

EXPLORING RELIGIOUS BIAS AND PERCEPTIONS OF ATHEISM

by

RAINA D. LECKIE

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Honors in the Major Program in Psychology
in the College of Sciences
and in the Burnett Honors College
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Spring Term 2013

Thesis Chair: Karen Mottarella, Psy.D

ABSTRACT

Much research focuses on religious bias and in particular the marginalization of Muslims in America. What initially surprised post 9-11 researchers is that participants typically rank atheists lower than Muslims in the areas of private and public trust. Further research is needed to continue to understand the nature and extent of religious-based bias. The present study explores whether a job candidate's religion impacts perception of the candidate's "hireability" and source credibility, including elements of trustworthiness, expertise and attractiveness.

Participants were randomly assigned to review an identical version of a resume in which only the implied religion of the candidate was manipulated. One line of the candidate's resume suggested that the candidate was Christian, Muslim, Scientologist, Atheist or no religion was indicated. Participants then rated the candidate using a 3-question Hireability Index (Rudman & Glick, 2001) and the Source-Credibility Scale (SCS: Ohanian, 1990). The SCS contains 3 subscales measuring Attractiveness, Expertise and Trustworthiness. In this study, attractiveness emerged as a variable influenced by the religion of the candidate. Trends in the data also suggest that the candidate's religion may influence the candidate's overall Hireability Index score as well. The results suggest that religion may influence variables related to hireability but seem to more strongly influence personal variables such as ratings of attractiveness when the ratings are made by participants who are young and educated.

DEDICATION

For my mom and dad, Don and Sandy, who loved me so much in life, that even now, six years later, I don't have a single doubt how proud you would be of me now. I can even hear you saying, "We knew you would do it, we did however, predict it would be on your own time, and no one else's."

For my husband, John, whose constant humor made me laugh exactly when I needed it. We make a fabulous team, and I can't wait to see what trouble we get into in the future.

For my crazy child Ian, I am so grateful to have the privilege of being your mother. You are interesting, funny, and witty. One day my padawan, you will understand why your mother spent many nights for months on end at the computer.

To my friend Brande -- we will cross the finish line together. We may be broken, bloody, and limping as we cross it, but we'll do it.

To my friend Jennifer, you have been the best friend anyone could ever hope to have.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to acknowledge my thesis committee. Dr. Whitten was always ready with incredible moral support and interest in my topic. Nancy Brasel was immensely helpful in tweaking my educator's resume and never tired of helping me fine tune it. I would like to thank Dr. Mottarella especially who was open to working on such a sensitive topic. Not only were you accommodating, but you helped me to see my topic from different viewpoints in psychology itself. I have a tendency to be so focused, that I didn't realize religious research bumped up against so many other areas. You showed me I could take my idea almost anywhere.

If that isn't empowerment, I don't know what is.

I would also like to thank all of those who assisted me with testing, and put up with my odd random perfectionist tendencies. Dr. M's research team, and RoseAnn, most especially, for walking me through stuff while she was in the hospital. No really, she's just that awesome.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
METHODS	4
Participants.....	4
Materials	4
Procedure	7
RESULTS	9
DISCUSSION.....	12
APPENDIX A: APPLICANT MATERIALS.....	15
APPENDIX B: SOURCE CREDIBILITY SCALE	21
APPENDIX C: DUKE UNIVERSITY RELIGION INDEX.....	23
APPENDIX D: MANIPULATION CHECK QUESTIONS	25
APPENDIX E: DEMOGRAPHICS FORM	27
APPENDIX F: EXPLANATION OF RESEARCH	30
APPENDIX G: IRB APPROVAL FORM.....	32
REFERENCES	34

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 9
Table 2 11

INTRODUCTION

Exploring Bias against Atheists

Marginalization of an underrepresented population is not a new concept. Edgell, Gerteis, and Hartmann (2006) outline this issue, "Symbolic distinctions drawn along lines of race, gender, sexuality, or social class are often studied because they lead to social exclusion for those in marginalized groups, and these distinctions form the basis for social inequality." They make the case that just as bias exists against the aforementioned groups, it can also exist in relationship to members of a particular religious group. However, understanding marginalization of a religious population is a relatively new area of research.

Since the bombing of the World Trade center on 9-11-2001, much research has focused on religious bias and in particular the marginalization of Muslims in America and the resulting psychological effects that members of the Muslim community experience in the US. What initially surprised researchers is that despite past events and the subsequent increased tensions between groups, atheists ranked below Muslims in the areas of private and public trust. One explanation they proposed for this data is that in our ever growing knowledge base, people are becoming more aware of other religious ideals and beliefs which has led to familiarity and more acceptance (Edgell, 2006). Diverse religious beliefs have become common, familiar, and accepted; making individuals with different religious faiths part of the same "in-group." Atheists stand alone as the group that is different, that does not believe in a divine, a higher power. As the

unknown, atheists then become members of the “out group,” and are therefore untrustworthy (Gervais, Shariff, & Ara, 2011).

