personality variables may mediate the relationships between religiousness and prejudice. In support of this possibility, several investigators have found that the relationship between fundamentalism and prejudice toward various groups diminishes after controlling for the effects of right-wing authoritarianism (Hunsberger 1995; Laythe, Finkel, and Kirkpatrick 2001; Rowatt and Franklin 2004; Wylie and Forest 1992).

Although this body of research has begun to fill in some of the pieces of the religion-prejudice puzzle, it is only a beginning. The correlations between the various indices of religiousness and prejudice are low-order, suggesting that there are, as yet, unidentified pieces of the puzzle. What might these pieces be?

The large majority of research on religion and prejudice has examined character traits or dispositions. Researchers have focused on people's stable religious and personality characteristics in the attempt to explain the connection between religion and prejudice. Though there have been important exceptions to the rule (e.g., Batson and Burris 1994; Jackson and Hunsberger 1999; Hunsberger and Jackson 2005), the literature in the psychology of religion has not generally considered the part that situations and intergroup dynamics might play in the development of prejudice.

This study examines prejudice from the perspective of religious coping theory. Coping theory assumes that significant human phenomena are the product of ongoing processes of interaction between individuals and life situations in a larger social context (Lazarus and Folkman 1984; Pargament 1997). This theory directs the researcher's attention from general attitudes, beliefs, and dispositions to specific person-social-situational transactions. To understand prejudice from the perspective of this theory, researchers must focus their attention on the expression of particular forms of prejudice by particular groups of people in particular contexts. In this study, we focus on anti-Semitic attitudes held toward Jews by Christians in the United States. Given the furor and debates that have recently arisen around the film, *The Passion of the Christ* (Gibson 2004), the topic is especially timely. However, it is important to add that religious coping theory could be applied to prejudice toward any particular religious group by the members of any other religious group.

Religious Coping Theory and Anti-Semitism

In contrast to theories that rest on reactive views of human nature, coping theory assumes that people are proactive, goal-directed beings who strive for significance in their lives (Lazarus

and Folkman 1984; Pargament 1997). In this process of striving, people encounter life events, major and minor, that are appraised with respect to their implications for whatever people hold to be of greatest value. In turn, when these ultimate values are challenged, threatened, or lost, people engage in coping strategies to conserve or, when necessary, transform significance, be it physical (e.g., health), financial (e.g., money), social (e.g., friends, family), and/or psychological (e.g., self-esteem).

Religious coping theory adds an important dimension to general coping theory by positing that the sacred is also an object of significance and a part of the search for significance (Pargament 1997). Many people seek to develop, foster, sustain, and transform a relationship that they hold to be sacred. The sacred refers to notions of God and higher powers, but goes beyond these concepts to encompass other significant aspects of life that take on spiritual character and significance by virtue of their association with the divine, a process that has been labeled "sanctification" (Pargament and Mahoney 2005). Through sanctification, people can invest sacred status into virtually any dimension of life, including people (e.g., religious leaders), psychological qualities (e.g., identity, virtues, meaning), social qualities (e.g., intimacy, love), time (e.g., Sabbath), and place (e.g., nature, churches). People evaluate the events in their lives for their significance not only to secular values but to sacred values as well. When people perceive that the sacred is violated or threatened, they also engage in efforts to preserve and protect these precious values (Pargament and Mahoney 2005). For example, Mahoney et al. (2002) conducted a study of college students in New York City and Ohio following the September 11 terrorist attacks. The students completed a measure of desecration, the degree to which they perceived the terrorist attacks to be a violation of their sacred values. Perceptions of the attacks as a desecration were tied to greater endorsement of extreme responses to the attacks, including the use of nuclear and biological weapons. Similarly, in another study of a larger community sample, Pargament et al. (2005) found that people who perceived their negative life events as desecrations reported greater anger as well as more intrusive thoughts and less posttraumatic growth. Silberman (2005) provides a number of illustrations of how religious groups respond to perceptions that they are threatened or are under attack with defensive acts of aggression that would be otherwise morally reprehensible.

As outlined above, religious coping theory provides a framework for understanding religious prejudice in general and anti-Semitism in particular. Historically, Jews have often been perceived as threats to the sacred values of non-Jews. As Prager and Telushkin (1983:17) stated: "Literally hundreds of millions of people have believed that Jews drink the blood of non-Jews, that they cause plagues and poison wells, that they murdered G-d himself." Over the centuries, these beliefs have been promulgated among Christians. In a provocative historical analysis, Carroll (2001) traces the evolution of the belief that Jews violate or threaten the sacred values of Christians over the past two millennium, beginning with first-century Gospel accounts of Jews as responsible for the crucifixion, to the 12th-century blood libel that Jews kill and consume the blood of Christian children, to Martin Luther's 16th-century description of Jews as the born enemy of Christians, to modern accusations of moral decadence among Jews. According to Carroll, present-day anti-Semitic beliefs and actions are fundamentally rooted in historical and ongoing perceptions that Jews represent a threat to Christianity. This argument is consistent with religious coping theory. From this perspective, anti-Semitism on the part of some Christian believers can be viewed psychologically as a protective response to a particular stressor; namely, the perceptions that Jews violated Christian values in the past and continue to represent a threat to Christianity today. According to this line of thinking, negative attitudes toward Jews as a group serve several defensive roles: they alert Christians to the possibility of future violations by Jews; they keep the potentially dangerous out-group at a distance; and they balance the scales of justice against Jews as the perceived transgressors.

