

ABSTRACT

Moral Licensing: The Effects of Religious Priming on Moral Behavior

Madeline Elaine Pettit

Director: Jo-Ann C. Tsang, Ph.D.

The present study examines the role of religious priming in moral licensing behavior. We included 582 undergraduate students from a private, religious university. There were four conditions: a control condition, a moral behavior neutral reading condition, a moral behavior punishment condition, and a moral behavior love condition. Moral behavior was manipulated by having some of the participants write about a personal moral behavior they recently did, whereas those in the control condition wrote about what a typical day looks like for them. Additionally, participants in the religious punishment prime condition viewed a Bible passage describing the wrath of God, whereas participants in the religious love condition viewed a Bible passage about God's love and kindness. Participants in the neutral reading condition viewed a passage about making bread. Participants completed a money allocation task as a measure of moral behavior. Writing about a previous moral behavior had a significant effect on the money allocation task; however, the direction was opposite of predictions, indicating moral consistency rather than moral licensing. Participants in the control condition donated significantly less money than participants in the moral behavior neutral reading and moral behavior punishment conditions. More research is needed to study potential moderating effects on moral behavior. There is a need for more research on potential contributing factors to moral licensing as opposed to moral consistency effects.

APPROVED BY DIRECTOR OF HONORS THESIS:

Dr. Jo-Ann C. Tsang, Department of Psychology and Neuroscience

APPROVED BY THE HONORS PROGRAM:

Dr. Andrew Wisely, Interim Director

DATE: _____

MORAL LICENSING:
THE EFFECTS OF RELIGIOUS PRIMING ON MORAL BEHAVIOR

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of
Baylor University
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Honors Program

By
Madeline Elaine Pettit

Waco, Texas

April 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	iii
Acknowledgments.....	iv
Chapter One	1
Introduction.....	1
Chapter Two.....	6
Method and Materials	6
Chapter Three.....	11
Results.....	11
Chapter Four	16
Discussion.....	16
Appendices.....	22
Appendix A: Preregistration Form.....	23
Appendix B: Qualtrics Survey	28
References.....	54

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Monetary Donation in U.S. Dollars as a Function of Condition.....	11
Table 2: Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations with Confidence Intervals.....	12
Table 3: One-Way Analysis of Variance of Money Allocation.....	13
Table 4: Descriptive Statistics for Individual Differences Measures.....	15

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my director, Dr. Jo-Ann Tsang. Thank you for your continued support and guidance. I truly appreciate your kindness and mentorship in the classroom, in the research lab, and throughout this project so much. I am so blessed to have been able to work with you as my director.

Thank you also to Marah Al-Kire, who spent countless hours with me analyzing data and helping me through difficult statistical issues. Thank you for your patience and willingness to support me; you have been a source of encouragement and guidance ever since you were my TA for Research Methods during my sophomore year.

I would also like to thank Eran Levy for helping me to “convert ideas into visual conversations” for my thesis defense.

Finally, thank you to my friends and family, who have listened to me discuss my project and helped me however they could. Thank you especially to my father, David Pettit, who took the time to help me with some challenging technological parts of the project.

I appreciate each and every person who has helped me accomplish this task over the past couple of years.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Moral licensing is a phenomenon that occurs when people behave in a moral way and subsequently become more likely to behave immorally because they feel as though they have earned the right or fulfilled their moral duty for the time period (Mullen & Monin, 2016). Several researchers have studied the effects of moral licensing and the conditions in which it is more likely to occur (Aquino & Reed, 2002; Blanken et al., 2015; Conway & Peetz, 2012; Mullen & Monin, 2016). Below, I review the research on moral licensing and discuss factors that affect the likelihood of moral licensing.