Gregory, Pomerantz, Pettibone, and Segrist (2008) found that atheists were the least likely to be chosen by individuals as potential psychologists for therapy. Even when additional humanizing information was added about the person being evaluated, the atheist still ranked at the bottom, though not quite as low as the atheist without humanizing factors (Swan & Heesacker, 2012). Humanizing factors such as years of college, hobbies, and job search difficulties all seemed to influence the score, but not enough to compensate for the fact that the subject was an atheist.

Swan and Heesacker (2012) also investigated the possibility that it is not necessarily the idea of non-belief that causes the anti-atheist bias, but rather negative emotional response to the word “atheist”. Participants were presented with vignettes describing “Jordan,” in which only the words used to describe the religious status of Jordan were manipulated. Jordan was described as “atheist” or as having “no belief in God.” Both the ‘atheist Jordan’ and the ‘no belief in God Jordan’ were rated the same, and both were rated significantly below the “religious Jordan.” The results indicated that negativity occurs in relation to “non-belief” and not simply as a reaction to the word or label “atheist.”

The above research suggests an anti-atheist bias in the United States. But how deep does that bias go? Edgell et. al. (2006) explored public and private trust by asking participants to agree or disagree with such statements as *“This group does not at all agree with my vision of American Society,”* and *“I would disapprove if my child wanted to marry a member of this group.”* When atheists were the group named in the statement, 39.6% of the respondents agreed.

In addition 47.6% stated they did not want their child to marry an atheist. By comparison, when the group named was Muslim, the numbers were 26.3% and 33.5%, respectively. It was also found that older individuals, males, less educated individuals, those with less educated fathers, those with stronger religiosity, and African Americans were significantly more negative about atheists.

Further research is needed to continue to understand the nature and extent of anti-atheism bias. In order to understand some aspects of this bias, the present study investigates whether a job candidate's implied non-belief on a resume affects participants' assessment of hireability and source credibility including its elements of trustworthiness, expertise and attractiveness.

Hypothesis 1: Atheists will be rated as significantly less hireable on a hireability question set.

Hypothesis 2: Atheists will also receive significantly lower Source Credibility Scale ratings including lower scores on each of its three domains of attractiveness, expertise, and trustworthiness.

METHODS

Participants

Participants for this study were college students from the University of Central Florida. All participants were 18 years of age or older, and were recruited through the university's SONA system. Participating in this study were 47 males and 100 females who ranged in age from 18 to 63 with an average age of 22.40 ($SD = 8.52$). The sample was comprised of the following: 105 (71.42%); White/Caucasian, 6 (4.08%); Black/African American, 4 (2.72%); Asian American, 26 (17.68); Hispanic/Latino, 6 (3.40%); Arabic/Middle Eastern. In the sample were 64 freshmen, 17 sophomores, 33 juniors, and 26 seniors and 7 non-degree seeking. The participants' majors included: 41 psychology majors, 15 biology, 12 business, 7 communication, 4 communicative disorder, 2 computer science, 2 education, 1 legal studies, 38 other.

Religious affiliation was reported by participants as follows: Agnostic, 14 (9.52%); Atheist, 10 (6.8%), Baptist, 1 (.68%), Buddhist, 1 (.68%); Catholic, 19 (12.93%); Christian, 46 (31.29%); Episcopalian, 1 (.68%); Jehovah's Witness, 1 (.68%); Judaism, 7 (4.76%); Lutheran, 6 (4.08%); Methodist, 1 (.68%); Muslim, 1 (.68%); Non-denominational Christian, 14 (9.52%); Personal Belief in Higher Power, no organized religion, 8 (5.44%); Presbyterian, 4 (2.72%); Southern Baptist, 2 (1.36%); Spiritual, no organized religion, 3 (2.04%); Undecided, 8 (5.44%).

Materials

Applicant Materials. The applicant materials reviewed by the participants included a picture of the applicant and a résumé. Participants were randomly assigned to review one of five versions of the résumé. In each resume, the "applicant" revealed that he was a coordinator of a

local blood drive. In the control version of the resume, our fictitious applicant, “Ryan” indicates the following: “*Citizens of Florida, Coordinator Annual Blood Drive, 2007-2012.*” The remaining resumes are identical except that the host of the blood drive was manipulated. The group names were changed as follows, *Atheists of Florida, Christians of Florida, Scientologists of Florida, and Muslims of Florida.*

The resume was created from an existing teacher’s resume with all identifying information changed. An existing teacher’s resume was used in order to establish hireability. A picture was included in the applicant materials in order for participants to be able to complete the Attractiveness subscale of the Source-Credibility Scale. All five versions of the resume can be found in Appendix A.