Empirical Evidence of Ties Between Perceptions of Jews as Threats to Christians and Anti-Semitism

Unfortunately, there is little direct empirical evidence that speaks to the prevalence of perceptions that Jews represent a threat to Christian values and their implications for anti-Semitism. There is, however, some indirect evidence from studies of prejudice toward other groups. Several studies from social psychology and the psychology of religion suggest that prejudice may be a response to threatened values and intergroup conflicts. In a series of studies, Greenberg et al. (1990) found that when people were threatened by thoughts of their own deaths, they were more likely to hold unfavorable views of people who challenge their worldviews. The researchers suggested that these unfavorable views of others reflect an effort by people to protect and defend their own worldview and values. Similarly, Jackson and Esses (1997) found that individuals higher in religious fundamentalism were more likely to view value-threatening others (homosexuals, single mothers) as being more responsible for their own problems than non-value-threatening groups. Commenting on this study, Hunsberger and Jackson (2005:22) wrote: "Once marked as a threat to religiously-based moral positions, [out-]groups may suffer extreme hostility and inhumane treatment—treatment that would be considered immoral within most other systems of meaning."

Jackson and Hunsberger (1999) hypothesized that more religious people would express greater favoritism toward in-groups (Christians, fellow believers) and more derogation toward out-groups (atheists, nonbelievers) than less religious people. Their hypothesis was supported for several indices of religiousness: higher levels of fundamentalism, Christian orthodoxy, intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientation, and belief in God were tied to more favoritism to in-groups and derogation of out-groups. They suggest that "prejudice against out-groups has its *origin in intergroup relations*, not in personality structure" (Jackson and Hunsberger 1999:519). Noting empirical findings linking religiousness consistently to prejudice toward some groups (e.g., gays) and not others (e.g., blacks), Batson and Burris (1994) argue that the relationship between religion and prejudice is moderated by whether prejudice toward particular target groups is proscribed or encouraged by religious institutions.

Perhaps of greatest relevance to the present investigation is Glock and Stark's (1966) national survey, which focused on the relationships between Christian beliefs and anti-Semitism. Glock and Stark created a composite index of religious dogmatism consisting of items that assessed orthodoxy, particularism, religious libertarianism, and the role of the historic Jews in the crucifixion of Jesus. They found that the relationship between religious dogmatism and anti-Semitism was mediated by a two-item measure of religious hostility toward Jews. The items assume that Jews were responsible for the crucifixion ("Jews can never be forgiven for what they did to Jesus until they accept Him as the True Saviour") and demean the faith of Christians ("Among themselves Jews think Christians are ignorant for believing Christ was the son of God").

However, Glock and Stark's work has been criticized for definitional and methodological tautology in their constructs and measures of religious hostility toward Jews and anti-Semitism, and the failure to rule out spurious variables that might account for the links between Christian beliefs and anti-Semitism (e.g., Hoge and Carroll 1975; Middleton 1973). For example, some studies have shown that the relationships between Christian beliefs and anti-Semitism are significantly reduced when controls for other variables (e.g., demographics, authoritarianism, particularism, and localism) are introduced (e.g., Eisinga, Billiet, and Felling 1999; Hoge and Carroll 1975; Middleton 1973). Yet, other research has shown that these links remain after potentially spurious variables are controlled (e.g., Eisinga, Konig, and Scheepers 1995; Konig, Eisinga, and Scheepers 2000). Thus, there is some evidence, admittedly controversial, to suggest that appraisals of Jews as desecrators of Christianity may trigger anti-Semitism in Christians as a response to perceived threats and violations of the sacred.

Religious Coping with Perceptions of Jews as Threats to Christians

Empirical studies have shown that stressors increase the risk of psychological, social, and physical distress, but they are not isomorphic with it (e.g., Rabkin and Streuning 1976). In the context of this topic, we assume that there is no one-to-one correspondence between the stressor (perceiving Jews as desecrators of Christianity) and the response (anti-Semitism). Conceptually, anti-Semitism is the broader construct. It refers to negative, generalized attitudes toward Jews, while perceptions of Jews as desecrators represent specific evaluations of this religious group in terms of its threat value to Christianity.

From the perspective of coping theory, whether stressors in fact lead to negative outcomes depends in large part on the individual's coping resources. Thus, an experienced auto mechanic and a mechanical neophyte are likely to react quite differently to the car that breaks down in the middle of the night. With respect to perceptions of Jews as desecrators of Christianity, there are a number of ways of coping with these perceptions that may increase or reduce the likelihood of anti-Semitism. Given the religious character of desecration and anti-Semitism, religious ways of coping may be especially relevant. Pargament et al. (1998) have distinguished between various positive and negative forms of religious coping. Positive religious coping methods involve benevolent appraisals of stressful situations, seeking spiritual support, and forgiveness. An example of positive religious coping with perceptions of Jews as desecrators of Christianity would be attempts to respond to Jews with love, forgiveness, and compassion. Negative religious coping methods involve appraisals of God's punishment, feelings of divine abandonment, and religious discontent. An example of negative religious coping with appraisals of Jews as desecrators would be interpreting Jews as agents of the Devil or condemned to punishment from God. A number of empirical studies have shown that positive and negative forms of religious coping are associated with higher and lower levels of health and well-being, respectively (Pargament and Ano 2004). Extrapolating from these results to the present topic, positive and negative religious coping with perceptions of Jews as desecrators might reduce or increase the risk of anti-Semitism.

Predictors of Perceptions of Jews as Threats to Christians

If perceptions that Jews desecrate Christianity are, in fact, linked to anti-Semitism, then it becomes important to understand how these perceptions develop. Perhaps most directly, these perceptions may grow out of exposure to messages from church, family, friends, or media that Jews desecrated Christianity in the past or continue to desecrate Christianity today. To the extent that these messages are deeply embedded within Christian institutions, we would expect higher levels of religious involvement among Christians to be tied to perceptions of Jews as desecrators. On the other hand, more first-hand experiences with Jews and greater exposure to messages that counter the view of Jews as desecrators might conceivably reduce the likelihood of these perceptions.