There is some question as to whether moral licensing literature contradicts with literature regarding moral consistency. Moral consistency is the idea that people tend to behave according to their moral standards in a consistent manner (Mullen & Monin, 2016). In other words, doing a moral act should not lead to an immoral act. Mullen and Monin (2016) explored this concept. They found that both moral consistency and moral licensing can take place depending on the conditions. When participants focused on their moral values related to their behavior, they tended to exhibit moral consistency. On the other hand, when participants thought more concretely about their actions, they were more likely to exhibit moral licensing (Mullen & Monin, 2016). Conway and Peetz (2012) found a similar distinction in their study; when participants recalled moral traits, they were more likely to display moral consistency, and when they recalled moral actions, they were more likely to display moral licensing. A potential explanation for this

phenomenon is that when people recall their moral traits, they think about their moral identity and want to behave consistently with it. On the other hand, when people recall a specific action, they feel as though they are already progressing toward a goal of morality and do not have to try as hard to be moral for the following time period (Conway & Peetz, 2012). However, a meta-analysis was conducted in order to examine various moral licensing studies. The meta-analysis did not find a difference in the moral licensing effect size when participants recalled moral traits compared to actions (Blanken et al., 2015). Because of these inconsistencies in the literature, more research is needed to determine potential moderators for the findings.

It is possible that participants' moral identities affect their tendency to become licensed in their moral behavior. According to Aquino and Reed (2002), moral identity is "a self-conception organized around a set of moral traits" (p. 1424). The self-conception may include people's beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors and relates to social identity. People may seek out behaviors that align with their moral identity. Moral identity is relevant in participants' moral cognition and behavior, so it has the potential to affect their responses in moral licensing studies (Aquino & Reed, 2002).

In addition to research regarding moral licensing and moral consistency, other research has focused on the effects of religious priming on moral behavior. For example, Carpenter and Marshall (2009) studied the effects of religious priming on moral hypocrisy, which is the concept of attempting to appear to be moral without actually behaving in a moral manner. They found that participants who received a religious prime before a moral task were less likely to behave in a morally hypocritical way than participants without that prime (Carpenter & Marshall, 2009). In other words, the

religious prime condition resulted in more moral behavior than the condition without the religious prime.

Additional research by DeBono et al. (2016) expanded on the understanding of the role of religious priming in moral behavior. They studied potential differences between various types of religious priming. In their study, the researchers noted that different studies regarding religiosity and moral behavior have yielded seemingly inconsistent results. While some studies show that religious priming decreased immoral behavior, others showed that it had no effect on moral behavior. Others even showed that it increased moral behavior. DeBono et al. (2016) stated that these inconsistent results could be due to treating religion as a “monolithic whole, rather than examining the specific mechanisms of religions that are associated with prosocial and antisocial behavior” (p. 1). Therefore, in their study, they looked at different ways to prime religion to determine if they affected the results. Specifically, they utilized religious primes depicting God as forgiving versus primes depicting God as punishing. They found that participants in the Forgiving God condition behaved less morally than participants in the Punishing God condition (DeBono et al., 2016). These results could be due to participants in the Forgiving God condition feeling less afraid of God than participants in the Punishing God condition and therefore less likely to behave appropriately. Similarly, Shariff and Norenzayan (2011) found that participants who thought of God as angry and punishing were less likely to cheat in a task than participants who thought of God as loving and compassionate. They stated that the fear of supernatural punishment may contribute to moral behavior.

While the previous literature regarding religious priming specifically focused on moral hypocrisy, it is possible that the same mechanisms can apply in studies regarding moral licensing. For example, the supernatural watcher hypothesis suggests that the thought of being watched by God contributes to moral behavior, and religious priming may make the concept of a supernatural watcher more salient (Shariff & Norenzayan, 2007). Furthermore, religious priming may increase one's own self-awareness and contribute to moral behavior with a function similar to a mirror (Batson et al., 1999). In both cases, there could be a difference between what the participant believes to be right and what may seem personally beneficial to them at the time.

Their behaviors and responses to religious priming may also be moderated by their God concepts, as measured by the LAMBI (Limitless, Authoritarian, Mystical, Benevolent, and Ineffable) scale (Johnson et al., 2019). These concepts are various ways that people may view God, and they potentially affect moral behavior by shaping the reasons that people behave a certain way. For example, someone who has an Authoritarian God concept may fear God more than someone with a Benevolent God concept, which may affect their moral behavior. More research is needed to study the effects of various types of religious priming on moral licensing.