Source-Credibility Scale (Ohanian, 1990). Participants rated the applicant using the Source-Credibility Scale. This scale is comprised of three subscales: Trustworthiness, Expertise, and Attractiveness. Each subscale includes 5 items rated on a seven-point semantic differential with bipolar pairs of adjectives at the endpoints. A sample item from the Trustworthiness subscale is *Dependable--Undependable*, and from the Attractiveness subscale is *Beautiful—Ugly*. The Expertise subscale contains bipolar adjectives such as *Experienced—Inexperienced*. Appendix B contains each of these subscales that comprise the Source-Credibility Scale.

The Source-Credibility Scale was developed in 1990 to rate celebrities on their ability to market products effectively. Strong reliability was evidenced on the subscales with reliability coefficients on Cronbach’s alpha of .8 or higher. The scale was also shown to have strong nomological, convergent and discriminative validity (see Ohanian, 1990). The purpose of the scale was to properly operationalize and measure source credibility with a reliable and valid

measure. The scale was designed to replace single item assessments of attractiveness, expertise and trustworthiness and to be adapted to diverse situations including assessment of political candidates, instructors in educational settings, and expertise, attractiveness and trustworthiness in experimental studies.

Hireability Index (Rudman & Glick, 2001). Hireability is measured in a simple, three question set. It is scored using a 7-point Likert scale (“*not at all likely*” to “*extremely likely*”) and has a high Cronbach’s alpha of .87. The creation of this index is credited to Rudman and Glick, and the index has been used in several subsequent studies by the authors as well other studies using resumes or vignettes to represent a possible employee (Moss-Racusin, Dovidio, Brescoll, Graham, & Handelsman, 2010). The 3-question Hireability Index used in this study is as follows:

1. *How likely would you be to invite the applicant to interview for the teaching position?*
2. *How likely would you be to hire the applicant for the teaching position?*
3. *How likely do you think it is that the applicant was actually hired for the job he applied for?*

Duke University Religion Index (DUREL: Koenig, 2010). Participants’ religious involvement, or religiosity, was assessed with the Duke University Religion Index (DUREL). The DUREL has solid reliability with an intra-class correlation coefficient of .91, and Cronbach’s alpha of 0.91. The scale demonstrates convergent validity with other established measures of religiosity. A sample question on this scale is “My religious beliefs are what really lie behind my whole approach to life.” See Appendix C for this measure.

Manipulation Check Questions. The Manipulation Check Questions can be found in Appendix D, and include basic questions pertaining to each section of the resume. An example

of a distractor question used was "At what school did Ryan receive a Teacher of the Year award?" The manipulation check was included in order to ask the question "For which organization did the applicant organize a blood drive?" This question was incorporated into the study in order to ensure that participants were actually aware of the implied religion of the candidate.

Participant Information Form. The Participant Information Form collected participants' basic demographic information relevant to the study including age, gender and religion. The questionnaire can be found in Appendix E.

Procedure

Participants were recruited through the university's SONA research participation system, and completed the study entirely online. First, the participant was presented with the Explanation of Research. Explanation of Research can be found in Appendix F. After providing informed consent, the participants were asked to carefully review the materials of a job applicant for a teaching position. The materials included the resume and picture of the applicant. Participants were randomly assigned to review one of five versions of the applicant's resume in which only the implied religious beliefs of the candidate differed. Participants were informed that after reviewing the applicant materials, they would be asked to answer questions about what they reviewed. These questions were the manipulation check questions previously described. The participants were informed that they had as much time as needed to answer the questions, and were able to view a copy of the résumé while answering the manipulation check questions. Data from participants who did not correctly answer the question, "For which organization did the

applicant organize a blood drive?" in the manipulation check were eliminated from the study. An inability to successfully answer this question indicated that the participant did not adequately review the applicant materials and did not notice the implied religion of the candidate. Consequently, 7 individuals were eliminated from the data set, leaving the sample described above.

After the manipulation check questions, participants were asked to rate the candidate using the Source-Credibility Scale questions, and a Hireability Scale question set. Lastly, participants were asked to complete a brief demographic questionnaire to provide basic information about themselves including their age and gender, and to complete the DUREL index, a measure of respondent's religiosity.

RESULTS

Each hypothesis was submitted to a multivariate analysis of variance with the five levels of the candidate's religion as the independent variable. The dependent variables were the Hireability Index scores, and the Source-Credibility scale and subscale scores. An alpha level of .05 was applied to all analyses.