Present Study

We believe that religious coping theory can make a number of potentially significant contributions to an understanding of prejudice. First, in contrast to more reactive theories, it rests on a proactive view of people searching for significance in life, evaluating life situations in terms of their implications for what people hold significant (including sacred values), and coping with these situations to protect and preserve these deeply held values. Anti-Semitism from this perspective is understood, in part, as a response to sacred values under threat and, in part, as a way of defending against these threats. Second, unlike theories that are more restricted in scope, religious coping theory attends to multiple levels of analysis: individual, situational, and social. Thus, the effort to make sense of anti-Semitism expands to include not only dispositional variables, but also other

specific, multilevel dynamics that may contribute to the development of this form of prejudice. Finally, in contrast to perspectives that emphasize static beliefs and traits, religious coping theory is fluid. It assumes that appraisals, ways of coping, and outcomes interact with each other and change over time. Anti-Semitism is not necessarily a fixed and final state from the perspective of this theory. It too may change as people shift in their perceptions of the threat value of Jews and their ways of coping with these perceived threats. At a general level then, this study tests the value of religious coping theory as a framework for understanding prejudice in one particular context, that of Christian anti-Semitism.

More specifically, this study examines the following set of questions that build upon each other: First, how common is the perception that Jews are a threat to Christians? Second, are higher levels of appraisals of Jews as desecrators (the stressor) related to greater anti-Semitism (the response)? Third, do appraisals of Jews as desecrators remain predictive of anti-Semitism after controlling for demographic variables, established dispositional predictors, including right wing authoritarianism, fundamentalism, Christian orthodoxy, religious orientation, and church attendance? Fourth, if, as expected, perceptions of Jews as desecrators of Christianity are predictive of anti-Semitism, are these appraisals ameliorated or exacerbated by positive and negative religious coping, respectively? Finally, in an exploratory vein, what factors are predictive of perceptions of Jews as desecrators of Christianity?

Method

Participants

The sample was composed of 139 undergraduate college students. Participants' ages ranged from 18 to 22 years with a mean of 18.91 years. In addition, the sample was predominantly white (87.1 percent) and female (78.4 percent).

To assess the religiousness of the sample, participants were asked their religious affiliation, the frequency of their attendance at religious services, the frequency with which they engage in private prayer, and the degree to which they consider themselves religious. The sample was primarily Christian (88.5 percent) with 39.6 percent of participants identifying as Catholic, 29.5 percent as Protestant, and 19.4 percent as nondenominational Christian. In addition, 8.6 percent of participants indicated no religious affiliation while 2.2 percent endorsed "other." Across measures, participants reported moderate levels of religious activity and beliefs. Participants rated the frequency with which they attend religious services on a scale of 1 to 9, with a higher rating indicating more frequent attendance. The mean for attendance at religious services was 4.88 ($SD = 2.19$). More specifically, 41 percent of participants reported attending religious services "2–3 times per month" or more. Approximately one-third of the sample (33.1 percent) reported attending services "about once per month" or "about once or twice a year" and 25.9 percent reported attending "less than once per year" or less. Frequency of private prayer was measured on a scale of 1 to 8 with higher numbers indicating more engagement in prayer. The mean for this religious activity was 4.99 ($SD = 2.33$). Over half of the sample (56.1 percent) reported engaging in private prayer "once a week" or more. In addition, 19.5 percent reported praying privately "a few times a month" to "once a month" while 24.5 percent reported praying "less than once a month." Finally, participants rated the degree to which they considered themselves religious on a scale of 1 to 4. A higher number indicates a greater degree of religiosity. The mean on this self-rated religiosity item was 2.50 ($SD = 0.76$). Almost half of the sample (48.9 percent) endorsed "moderately religious" while 34.5 percent endorsed "slightly religious." Only 16.6 percent of the sample endorsed either "very religious" or "not religious at all," evidence of the moderate religiosity of the sample. Overall, measures of attendance at religious services, private prayer, and self-rated religiosity indicate that this is a moderately religious college sample.

Procedures

Participants were recruited from introductory psychology classes at a midwestern university. Researchers visited classes, briefly explained the study, and distributed questionnaire packets to interested students. Students were instructed to complete the questionnaire packets and return them to class instructors in sealed envelopes. Students participated voluntarily and received class credit for their participation.

Measures

Desecration

Conceptually, it was important to distinguish between perceptions that Jews desecrated Christianity in the past from perceptions that Jews are a current threat to Christianity. Thus, two scales were created to measure the degree to which participants believe Jews desecrate or violate sacred Christian teachings and beliefs. The first scale, Perceptions of Historical Desecration, is a two-item measure assessing historical desecration or the belief that the Jews played a dominant role in the death of Christ. The statements comprising this scale are "the Jews killed Christ" and "the Jews were most responsible for crucifying Christ" (Cronbach's alpha = 0.89). The second scale, "Perceptions of Current Desecration," is a five-item measure that assesses the degree to which individuals believe that Jews are currently violating Christian beliefs. Items include: "the failure of Jews to accept Jesus Christ is an insult to the Church"; "the Jews represent a threat to the ultimate mission of Christ"; "some Jews have greatly damaged the Church"; and "among themselves, Jews think Christians are ignorant for believing Christ was the son of God" (Cronbach's alpha = 0.92). On both subscales, participants rated their beliefs on a five-point scale with higher scores indicating greater belief in desecration by Jews.

Alternative Predictors of Anti-Semitism

A variety of trait-like personality constructs already established in prior research as predictors of prejudice were assessed. The Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale (Altemeyer 1981) was used to measure alignment with conservative traditional political and social beliefs. Participants rated each item on a scale from −4 (very strongly disagree) to 4 (very strongly agree). Reliability for this 34-item scale on the current sample was adequate (Cronbach's alpha = 0.87). Belief in a single true religion was measured with a shortened 14-item version of the Religious Fundamentalism Scale (Altemeyer and Hunsberger 1992). Reponses ranged on a scale from 1 to 9 with higher scores indicating greater belief in one true religion. Based on the current sample, reliability for this shortened form was adequate (Cronbach's alpha = 0.87). The Doctrinal Orthodoxy Scale (Batson 1976) was used to measure belief in the teachings and doctrine of Christianity. Each item was rated on a scale of 1 to 9 with higher scores representing greater belief in Christian doctrines. Cronbach's alpha for this 12-item scale was 0.95. The Christian Particularism Scale (Glock and Stark 1966) was used to measure the degree to which individuals believe Christianity is the only right and true religion. Responses ranged on a scale of 1 to 3 with higher scores indicating greater belief in Christianity as the only true religion. For this sample, the six-item measure was adequately reliable (Cronbach's alpha = 0.84).