This study attempts to address the gap in the current literature regarding religious priming and moral licensing. In the same way that religious priming affected moral hypocrisy, it might also reduce moral licensing, possibly because of the supernatural watcher hypothesis, self-awareness, and individual God concept. In addition, it investigates the effects of the type of religious priming on moral behavior. It is possible that one type of religious prime, God as forgiving, may increase moral licensing, while

another type, God as punishing, may decrease it. This study includes four conditions to test this phenomenon; they are the control condition, moral behavior punishment condition, moral behavior love condition, and moral behavior neutral condition. We predicted that participants in the moral behavior neutral condition would donate less money than participants in the control condition due to moral licensing effects. Furthermore, we predicted that priming a forgiving God concept would increase moral licensing effects compared to the moral behavior neutral condition, while priming a punishing God concept would decrease moral licensing effects compared to the moral behavior neutral condition.

CHAPTER TWO

Method and Materials

Participants

A total of 582 undergraduate students from a private, religious university participated in the online Qualtrics study (415 women, 167 men, $M_{age} = 18.88$ years, age range: 18-30 years). We determined the sample size from a meta-analysis, which suggests 165 participants per condition due to the typical effect sizes of moral licensing studies (Blanken et al., 2015). We added 10% of 165 per condition to account for suspicion and missed manipulation checks, aiming for 182 participants per condition. Possibly due to the COVID-19 pandemic, data collection was slower than expected, and we did not meet this participant goal. The participants' ethnic breakdown was 60.65% Caucasian/White, 15.12% Asian/Pacific Islander, 13.74% Hispanic, 6.70% African American/Black, 0.52% Native American, and 2.75% Other; 0.52% of participants did not specify an ethnicity. Participants indicated religious affiliations; they were 61.68% Protestant, 19.07% Catholic, 7.56% Other, 6.88% Agnostic, 3.44% None, and 1.37% Atheist. The study was preregistered on OSF, <https://osf.io/bnfus>. We report all conditions, analyses, and variables associated with our preregistered hypotheses. Additional measured variables are listed in the preregistration document.

Measures

Participants were divided into four conditions: a control condition, a moral behavior neutral reading condition, a moral behavior punishment condition, and a moral

behavior love condition. Participants were randomly assigned to engage in one of two moral licensing tasks, modified from Conway and Peetz (2012). Instructions for the moral task were,

Describe a time in the past week that you felt especially righteous or honorable. Perhaps you were loyal to a friend, were generous when you could have been selfish, were kind to someone for no particular reason, or caring toward someone who needed you. Please spend about 5-10 minutes on this task.

Participants assigned to the control condition received the following instructions: “Please describe your classes and what a typical day looks like for you.”

Participants in the moral task condition were further assigned to one of three God concept priming conditions: The Love Condition, the Punishment Condition, and the Neutral Condition. Participants in the Love Condition read James 3:17 and received instructions that said,

Please read the following passage in the Bible. We want you to really think about what the passage means to you and how it applies to your belief in God. We especially want you to think about how God is eternally forgiving. After you absorb the passage, we would like you to write about the passage for 5-10 minutes. Write about your interpretation of the Bible passage and how it conveys God as always compassionate and forgiving (modified from DeBono et al., 2017).

James 3:17 reads, “But the wisdom from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, open to reason, full of mercy and good fruits, impartial and sincere.”

Participants in the Punishment Condition read Deuteronomy 29:20. Instructions stated,

Please read the following passage in the Bible. We want you to really think about what this passage means to you and how it applies to your belief in God. We especially want you to think about how God is eternally punishing. After you absorb the passage, we would like you to write about the passage for 5-10 minutes. Write about your interpretation of the Bible passage and how it conveys God as always vengeful and punishing (modified from DeBono et al., 2017).

Deuteronomy 29:20 reads, “The LORD will not be willing to forgive him, but rather the anger of the LORD and his jealousy will smoke against that man, and the curses written

in this book will settle upon him, and the LORD will blot out his name from under heaven.”

Finally, in the Neutral Condition, participants read a passage about making bread. The instructions said, “Please read the following passage about making bread. After you read it, please write your thoughts about the passage for 5-10 minutes.” The passage read,

In order to make bread, you will need several ingredients. Homemade bread requires yeast, flour, sugar, water, oil, and salt. Once the ingredients are mixed, knead the dough, let it rise, and shape it. Let the dough rise one more time, and then it will be ready to bake.