Hypothesis 1: Hireability. The first hypothesis that atheists would be rated as significantly less hireable on the Hireability Index was not supported by a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) which revealed no statistically significant differences on hireability ratings across the groups. However, the atheist candidate had the lowest mean on the hireability index, while the "Christian" and "No Religion implied" had the highest means on the hireability index. Table 1 reports the means for the Hireability Index ratings.

Table 1

Participant means and standard deviations for Hireability Index

<i>Implied Religion</i>	<i>Hireability Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
<i>No Religion Identified</i>	17.76	2.28
<i>Atheist</i>	16.67	3.20
<i>Christian</i>	17.73	2.36
<i>Scientologist</i>	17.54	1.99
<i>Muslim</i>	17.24	2.01

Hypothesis 2: Credibility. The second hypothesis, that atheists would have the lowest assessment of their Source Credibility, was partially supported by significant differences on participants' Attractiveness subscale score ratings, $F(1, 146) = 3.35, p < .05$, when the candidate was Muslim ($M = 19.80, SD = 4.63$) compared to when the candidate's resume implied Christian ($M = 16.38, SD = 4.92$), Scientologist ($M = 16.54, SD = 5.87$) or no religion was implied ($M = 16.74, SD = 5.72$). No significant difference existed between the atheist ($M = 17.50, SD = 5.19$) and Muslim attractiveness ratings. (Note that for the Source Credibility Scale and its subscales, the lower the score, the more favorable the rating.) No statistically significant differences were found across the groups on the Source Credibility Expertise and Trustworthy subscales. However, the Christian had the highest mean rating on all of the Source Credibility scores including Trustworthiness, Expertise, Attractiveness subscales and the Overall Source Credibility Score.

No significant differences emerged on any of the demographic variables or the participants' religiosity measured on the DUREL, with the exception of attractiveness ratings between males and female participants, $F(1,146) = 4.15, p < .05$. Male participants rated the candidate as significantly more attractive (Female $M = 17.78, SD = 5.53$; Male $M = 15.54, SD = 5.31$).

Table 2

Participant means and standard deviations for source credibility and sub-scores

Please note the lower the score the more favorable

Implied Religion	Trust Subscale <i>M (SD)</i>	Expert Subscale <i>M (SD)</i>	Attractive Subscale <i>M (SD)</i>	Source Credibility <i>M (SD)</i>
Christian	10.29 (3.48)	9.82 (3.94)	16.38 (4.92)	36.5 (10.47)
Citizen	11.74 (4.96)	11.32 (4.95)	16.74 (5.72)	39.79 (12.98)
Scientologist	10.75 (4.58)	11.38 (4.66)	16.54 (5.87)	38.67 (12.77)
Muslim	11.20 (4.16)	10.88 (3.92)	19.80 (4.63)	41.88 (10.68)
Atheist	10.70 (3.98)	10.86 (4.19)	17.50 (5.19)	39.07 (10.25)

DISCUSSION

The present study explored bias against atheists and other religious minorities. Several previous investigations found that revealing such information in a work setting has negative effects. For example, Gregory (2008) discovered that a therapist was significantly less likely to be selected by a client if they revealed they were an atheist as compared to a Christian therapist, Jewish therapist, Islamic therapist, and a no religion identified therapist. In the present study, difference in relation to the candidate's implied religion emerged in the ratings of attractiveness with the Muslim candidate receiving significantly lower attractiveness ratings than when the candidate was Christian, Scientologist or No Religion Identified. The fact that Attractiveness was the variable that was most influenced by the candidate's religion suggests that religious preferences and religious bias may emerge more strongly in personal rather than business arenas. Exploring the context in which religious bias is mostly to emerge is an area of further research.

While no statistically significant results emerged in relation to the other scale ratings, a trend in the data existed in favor of the Christian candidate who had the strongest means on ratings of hireability, attractiveness, expertise and trustworthiness compared to all other groups. It is also possible that with a larger sample size, the trends in the data could solidify.

Often individuals making hiring decisions do not know the job candidate's actual religion but may infer religion or other demographic information from resume information such as through a candidate's inclusion of membership in "*Atheists of Florida*." Thus, a strength of this study involved introducing the applicant's religion (or lack thereof) in an implied or indirect manner which mirrors the way such information may be assumed by hiring bodies in the real

world. A weakness of this study in its current form was the low participant numbers such that each group had 30 or less participants.