Two additional measures that have been tied theoretically to anti-Semitism (Glock and Stark 1966) were created for the purpose of this study. A seven-item index was created to assess religious pluralism or the degree to which individuals believe there are multiple paths to religious truth. This measure included items such as "there is more than one path to salvation." Participants rated their beliefs on a scale of 1 to 5 with higher scores indicating greater belief in multiple paths to the truth. Cronbach's alpha for this pluralism index was 0.83. A four-item questionnaire, Closeness

to Jews, was created to measure participants' familiarity with and exposure to Jewish individuals, with higher scores indicating more familiarity with Jews. The items assessed familiarity with characteristics of Jewish people, the number of Jews known by the individual, and the number of Jewish friends and relatives of the individual on a five-point scale. This index exhibited adequate reliability with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.76.

Anti-Semitism

Two indices of anti-Semitism were used as criterion measures in this study. First, the Anti-Semitism Index (Glock and Stark 1966) was used to assess prejudiced views of Jews. This 11-item measure has been used repeatedly to assess the prevalence of anti-Semitic beliefs in the United States. Items such as "Jews have too much power in the United States today" and "Jews have a lot of irritating faults" are rated on a scale from 1 to 5. Higher scores indicate more anti-Semitic beliefs. For this sample, Cronbach's alpha for the Anti-Semitism Index was 0.93. The second criterion measure assessed perceived conflict with Jews. Two items of this index were created by Struch and Schwartz (1989). One item reads: "The everyday interests of the Jews and of your group conflict." Three additional items such as "Jews and Christians could co-exist together in peace and harmony" (reverse coded) were added to increase the length of the scale. Each of the five items of this index was rated on a scale of 1 to 5 with higher scores indicating more perceived conflict. The final perceived conflict with Jews measure was moderately reliable (Cronbach's alpha $= 0.76$).

Religious Coping with Desecration

A 23-item scale was created to measure religious ways of coping with perceptions of negative Jewish behavior and attitudes toward Christianity. Participants were asked to rate the degree to which each item described a way they understood or dealt with current desecration of Christianity by Jews. Participants responded to each item on a five-point scale with higher scores indicating greater endorsement of that way of religious coping. These items were factor analyzed into three subscales: Jews as Demonic; Jews as Punished by God; and Christian Love. The nine-item Jews as Demonic subscale included statements such as "Jews are demonic" and "Jews are influenced by Satan" and exhibited adequate reliability (Cronbach's alpha $= 0.84$). Seven items loaded on another negative religious coping subscale that was defined largely by beliefs that Jews are being punished by God, such as "I realize that the Jews have so much trouble because God is punishing them for rejecting Jesus" and "I understand that God is punishing Jews for their sins." Interestingly, the statement "I try to convert Jews to Jesus" also loaded on the Jews as Punished by God subscale, indicating that evangelical activities were part of a negative rather than positive religious coping pattern in the context of this study. The reliability of this subscale was adequate with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.85. The seven-item Christian Love subscale included statements such as "I offer Jews the love and compassion that comes from God" and "I remind myself that God loves all of his children." This subscale exhibited adequate reliability with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.93.

Predictors of Perceptions of Desecration

We constructed additional items and scales to measure exposure to messages affirming the desecration of Christian beliefs by Jews historically and currently. These measures were used as predictors of perceptions of desecration. A single item measured exposure to messages of historical desecration. Participants were asked how often they had heard or read that, "according to the Gospels, the Jews killed Christ." Responses ranged from 1 to 5 with higher scores indicating

more frequent exposure to the desecration message. To assess exposure to messages of current desecration, participants were asked to rate the frequency with which they heard or read messages affirming current desecration of Christian beliefs by Jews on a scale of 1 to 5. Through factor analysis, this nine-item scale was divided into two subscales, exposure to current desecration and exposure to current counterdesecration. The five exposures to current desecration items included statements such as "some Jews have greatly damaged the church." Higher scores on this subscale indicate more exposure to such messages. The three exposures to current counterdesecration items included "anti-Semitism is a sin." Higher scores on this subscale indicate more exposure to these messages. The reliability for the exposure to current desecration subscale was adequate with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.83. Reliability for the exposure to current counterdesecration subscale was marginal with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.60.

Results

Perception of Jews as a Threat to Christians

The first question addressed by this study concerns the commonality of the belief that Jews are a threat to Christians. Participants' responses on each item of the Perceptions of Historical Desecration and Perceptions of Current Desecration measures provide insight into the frequency of these beliefs. Regarding the Perceptions of Historical Desecration measure, 10.8 percent of participants agreed or strongly agreed that "the Jews killed Christ," and 12.9 percent agreed or strongly agreed that "the Jews were most responsible for crucifying Christ." Similar percentages emerged on the Perceptions of Current Desecration items: "some Jews have greatly damaged the Church" (7.9 percent), "the failure of Jews to accept Jesus Christ is an insult to the Church" (14.4 percent), "the Jews represent a threat to the ultimate mission of Christ" (7.2 percent), "Jews oppose the fundamental teachings of Christ" (16.6 percent), and "among themselves, Jews think Christians are ignorant for believing Christ was the Son of God" (9.4 percent).

Consistent with the response pattern on the individual items, the mean scores on the desecration measures were moderately positively skewed (see Table 1), as were the means scores on Exposure to Current Desecration and Exposure to Historical Desecration. These results indicate that a small but notable percentage of these undergraduate college students perceive Jews as a threat to Christian values. Consistent with these findings, the mean scores on the Anti-Semitism and Perceived Conflict with Jews measures were below the theoretical midpoint of the indices. Thus, anti-Semitism and perceived conflict with Jews were not the norms among these college students. However, both of these measures displayed approximately normal distributions.