Participants in all conditions were then presented with the main dependent variable, which was participants’ moral behavior, measured using a money allocation task. Participants received instructions telling them that, because of their participation in the study, they were being entered into a \$50 prize drawing. The instructions asked participants to identify how much prize money they would be willing to donate to the Ronald McDonald House Charities if they won the drawing. Instructions read:

To thank you for participating in this study, you will be entered into a drawing for a \$50 gift card. Please indicate whether, if you win, you would like to donate any of your potential earnings to the Ronald McDonald House, which provides a safe and welcoming place for families to stay while their children are receiving treatment at the hospital. It allows families who may live far from the hospital to remain close to their children. Donations help the Ronald McDonald House to stay in operation, and they also go toward food for the families. If you choose to donate, please state how much you would like to give if you were to win the drawing prize.

There was a slider for participants to select the amount they would be willing to donate.

Participants were then presented with several individual differences scales, including the Moral Identity Scale (Aquino & Reed, 2002). This scale measures how important to their identities people consider their morality to be. The instructions read:

Listed alphabetically below are some characteristics that might describe a person: Caring, Compassionate, Fair, Friendly, Generous, Hardworking, Helpful, Honest, Kind. The person with these characteristics could be you or it could be someone else. For a moment, visualize in your mind the kind of person who has these characteristics. Imagine how that person would think, feel, and act. When you have a clear image of what this person would be like, answer the following questions (Aquino & Reed, 2002).

Participants responded to statements such as, “It would make me feel good to be a person who has these characteristics,” “Having these characteristics is not really important to me,” and “I am actively involved in activities that communicate to others that I have these characteristics” (Aquino & Reed, 2002). The measure had a 7-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (*completely disagree*) to 7 (*completely agree*). The reliability was very good, $\alpha = .80$.

Participants took the Limitless, Authoritarian, Mystical, Benevolent, and Ineffable (LAMBI) Scale to measure their concepts of God (Johnson et al., 2019). The scale had very good reliabilities, with Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for different concepts ranging from $\alpha = .88$ to $\alpha = .92$. Each subscale measures how closely participants consider the given concept to align with their view of God. Example items on the scale are, “merciful,” “commanding,” and “boundless” (Johnson et al., 2019). The measure has a 7-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*).

Finally, participants took two measures assessing their responses to the COVID-19 pandemic; they were the Coronavirus Impacts Questionnaire and the Perceived Coronavirus Threat Questionnaire (Conway et al., 2020). The Coronavirus Impacts Questionnaire had a good reliability of $\alpha = .78$, and the Perceived Coronavirus Threat Questionnaire had a good reliability of $\alpha = .77$. Instructions before the measures read, “This next set of questions asks you about your experience with COVID-19.” An

example item from the Coronavirus Impacts Questionnaire is, “It has been difficult for me to get the things I need due to the Coronavirus (COVID-19).” An item from the Perceived Coronavirus Threat Questionnaire reads, “I am worried that I or people I love will get sick from the Coronavirus (COVID-19).” Participants answered both scales on a 7-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (*Not True of Me At All*) to 7 (*Very True of Me*).

Procedure

Participants were recruited from the psychology and neuroscience department subject pool via SONA Systems. The online survey contained an online informed consent, the priming passages, the money allocation task, individual differences measures, and a demographics form. The survey ended with a debriefing form explaining the purpose of the study. Overall, completing the survey took participants less than an hour on average. Because the survey did not require participants to come to the laboratory, they could complete the survey wherever they chose. Participants’ names were entered into a \$50 prize drawing and a winner was determined at the end of each semester in which the study was run.

CHAPTER THREE

Results

Participants stated that they would give an average of \$34.66 out of their potential \$50 prize to charity across all conditions, $SD = 17.03$. Answers ranged from \$0.00 to \$50.00.