Existing research (Edgell, 2006) suggests that age is a significant factor in relation to religious bias, such that as age increases so does religious bias. To illustrate this point further, in Swan and Heesacker's study, 56.8% of the sample was in-between the ages of 35-64, and the study found that the atheist vignette was evaluated more negatively than the religious vignette or the control vignette. In contrast, the present study contained a majority (76.4%) of participants between the ages of 18-22; one hundred percent of which had some college education or higher. Yet in Swan's study, only 56.3% had some type of college education or above. Edgell (2006) specifically mentions greater age and lower levels of education as factors that result in reporting increased negative bias towards atheists. Future studies could include a larger sample not comprised of college students and with a broader age range.

Johnson, Rowatt and LaBouff (2012) found extensive significance when religious priming was used. In a series of studies, they introduced religious words to the participant before asking them to report their attitudes toward atheists. Participants who had been primed reported colder feelings towards atheists. In contrast, our participants were generally young and educated which reduces bias, and primed in the opposite manner in the sense that this study utilized only implied religious affiliation.

While many factors can and do influence participant responses, it is interesting to note that the data collected illustrated similar trends as previous studies. Out-group versus in-group biases are suggested by the present data, and it would be of benefit to see the data continues to trend towards out-group bias, or in-group favoritism. Future studies could explore that

difference and expound upon it as well as delving deeper into the difference of private vs. public evaluation. The term private trust, as used by Edgell et. al. (2006), was used to categorize trust participants assigned to situations involving personal family matters. Whereas public trust was used to explore how the participants viewed public figures, such as politicians. Edgell separated the two realms to see if trustworthiness would vary according to the public or private group the being evaluated. She discovered that participants rated out group members much more harshly in the matters of private trust. It would be beneficial to see if a teacher qualifies for the realm of public or private trust.

The added dimension of attractiveness that has not been previously explored brought about very interesting results, and should be included in future studies.

APPENDIX A: APPLICANT MATERIALS

Ryan N. Smith 555 Brevard County Way, Cocoa Beach, FL 32922 Cell: 321-555-1212 Email: ryansmith@yahoo.com

Experience: West Shore Junior/Senior High August '09 – Present Melbourne, FL
9th, 10th Grade Social Studies Teacher/Coach

- Teacher of the Year (2010)
- Teach basic Civics and Geography classes using a variety of methods and strategies, including innovative technology software and smart phone apps
- Established and manage a positive learning environment that meets and enhances children's intellectual, emotional, and social needs
- Work as part of a teaching team that focuses on raising math intellect in lower-achieving students in the federally-funded ACE program.
- Co-developed iPad app for Social Sciences programs to include enhanced interactive maps and interactive civics diagrams
- Applied and received Seeds for Schools Grant (\$500)

Melbourne High School August '06 – August '09 Melbourne, FL
10th Grade Social Science Teacher/Coach

- Planned and instructed middle level social science curriculum using a variety of teaching aids, strategies and technological equipment
- Developed and adjusted curriculum to accommodate individual student needs
- Developed and maintained positive relationships with parents that included regular communication regarding their children's academic progress
- Applied and received Seeds for Schools Grant (\$250)

Education: B.S. Social Science Education
3.58 GPA
Florida Atlantic University

Certification: Florida Certification
Middle Grades Social Science (grades 5-9)
High School Social Science (grades 6-12)

Community: Big Brothers and Big Sisters of Central Florida, Big Brother 2006-2012
Citizens of Florida, Coordinator Annual Blood Drive, 2007-2012

References: Available upon request



Ryan N. Smith 555 Brevard County Way, Cocoa Beach, FL 32922 Cell: 321-555-1212 Email: ryansmith@yahoo.com

Experience: West Shore Junior/Senior High August '09 – Present Melbourne, FL
9th, 10th Grade Social Studies Teacher/Coach

- Teacher of the Year (2010)
- Teach basic Civics and Geography classes using a variety of methods and strategies, including innovative technology software and smart phone apps
- Established and manage a positive learning environment that meets and enhances children's intellectual, emotional, and social needs
- Work as part of a teaching team that focuses on raising math intellect in lower-achieving students in the federally-funded ACE program.
- Co-developed iPad app for Social Sciences programs to include enhanced interactive maps and interactive civics diagrams
- Applied and received Seeds for Schools Grant (\$500)

Melbourne High School August '06 – August '09 Melbourne, FL
10th Grade Social Science Teacher/Coach

- Planned and instructed middle level social science curriculum using a variety of teaching aids, strategies and technological equipment
- Developed and adjusted curriculum to accommodate individual student needs
- Developed and maintained positive relationships with parents that included regular communication regarding their children's academic progress
- Applied and received Seeds for Schools Grant (\$250)

Education: B.S. Social Science Education
3.58 GPA
Florida Atlantic University

Certification: Florida Certification
Middle Grades Social Science (grades 5-9)
High School Social Science (grades 6-12)

Community: Big Brothers and Big Sisters of Central Florida, Big Brother 2006-2012
Atheists of Florida, Coordinator Annual Blood Drive, 2007-2012