Perceptions of Jews as Desecrators of Christianity and Anti-Semitism

The second question raised by this study focuses on the relationship between perceptions of Jews as desecrators of Christianity and anti-Semitism. Table 2 contains correlations of the predictor variables with the criterion variables (Anti-Semitism Index and Perceived Conflict with Jews). Higher scores on Perceptions of Historical Desecration and Perceptions of Current Desecration were correlated with higher scores on the Anti-Semitism Index ($r = 0.35$ and 0.39, $p < 0.01$, respectively). These two variables were the only predictor variables significantly correlated with anti-Semitism. Higher scores on the Perceptions of Historical and Current Desecration measures were also associated with higher scores on Perceived Conflict with Jews ($r = 0.36$ and 0.48, $p < 0.01$, respectively). As expected then, viewing Jews as desecrators of Christianity was associated with more prejudiced attitudes toward Jews and more perceived conflict with Jews.

TABLE 1
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR ALL MEASURES

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Right-wing authoritarianism	−94.00	64.00	−16.73	27.35
Fundamentalism	17.00	122.00	65.42	18.39
Orthodoxy	13.00	108.00	83.66	22.68
Pluralism	6.00	30.00	21.08	4.76
Particularism	6.00	19.00	11.21	3.32
Closeness to Jews	4.00	18.00	8.18	2.70
Perceptions of historical desecration	2.00	9.00	4.50	2.08
Perceptions of current desecration	5.00	25.00	11.20	4.60
Religious coping: Jews as demonic	9.00	42.00	16.00	6.15
Religious coping: punished by God	7.00	33.00	11.40	5.85
Religious coping: Christian love	7.00	35.00	23.00	6.30
Exposure to current desecration	5.00	25.00	8.87	4.21
Exposure to current counterdesecration	4.00	15.00	11.57	2.66
Exposure to historical desecration	1.00	5.00	2.01	1.26
Perceived conflict with Jews	5.00	19.00	10.60	3.74
Anti-Semitism	11.00	43.00	24.92	8.44

Perception of Jews as Desecrators as a Distinctive Predictor of Anti-Semitism

The third question addressed by this study concerns whether the perception of Jews as desecrators of Christianity predicts anti-Semitism and perceived conflict with Jews after controlling for other demographic and dispositional predictors. Regression analyses were conducted on two models with the Anti-Semitism Index and Perceived Conflict with Jews measures as criterion variables (see Table 3). In Model 1, the predictors were the demographic variables (age, year in school, gender, prayer, church attendance, and self-rated religiosity) and dispositional variables (right-wing authoritarianism, fundamentalism, orthodoxy, pluralism, particularism, and closeness to Jews). The overall model was a significant predictor of perceived conflict with Jews

TABLE 2
CORRELATIONS OF PREDICTORS WITH ANTI-SEMITISM AND PERCEIVED CONFLICT WITH JEWS

Predictors	Anti-Semitism	Perceived Conflict with Jews
Perceptions of historical desecration	0.35*	0.36*
Perceptions of current desecration	0.39*	0.48*
Right-wing authoritarianism	0.14	0.36*
Fundamentalism	0.05	0.36*
Orthodoxy	−0.11	0.23*
Pluralism	−0.15	−0.28*
Particularism	0.02	0.42*
Closeness to Jews	−0.14	−0.28*

*$p < 0.01$.

TABLE 3
PREDICTORS OF PERCEIVED CONFLICT WITH JEWS AND ANTI-SEMITISM

	Perceived Conflict with Jews (β)		Anti-Semitism (β)	
Predictors	Model 1[a]	Model 2[b]	Model 1[a]	Model 2[b]
Demographics				
Age	−0.04	−0.12	−0.02	−0.10
Year in school	0.05	0.11	0.05	0.12
Gender	0.02	0.04	−0.15	−0.12
Global religiousness				
Prayer	−0.17	−0.14	−0.02	0.03
Church attendance	0.13	0.10	−0.13	−0.17
Self-rated religiosity	0.01	0.07	−0.05	0.03
Competing variables				
Right-wing authoritarianism	0.10	0.04	0.10	0.03
Fundamentalism	−0.03	−0.01	0.06	0.09
Orthodoxy	0.10	0.04	−0.05	−0.13
Pluralism	−0.11	−0.07	−0.11	−0.05
Particularism	0.26*	0.19†	−0.05	−0.14
Closeness to Jews	−0.14	−0.11	−0.14	−0.10
Perceptions of historical desecration by Jews		0.10		0.14
Perceptions of current desecration by Jews		0.28*		0.34**
Overall R^2	0.19***	0.28***	0.03	0.17***
Change in R^2		0.09***		0.14***

†$p < 0.10$, *$p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.01$, ***$p < 0.001$.

[a]Predictors: Age, year in school, gender, church attendance, prayer, self-rated religiosity, right-wing authoritarianism, fundamentalism, orthodoxy, pluralism, particularism, and closeness to Jews.

[b]Predictors: Age, year in school, gender, church attendance, prayer, self-rated religiosity, right-wing authoritarianism, fundamentalism, orthodoxy, pluralism, particularism, closeness to Jews, perceptions of historical desecration, and perceptions of current desecration.

($R^2 = 0.19$, $p < 0.001$). Particularism significantly predicted greater perceived conflict with Jews in this model ($\beta = 0.26$, $p < 0.05$). No significant predictors of anti-Semitism emerged in Model 1.