Four conditions were created to test for the effects of religious priming on moral licensing: a control condition, a moral behavior neutral reading condition, a moral behavior punishment condition, and a moral behavior love condition. See Table 1 for descriptive statistics and Table 2 for correlations between variables.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Monetary Donation in U.S. Dollars as a Function of Condition

Condition	M	M	SD
		95% CI [LL, UL]	
Control	\$31.78	[28.76, 34.79]	17.66
Moral Behavior Neutral Reading	\$36.04	[33.19, 38.89]	16.87
Moral Behavior Love	\$34.69	[31.78, 37.60]	17.18
Moral Behavior Punishment	\$36.07	[33.35, 38.79]	16.22

Note. M and SD represent mean and standard deviation, respectively. LL and UL indicate the lower and upper limits of the 95% confidence interval for the mean, respectively. The confidence interval is a plausible range of population means that could have created a sample mean (Cumming, 2014).

Table 2

Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlations with Confidence Intervals

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4
1. Money Allocation	34.78	16.95				
2. Moral Identity	5.68	0.72	.03 [-.05, .12]			
3. LAMBI - Benevolent	6.12	1.27	.06 [-.02, .14]	.34** [.26, .41]		
4. LAMBI - Authoritarian	4.15	1.54	.01 [-.07, .09]	-.05 [-.13, .03]	-.06 [-.14, .02]	
5. LAMBI - Ineffable	3.56	1.78	-.01 [-.09, .07]	-.15** [-.23, -.07]	-.23** [-.31, -.15]	.38** [.31, .45]
6. LAMBI - Mystical	5.23	1.55	.05 [-.03, .13]	.06 [-.02, .14]	.28** [.21, .36]	.12** [.03, .19]
7. LAMBI - Limitless	6.12	1.24	.07 [-.01, .15]	.22** [.14, .29]	.54** [.47, .59]	.10* [.02, .18]
8. COVID Impacts	3.44	1.23	-.19** [-.26, -.11]	-.06 [-.14, .02]	-.12** [-.20, -.04]	.12** [.04, .20]
9. COVID Threat	3.53	1.28	-.01 [-.09, .08]	-.02 [-.11, .06]	-.12** [-.20, -.04]	-.02 [-.10, .07]

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	5	6	7	8
6. LAMBI - Mystical	5.23	1.55	.14** [.06, .22]			
7. LAMBI - Limitless	6.12	1.24	-.02 [-.10, .06]	.49** [.42, .55]		
8. COVID Impacts	3.44	1.23	.09** [.01, .17]	.04 [-.04, .12]	-.07 [-.15, .01]	
9. COVID Threat	3.53	1.28	.06 [-.02, .14]	.06 [-.02, .14]	-.04 [-.12, .04]	.30** [.22, .37]

Note. *M* and *SD* are used to represent mean and standard deviation, respectively. Values in square brackets indicate the 95% confidence interval for each correlation. The confidence interval is a plausible range of population correlations that could have caused the sample correlation (Cumming, 2014). * indicates $p < .05$. ** indicates $p < .01$.

A one-way ANOVA was performed to compare the differences across the four conditions: There was a nonsignificant effect of condition on the amount of money allocated to the Ronald McDonald House Charities, $F(3, 542) = 1.91, p = .127$. See Table 3 for statistics.

Table 3
One-Way Analysis of Variance of Money Allocation

Source	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between groups	3	1651.25	550.41	1.90	.127
Within groups	542	156310.41	288.39		
Total	545	157961.66			

Planned contrasts showed significant differences between certain conditions. Demonstrating a moral consistency effect, the amount of money allocated was significantly higher in the moral behavior neutral reading condition compared to the control condition, $t(df) = -4.26, p = .039, d = .25$. This finding was inconsistent with moral licensing predictions, which stated that participants in the moral behavior neutral reading condition would allocate less money. Partially consistent with predictions, the amount of money allocated was significantly higher in the moral behavior punishment condition compared to the control condition, $t(df) = -4.30, p = .037, d = .25$. The difference between the moral behavior love condition and the control condition was not significant, $t(df) = -2.92, p = .159, d = .17$. These results demonstrate an effect of the moral writing task in two of the conditions; in the moral behavior neutral reading

condition and the moral behavior punishment condition, participants who wrote about their moral behavior allocated *more* money than participants who did not. Furthermore, while the control condition and the moral behavior punishment condition were significantly different, differences between the control condition and the moral behavior love condition were nonsignificant, showing a potential effect of the punishing religious prime on moral behavior. Significant differences between the religious punishing and religious love conditions were not found.