References: Available upon request



Ryan N. Smith 555 Brevard County Way, Cocoa Beach, FL 32922 Cell: 321-555-1212 Email: ryansmith@yahoo.com

Experience: West Shore Junior/Senior High August '09 – Present Melbourne, FL
9th, 10th Grade Social Studies Teacher/Coach

- Teacher of the Year (2010)
- Teach basic Civics and Geography classes using a variety of methods and strategies, including innovative technology software and smart phone apps
- Established and manage a positive learning environment that meets and enhances children's intellectual, emotional, and social needs
- Work as part of a teaching team that focuses on raising math intellect in lower-achieving students in the federally-funded ACE program.
- Co-developed iPad app for Social Sciences programs to include enhanced interactive maps and interactive civics diagrams
- Applied and received Seeds for Schools Grant (\$500)

Melbourne High School August '06 – August '09 Melbourne, FL
10th Grade Social Science Teacher/Coach

- Planned and instructed middle level social science curriculum using a variety of teaching aids, strategies and technological equipment
- Developed and adjusted curriculum to accommodate individual student needs
- Developed and maintained positive relationships with parents that included regular communication regarding their children's academic progress
- Applied and received Seeds for Schools Grant (\$250)

Education: B.S. Social Science Education
3.58 GPA
Florida Atlantic University

Certification: Florida Certification
Middle Grades Social Science (grades 5-9)
High School Social Science (grades 6-12)

Community: Big Brothers and Big Sisters of Central Florida, Big Brother 2006-2012
Christians of Florida, Coordinator Annual Blood Drive, 2007-2012

References: Available upon request



Ryan N. Smith 555 Brevard County Way, Cocoa Beach, FL 32922 Cell: 321-555-1212 Email: ryansmith@yahoo.com

Experience: West Shore Junior/Senior High August '09 – Present Melbourne, FL
9th, 10th Grade Social Studies Teacher/Coach

- Teacher of the Year (2010)
- Teach basic Civics and Geography classes using a variety of methods and strategies, including innovative technology software and smart phone apps
- Established and manage a positive learning environment that meets and enhances children's intellectual, emotional, and social needs
- Work as part of a teaching team that focuses on raising math intellect in lower-achieving students in the federally-funded ACE program.
- Co-developed iPad app for Social Sciences programs to include enhanced interactive maps and interactive civics diagrams
- Applied and received Seeds for Schools Grant (\$500)

Melbourne High School August '06 – August '09 Melbourne, FL
10th Grade Social Science Teacher/Coach

- Planned and instructed middle level social science curriculum using a variety of teaching aids, strategies and technological equipment
- Developed and adjusted curriculum to accommodate individual student needs
- Developed and maintained positive relationships with parents that included regular communication regarding their children's academic progress
- Applied and received Seeds for Schools Grant (\$250)

Education: B.S. Social Science Education
3.58 GPA
Florida Atlantic University

Certification: Florida Certification
Middle Grades Social Science (grades 5-9)
High School Social Science (grades 6-12)

Community: Big Brothers and Big Sisters of Central Florida, Big Brother 2006-2012
Scientologists of Florida, Coordinator Annual Blood Drive, 2007-2012

References: Available upon request



Ryan N. Smith 555 Brevard County Way, Cocoa Beach, FL 32922 Cell: 321-555-1212 Email: ryansmith@yahoo.com

Experience: West Shore Junior/Senior High August '09 – Present Melbourne, FL
9th, 10th Grade Social Studies Teacher/Coach

- Teacher of the Year (2010)
- Teach basic Civics and Geography classes using a variety of methods and strategies, including innovative technology software and smart phone apps
- Established and manage a positive learning environment that meets and enhances children's intellectual, emotional, and social needs
- Work as part of a teaching team that focuses on raising math intellect in lower-achieving students in the federally-funded ACE program.
- Co-developed iPad app for Social Sciences programs to include enhanced interactive maps and interactive civics diagrams
- Applied and received Seeds for Schools Grant (\$500)

Melbourne High School August '06 – August '09 Melbourne, FL
10th Grade Social Science Teacher/Coach

- Planned and instructed middle level social science curriculum using a variety of teaching aids, strategies and technological equipment
- Developed and adjusted curriculum to accommodate individual student needs
- Developed and maintained positive relationships with parents that included regular communication regarding their children's academic progress
- Applied and received Seeds for Schools Grant (\$250)

Education: B.S. Social Science Education
3.58 GPA
Florida Atlantic University

Certification: Florida Certification
Middle Grades Social Science (grades 5-9)
High School Social Science (grades 6-12)