For Model 2, Perceptions of Historical Desecration and Perceptions of Current Desecration were added to the predictors in Model 1. The overall model significantly predicted perceived conflict with Jews ($R^2 = 0.28$, $p < 0.001$) and the change in R^2 from Model 1 to Model 2 was significant (R^2 *change* $= 0.09$, $p < 0.001$). Perceptions of Current Desecration significantly predicted greater perceived conflict with Jews ($\beta = 0.28, p < 0.05$). Particularism was a marginally significant predictor of more perceived conflict with Jews ($\beta = 0.19$, $p < 0.10$) in this model. Regarding anti-Semitism, the overall model significantly predicted anti-Semitism ($R^2 = 0.17$, $p < 0.001$) and the change in R^2 from Model 1 to Model 2 was significant (R^2 *change* $= 0.14$, $p < 0.001$). Perceptions of Current Desecration was the only significant predictor ($\beta = 0.34, p < 0.01$) of greater anti-Semitism that emerged in this model. Thus, after controlling for demographic

TABLE 4
RELIGIOUS COPING AS PREDICTORS OF PERCEIVED CONFLICT WITH JEWS AND ANTI-SEMITISM

	Perceived Conflict with Jews (β)	Anti-Semitism (β)
Religious coping		
Jews as demonic	0.16*	0.20*
Jews as punished by God	0.27***	0.19*
Christian love	−0.26**	−0.15†
R^2	0.18***	0.12***

†$p < 0.10$, *$p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, ***$p < 0.001$.

and personality variables, Perceptions of Current Desecration by Jews significantly predicted more perceived conflict with Jews and anti-Semitism. Perceptions of Historical Desecration was not a significant predictor of perceived conflict with Jews or anti-Semitism.

Religious Coping with Desecration as Factors that Increase or Reduce the Risk of Anti-Semitism

The fourth question of this study examines whether religious coping with perceptions of Jews as desecrators of Christianity increases or decreases the risk of anti-Semitism. Regression analyses were conducted in which the religious coping measures (Demonic, Punished by God, and Christian Love subscales) served as predictors and the Perceived Conflict with Jews and Anti-Semitism indices served as criterion variables (see Table 4). The overall model was significant for perceived conflict with Jews ($R^2 = 0.18$, $p < 0.001$) and anti-Semitism ($R^2 = 0.12$, $p < 0.001$). Explanations of Jews as Demonic ($\beta = 0.16$, $p < 0.05$) and Punished by God ($\beta = 0.27$, $p < 0.01$) were associated with higher levels of perceived conflict with Jews. Coping with perceptions of desecration through Christian Love was predictive of less conflict with Jews ($\beta = -0.26$, $p < 0.001$). Similarly, explanations of Jews as Demonic ($\beta = 0.20$, $p < 0.05$) and Punished by God ($\beta = 0.21$, $p < 0.05$) were predictive of greater anti-Semitism, while Christian Love ($\beta = -0.15$, $p < 0.07$) was marginally associated with lower anti-Semitism. These results suggest that the way individuals cope with their perceptions of Jews as desecrators of Christianity may exacerbate or ameliorate prejudicial attitudes toward Jews.

Predictors of Perceptions of Current Desecration

The previous results suggest that perceptions of Jews as desecrators of Christianity are positively related to anti-Semitic beliefs and perceived conflict with Jews. Based on this finding, the final purpose of this study was to identify the predictors of perceptions of current desecration. Regression analyses were conducted with Perceptions of Current Desecration as the criterion variable (see Table 5). Variables entered into the regression equation included demographic variables (age, year in school, gender, frequency of prayer, church attendance, and self-rated religiosity), dispositional variables (right-wing authoritarianism, fundamentalism, orthodoxy, pluralism, particularism, and closeness to Jews), and exposure variables (exposure to current desecration, exposure to current counterdesecration, and exposure to historical desecration). The overall model significantly predicted Perceptions of Current Desecration ($R^2 = 0.36$, $p < 0.001$). Among the dispositional variables, greater Perceptions of Current Desecration were predicted by higher right-wing authoritarianism ($\beta = 0.18$, $p < 0.10$), higher orthodoxy ($\beta = 0.22$, $p < 0.05$), and lower

TABLE 5
PREDICTORS OF PERCEPTIONS OF CURRENT DESECRATION

Predictors	Perceptions of Current Desecration (β)
Demographics	
Age	0.14
Year in school	−0.15
Gender	0.00
Global religiousness	
Prayer	−0.15
Church attendance	0.08
Self-rated religiosity	−0.13
Competing variables	
Right-wing authoritarianism	0.18†
Fundamentalism	−0.03
Orthodoxy	0.22*
Pluralism	−0.06
Particularism	0.06
Closeness to Jews	− 0.16*
Exposure to current desecration	0.45***
Exposure to current counterdesecration	− 0.16*
Exposure to historical desecration	0.09
R^2	0.36***

$^{\dagger}p < 0.10$, $^{*}p < 0.05$, $^{**}p < 0.01$, $^{***}p < 0.001$.

closeness to Jews ($\beta = -0.16, p < 0.05$). In addition, greater Perceptions of Current Desecration were predicted by more Exposure to Current Desecration messages ($\beta = 0.45, p < 0.001$) and less Exposure to Current Counterdesecration messages ($\beta = -0.16, p < 0.05$).

Discussion

Overall, these findings offer initial support for the value of religious coping theory as one framework for understanding one form of prejudice, anti-Semitism. Our findings were consistent with the theory that perceived threats by religious out-groups against the sacred values of the in-group are likely to elicit prejudice from the in-group as a protective response (Pargament 1997; Pargament and Mahoney 2005). In this study, people who appraised Jews to be a current threat to Christians (i.e., desecrators) were more likely to report anti-Semitism and conflicts with Jews. These findings were robust. Significant results remained even after controlling the effects of demographic and established dispositional predictors of anti-Semitism. Also consistent with religious coping theory and research, we were able to identify some forms of religious coping with perceptions of Jews as desecrators that appeared to increase or reduce the risk of anti-Semitism and conflict with Jews. Modeling the Christian value of love was tied to lower levels of conflict with Jews and, marginally, to lower anti-Semitism. On the other hand, negative religious coping methods (e.g., believing that Jews are being punished by God or Jews are being influenced by Satan) were tied to greater conflict with Jews and greater anti-Semitism.

Several findings from this study deserve additional consideration. First, approximately 7–17 percent of the participants agreed or strongly agreed with the items assessing perceptions of Jews as desecrators of Christianity. Although this figure is relatively small, it is nevertheless noteworthy, given that the sample was made up of college students at a midwestern state university. Among

less educated and more religious groups, we might expect that higher proportions of people hold these perceptions.

Second, it is interesting to note that the established demographic and dispositional predictors of prejudice (church attendance, prayer, self-rated religiosity, right-wing authoritarianism, fundamentalism, orthodoxy, and particularism) were largely unrelated to anti-Semitism in this study, in contrast to the findings of other researchers (e.g., Eisinga, Billiet, and Felling 1999; Hoge and Carroll 1975; Hunsberger 1995; Laythe, Finkel, and Kirkpatrick 2001; McFarland 1989; Rowatt and Franklin 2004; Scheepers, Gijsberts, and Hello 2002; Wylie and Forest 1992). The major difference that set this study apart from prior research was the inclusion of the measure of desecration, suggesting that this variable may play a pivotal role in our understanding of anti-Semitism.

This leads to the third point. Although the dispositional factors did not emerge as predictors of anti-Semitism, they were predictive of perceptions of Jews as desecrators of Christianity. Right-wing authoritarianism and religious orthodoxy were most closely related to these perceptions. These findings suggest that, while dispositional factors may play the most critical role in triggering perceptions of out-groups as violators of the sacred, it is the latter perceptions of desecration that may be most directly linked to prejudice. This mediational model could be put to test in studies of other forms of religious and ethnic prejudice. It could be argued that these findings are simply a reflection of definitional and measurement tautology (i.e., both desecration and anti-Semitism represent negative views of Jews). However, it is important to note that the correlations between desecration and anti-Semitism were not of a sufficient magnitude to indicate that they were basically the same phenomenon. Furthermore, we would argue that there is an important theoretically based and empirically supported distinction to be made between specific religious-based perceptions of threat *by* Jews and generalized attitudes of distaste and dislike *toward* Jews.

Fourth, these results also point to social pathways that may lead to perceptions of desecration. Perceptions of desecration were associated with greater exposure to messages labeling Jews as desecrators. Although this finding is correlational, it does suggest that messages presented through church, family, and media have the potential to trigger perceptions of Jews as desecrators. In addition, our findings underscore the importance of distinguishing between current and historical desecration. Perceptions of current desecration held greater significance for anti-Semitism and religious conflict than perceptions of historical desecration. Furthermore, perceptions of current desecration were predicted by exposure to messages of current desecration rather than messages of historical desecration. These findings raise the question of whether films such as *The Passion of the Christ*, an arguably hostile depiction of the historical relationship between Jesus and the Jews, do indeed incite perceptions of current desecration and anti-Semitism, in turn. Experimental studies of messages such as those expressed in *The Passion of the Christ* are needed to determine whether they trigger perceptions of desecration and, if so, whether these perceptions are limited to historical desecration or encompass current desecration as well. Experimental studies of desecration messages are also needed to provide a more direct test of their impact on perceptions of Jews.

Fifth, it is important to emphasize that, even though anti-Semitism can be *explained* in part as a result of perceived threats against sacred values, this explanation does not *justify* anti-Semitism or other types of prejudice. Prejudice remains a destructive phenomenon regardless of its explanation. The findings of this study have a few implications for the prevention of perceptions of desecration or mitigation of these perceptions once they occur. We found that perceptions of Jews as desecrators were less likely among people who were exposed more often to messages that countered the views of Jews as desecrators as well as among people who had more familiarity and closeness with Jews. Messages that challenge the view of Jews as desecrators of Christianity, exposure to models of interfaith tolerance, and greater interaction between Jews and Christians may help to forestall the development of potentially destructive perceptions of Jews.

We also identified a factor that mitigated the impact of perceptions of desecration on anti-Semitism, namely, expressions of the Christian value of love to Jews. Researchers should consider

other factors that might temper the impact of perceptions of desecration on anti-Semitism, such as beliefs that the desecration was committed unknowingly or unintentionally. It is also important to attend to ways of coping that exacerbate the effects of desecration. Perceptions that Jews are being punished by God and influenced by Satan were particularly problematic in this study. Silberman and her colleagues maintain that these kinds of perceptions dehumanize Jews and increase the likelihood of prejudice (Silberman 2005; Silberman, Higgins, and Dweck 2005).

Finally, even though the focus of this article was anti-Semitism, religious coping theory should also apply to prejudice toward other groups. Age-old conflicts between religious groups—Hindus and Muslims, Muslims and Christians, Christians and Jews, Muslims and Jews—may be understood at least in part as responses to perceptions that the out-group represents a threat to the most sacred of values of the in-group. Additional research among diverse religious groups is needed to extend the theory of religious coping to other forms of prejudice.

This is simply a first test of religious coping theory as it applies to the problem of religious prejudice. The findings are limited in several respects: the cross-sectional design, which prohibits any causal inferences; the sample of college students, which limits the generalizability of the findings to the larger population; and the focus on simply one form of religious prejudice. In addition, the study is limited by its reliance on a self-report methodology. Future studies should attempt to replicate and generalize these findings to a more diverse sample and other forms of religious prejudice. Covert measures of prejudice would also represent valuable adjuncts to self-report indices (e.g., Rudman et al. 1999).

In spite of these limitations, this study represents a promising first effort to apply religious coping theory to the problem of religious prejudice and anti-Semitism in particular. Though no single theoretical framework is likely to explain fully this problem, religious coping theory, with its focus on people in active pursuit of sacred value and the dynamic interplay between person, group, and situation, appears to offer a broad, multidimensional perspective for understanding at least some forms of religious prejudice.

References

Anti-Defamation League. 2005a. *Attitudes towards Jews in 12 European countries*. New York: First International Resources.