Community: Big Brothers and Big Sisters of Central Florida, Big Brother 2006-2012
Muslims of Florida, Coordinator Annual Blood Drive, 2007-2012

References: Available upon request



APPENDIX B: SOURCE CREDIBILITY SCALE

<u>Source Credibility Scale</u>		
<u>Trustworthiness</u>	<u>Expertise</u>	<u>Attractiveness</u>
Dependable—Undependable	Expert—Not an expert	Attractive -- Unattractive
Honest—Dishonest	Experienced—Inexperienced	Classy -- Not Classy
Reliable—Unreliable	Knowledgeable— Unknowledgeable	Beautiful -- Ugly
Sincere—Insincere	Qualified—Unqualified	Elegant – Plain
Trustworthy—Untrustworthy	Skilled -- Unskilled	Sexy -- Not Sexy

APPENDIX C: DUKE UNIVERSITY RELIGION INDEX

Duke University Religion Index (DUREL)

Please note, subscale 1 is question 1. Subscale 2 is question 2. Subscale 3 is questions 3,4, and 5.

Questions:

1. How often do you attend church or other religious meetings?
 - a. Never
 - b. Once a year or less
 - c. A few times a year
 - d. A few times a month
 - e. Once a week
 - f. More than once a week
2. How often do you spend time in private religious activities, such as prayer, meditation, or study of holy writings (i.e. Bible)?
 - a. Rarely or never
 - b. A few times a month
 - c. Once a week
 - d. Two or more times/week
 - e. Daily
 - f. More than once a day
3. In my life, I experience the presence of the Divine
 - a. Definitely not true
 - b. Tends not to be true
 - c. Unsure
 - d. Tends to be true
 - e. Definite true of me
4. My religious beliefs are what really lie behind my whole approach to life
 - a. Definitely not true
 - b. Tends not to be true
 - c. Unsure
 - d. Tends to be true
 - e. Definitely true of me
5. I try hard to carry my religion over into all other dealings in life
 - a. Definitely not true
 - b. Tends not to be true
 - c. Unsure
 - d. Tends to be true
 - e. Definitely true of me

APPENDIX D: MANIPULATION CHECK QUESTIONS

1. How many schools are listed under the applicant's Experience section?
 - a. 1
 - b. 2
 - c. 3
 - d. 4
 - e. 5
2. Where did Ryan graduate college?
 - a. University of Central Florida
 - b. Florida Atlantic University
 - c. Florida State University
 - d. University of Miami
 - e. University of North Florida
3. Ryan developed an iPad app for use in the classroom.
 - a. True
 - b. False
4. For which organization did the applicant organize a blood drive?
 - a. Citizens of Florida
 - b. Atheists of Florida
 - c. Scientologists of Florida
 - d. Christians of Florida
 - e. Muslims of Florida
5. At what school did Ryan receive a Teacher of the Year award?
 - a. Melbourne High School
 - b. Cocoa Beach Junior/Senior High School
 - c. West Shore Junior/Senior High School
 - d. Palm Bay High School
 - e. Eau Gallie High School

APPENDIX E: DEMOGRAPHICS FORM

What is your age (please provide a number)? _____years

What is your gender?

Male

Female

Transgender MTF

Transgender FTM

Other

What is your race/ethnicity?

American Indian/ Native American

Black / African American

Chinese / Japanese / Asian decent

Hispanic / Latino

Arabic / Middle Eastern

Pacific Islander

White / Caucasian

Other

What do you consider your religious affiliation to be? (Dropdown menu choice)

Christian, Non-denominational Christian, Judaism, Muslim, Protestant, Southern Baptist, Baptist, Lutheran, Episcopalian, Universal Unitarian, Methodist, Catholic, Latter Day Saints, Pentecostal, Presbyterian, Buddhist, Hindu, Sikhist, Native American, Wiccan, Pagan, Satanist, Assembly of God, Jehovah's Witness, Seventh Day Adventist, Church of Christ, Church of God, Atheist, Agnostic, Spiritual, no organized religion; Personal Belief in a higher power, no organized religion, Undecided

What is your major?

Biology

Business

Communication

Communicative Disorders

Computer Science

Education

English

Engineering

History

Legal Studies

Political Science

Psychology

Sociology

Other: _____

What year in college are you?

Freshman

Sophomore

Junior

Senior

Other

What is your marital status?

Single now and never married

Living with a significant other

Married

Separated/Divorced

Widowed

What are your current living arrangements?

On campus

Off campus, with friends, roommate or by yourself

Off campus, with parents

Off campus, with significant other, husband and/or your children

Do you have children? Yes No

APPENDIX F: EXPLANATION OF RESEARCH



EXPLANATION OF RESEARCH

Title of Project: Exploring Bias Against Atheists

Principal Investigator: Karen Mottarella, Psy.D.

Other Investigators: Raina Leckie, Shannon Whitten, Ph.D.

You are being invited to take part in a research study. Whether you take part is up to you.

- The purpose of this research is to examine how job candidate's application materials are evaluated.
- Individuals participating in this study will be asked to review application materials of a job candidate and provide your evaluation of the applicant through a series of questionnaires.
- Please be advised that you do not have to answer every question. You are free to skip questions or tasks.
- However, if you decide to withdraw your participation or do not complete the study, you will not receive SONA credit for your participation and your responses will not be included for analysis.
- The study is administered entirely online and can be completed from any location that provides you with internet access.
- We expect your participation in this study to take approximately 45 minutes.

You must be 18 years of age or older to take part in this research study.

Study contact for questions about the study or to report a problem: If you have questions, concerns, or complaints, or think the research has hurt you, talk to Dr. Karen Mottarella, Building 3 Room 226, Psychology Department, and University of Central Florida Palm Bay Campus. Dr. Mottarella can be reached by phone at 321-433-7987 or by email at Karen.mottarella@ucf.edu

IRB contact about your rights in the study or to report a complaint: Research at the University of Central Florida involving human participants is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board (UCF IRB). This research has been reviewed and approved by the IRB. For information about the rights of people who take part in research, please contact: Institutional Review Board, University of Central Florida, Office of Research & Commercialization, 12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501, Orlando, FL 32826-3246 or by telephone at (407) 823-2901.

APPENDIX G: IRB APPROVAL FORM



University of Central Florida Institutional Review Board
Office of Research & Commercialization
12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501
Orlando, Florida 32826-3246
Telephone: 407-823-2901 or 407-882-2276
www.research.ucf.edu/compliance/irb.html

Approval of Exempt Human Research

From: UCF Institutional Review Board #1
FWA00000351, IRB00001138

To: Karen E. Mottarella and Co-PIs: Raina D. Leckie, Shannon N. Whitten

Date: December 18, 2012

Dear Researcher:

On 12/18/2012, the IRB approved the following activity as human participant research that is exempt from regulation:

Type of Review: Exempt Determination
Project Title: Exploring Bias Against Atheists
Investigator: Karen E. Mottarella
IRB Number: SBE-12-08917
Funding Agency:
Grant Title:
Research ID: N/A

This determination applies only to the activities described in the IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are made and there are questions about whether these changes affect the exempt status of the human research, please contact the IRB. When you have completed your research, please submit a Study Closure request in iRIS so that IRB records will be accurate.

In the conduct of this research, you are responsible to follow the requirements of the Investigator Manual.

On behalf of Sophia Dziegielewski, Ph.D., L.C.S.W., UCF IRB Chair, this letter is signed by:

Signature applied by Joanne Muratori on 12/18/2012 01:09:15 PM EST

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads 'Joanne Muratori'.

IRB Coordinator

REFERENCES

- Edgell, P., Gerteis, J., & Hartmann, D. (2006). Atheists as "other": Moral boundaries and cultural membership in American society. *American Sociological Review*, *71*, 211-234. doi: 10.1177/000312240607100203
- Gervais, W. M., Shariff, A. F., & Ara, N. (2011). Do you believe in atheists? Distrust is central to anti-atheist prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *101*(6), 1189-1206. doi: 10.1037/a0025882
- Gregory, C., Pomerantz, A., Pettibone, J., & Segrist, D. (2008). The effect of psychologists' disclosure of personal religious background on prospective clients. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*, *11*(4), 369-373. doi: 10.1080/13674670701438739
- Johnson, M. K., Rowatt, W. C., & LaBouff, J. P. (2012). Religiosity and prejudice revisited: In-group favoritism, out-group derogation, or both? *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, *4*, 154-168. doi: 10.1037/a0025107
- Koenig, H. G., & Bussing, A. (2010, December 1). The Duke University Religion Index (DUREL): A five item measure for use in epidemiological studies. *Religions*. doi: 10.3390/rel1010078
- Moss-Racusin, C. A., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Graham, M. J., & Handelsman, J. (2010). Science faculty's subtle gender biases favor male students. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1211286109

- Ohanian, R. (1990). Construction and validation of a scale to measure celebrity endorsers' perceived expertise, trustworthiness, and attractiveness. *Journal of Advertising*, 19(3), 39-52.
- Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2001). Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward agentic women. *Journal Of Social Issues*, 57(4), 743-762. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00239
- Swan, L. K., & Heesacker, M. (2012). Anti-Atheist bias in the United States: Testing two critical assumptions. *Secularism & Nonreligion*, 1, 32-42. Retrieved November 1, 2012, from <http://secularismandnonreligion.org>