———. 2005b. *American attitudes towards Jews: An Anti-Defamation League survey*. New York: Marttila Communications Group.

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

Altemeyer, B. and B. E. Hunsberger. 1992. Authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, quest, and prejudice. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion* 2:113–33.

Batson, C. D. 1976. Religion as prosocial: Agent or double agent? *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 15:29–45.

Batson, C. D. and C. T. Burris. 1994. Personal religion: Depressant or stimulant of prejudice and discrimination? In *The psychology of prejudice: The Ontario symposium* (Vol. 7), edited by M. P. Zanna and J. M. Olson, pp. 149–69. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

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

Carroll, J. 2001. *Constantine's sword—The church and the Jews: A history*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Donahue, M. J. 1985. Intrinsic and extrinsic religiousness: Review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 48:400–19.

Eisinga, R., J. Billiet, and A. Felling. 1999. Christian religion and ethnic prejudice in cross-national perspective: A comparative analysis of the Netherlands and Flanders (Belgium). *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 40:375–93.

Eisinga, R., R. Konig, and P. Scheepers. 1995. Orthodox religious beliefs and anti-Semitism: A replication of Glock and Stark in the Netherlands. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 34:214–23.

Gibson, M. (producer/director). 2004. *The passion of the Christ* (motion picture). United States: Twentieth Century Fox.

Glock, C. Y. and R. Stark. 1966. *Christian beliefs and anti-Semitism*. New York: Harper and Row.

Goodstein, L. 2004. Passion disturbs a panel of religious leaders. *New York Times*. February 25: A14, Column 1.

Greenberg, J., T. Pyszczynski, S. Solomon, A. Rosenblatt, M. Veerder, S. Kirkland, and D. Lyon. 1990. Evidence for terror management theory II: The effects of mortality salience reactions to those who threaten or bolster the cultural worldview. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 58:308–18.

Hoge, D. R. and J. W. Carroll. 1975. Christian beliefs, nonreligious factors, and anti-Semitism. *Social Forces* 53:581–94.
Hunsberger, B. 1995. Religion and prejudice: The role of religious fundamentalism, quest, and right wing authoritarianism. *Journal of Social Issues* 51:112–29.
Hunsberger, B. and L. M. Jackson. 2005. Religion, meaning, and prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues* 61:807–26.
Jackson, L. M. and V. M. Esses. 1997. Of scripture and ascription: The relation between religious fundamentalism and intergroup helping. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 233:893–906.
Jackson, L. M. and B. Hunsberger. 1999. An intergroup perspective on religion and prejudice. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 38:509–23.
Konig, R., R. Eisinga, and P. Scheepers. 2000. Explaining the relationship between Christian religion and anti-Semitism in the Netherlands. *Review of Religious Research* 41:373–93.
Laythe, B., D. Finkel, and L. A. Kirkpatrick 2001. Predicting prejudice from religious fundamentalism and right-wing authoritarianism: A multiple-regression approach. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 40:1–10.
Lazarus, R. S. and S. Folkman. 1984. *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New York: Springer.
Mahoney, A., K. I., Pargament, G. Ano, Q. Lynn, G. M. Magyar, S. McCarthy, E. Pristas, and A. Wachholtz. 2002. The devil made them do it? Demonization and desecration in response to the 9/11 attacks. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.
McFarland, S. 1989. Religious orientation and the targets of discrimination. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 28:324–26.
Middleton, R. 1973. Do Christian beliefs cause anti-Semitism? *American Sociological Review* 38:33–52.
Pargament, K. I. 1997. *The psychology of religion and coping: Theory, research, practice*. New York: Guilford Press.
Pargament, K. I. and G. Ano. 2004. Empirical advances in the psychology of religion and coping. In *Religious influences on health and well-being in the elderly*, edited by K. W. Schaie, N. Krause, and A. Booth, pp. 114–40. New York: Spring Publishing.
Pargament, K. I., G. M. Magyar, E. Benore, and A. Mahoney. 2005. Sacrilege: A study of sacred loss and desecration and their implications for health and well-being in a community sample. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 44:59–78.
Pargament, K. I. and A. M. Mahoney. 2005. Sacred matters: Sanctification as a phenomenon of interest for the psychology of religion. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion* 15:179–98.
Pargament, K. I., B. W. Smith, H. G. Koenig, and L. Perez. 1998. Patterns of positive and negative religious coping with major life stressors. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 37:710–24.
Prager, D. and J. Telushkin. 1983. *Why the Jews? The reasons for anti-Semitism*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
Rabkin, J. G. and E. L. Streuning. 1976. Life events, stress, and illness. *Science* 194:1013–20.
Rowatt, W. C. and L. M. Franklin. 2004. Christian orthodoxy, religious fundamentalism, and right-wing authoritarianism as predictors of implicit racial prejudice. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion* 14:125–38.
Rudman, L. A., A. G. Greenwald, D. S. Mellott, and J. L. K. Schwartz. 1999. Measuring the automatic components of prejudice: Flexibility and generality of the implicit association test. *Social Cognition* 17:437–65.
Scheepers, P., M. Gijsberts, and E. Hello. 2002. Religiosity and prejudice against ethnic minorities in Europe: Cross-national tests on a controversial relationship. *Review of Religious Research* 43:242–65.
Silberman, I. 2005. Religious violence, terrorism, and peace: A meaning-system analysis. In *Handbook of religion and spirituality*, edited by R. F. Paloutzian and C. L. Park, pp. 529–49. New York: Guilford Press.
Silberman, I., E. T. Higgins, and C. S. Dweck. 2005. Religion and world change: Violence and terrorism versus peace. *Journal of Social Issues* 61:761–84.
Struch, N. and S. H. Schwartz. 1989. Intergroup aggression: Its predictors and distinctness from in-group bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 56:364–73.
Wylie, L. and J. Forest. 1992. Religious fundamentalism, right wing authoritarianism and prejudice. *Psychological Reports* 71:1291–98.