Moderating effects were tested to see if participants' personal views of God as more loving or punishing affected their moral behavior. Also, moderating effects of moral identity were tested to see if participants with stronger moral identities showed weaker moral licensing effects. Finally, exploratory analyses were run to determine if the impacts or the threat of the COVID-19 pandemic moderated effects. Moderating effects of God concept, moral identity, COVID-19 impacts, and COVID-19 threat were not found, $p > .05$. See Table 4 for descriptive statistics of individual differences measures.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for Individual Differences Measures

Condition	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
		95% CI [LL, UL]	
Moral Identity	4.67	[4.63, 4.72]	0.60
LAMBI – Benevolent	6.10	[5.99, 6.20]	1.28
LAMBI – Authoritarian	4.16	[4.03, 4.28]	1.54
LAMBI – Ineffable	3.56	[3.41, 3.70]	1.77
LAMBI – Mystical	5.22	[5.10, 5.35]	1.56
LAMBI – Limitless	6.10	[6.00, 6.21]	1.25
COVID Impacts	3.28	[3.22, 3.34]	0.72
COVID Threat	3.53	[3.43, 3.64]	1.28

Note. *M* and *SD* represent mean and standard deviation, respectively. *LL* and *UL* indicate the lower and upper limits of the 95% confidence interval for the mean, respectively. The confidence interval is a plausible range of population means that could have created a sample mean (Cumming, 2014).

CHAPTER FOUR

Discussion

The current study was conducted to investigate potential effects of religious priming on moral behavior. Specifically, we tested whether different types of religious priming affected participants' moral behavior differently in a money allocation task. We hypothesized that writing about a recent moral behavior would induce moral licensing in participants. Furthermore, hypotheses stated that participants viewing a loving religious prime, as opposed to a punishing religious prime, would be more morally licensed. There was a significant difference between participants who wrote about a personal moral behavior and those in the control condition, although in the opposite direction predicted. Participants given the moral behavior assignment behaved *more* morally in the money allocation task, indicating moral consistency, rather than moral licensing, effects. There was also a significant difference between the control group and the moral behavior punishing condition. The control group showed less morality in the money allocation task, indicating a possible effect of both writing about a moral behavior and a punishing religious prime on subsequent moral behavior.

Comparisons and Explanations

These findings are inconsistent with previous moral licensing research, as participants demonstrated moral consistency instead of licensing. Research has indicated that when participants recall a previous moral action, they subsequently engage in moral licensing (Conway & Peetz, 2012). However, in the current study, recalling a moral

action led to moral consistency. Mullen and Monin (2016) found that participants who thought about their moral values instead of specific actions demonstrate moral consistency; it is possible that in the current study, the manipulation made participants think of moral values. Additionally, although Aquino and Reed (2002) found that moral identity may affect moral licensing effects, moral identity did not significantly moderate the effects in the current study.

Previous research has demonstrated mixed findings in regard to the effects of religious priming. Although this research focused on moral hypocrisy as opposed to moral licensing, it is useful in understanding current results. Consistent with research from Carpenter and Marshall (2009), participants who viewed a religious prime behaved more morally than participants who did not. However, this pattern of results in our study was only found for participants in the religious punishing condition, not the religious love condition. Unlike DeBono et al. (2016), we did not find significant differences between the religious punishing and religious love conditions. Our finding is consistent with Yilmaz and Bahçekapili (2016), who found that participants primed with a punishing God concept, but not with a neutral or non-punishing God concept, demonstrated an increase in cooperation. Their findings supported the supernatural punishment hypothesis, which states that the threat of punishment by a supernatural being contributes to prosocial behavior. Similarly, the findings showed punishment as a means to societal cooperation (Yilmaz et al., 2016). The results also supported the supernatural watcher hypothesis (Shariff & Norenzayan, 2007). We analyzed participants' God concepts to test for moderation, but we did not find significant results.

Limitations and Strengths

The research has several potential limitations. First, it is possible that including the money allocation task as a measure of morality was a limitation. Because the task was hypothetical and distant, as opposed to immediate, participants may not have responded in the same way as they would have if they were in actual possession of the money. Participants were offered a chance to win a \$50 prize, but they did not have the \$50 while they completed the survey. It is possible that it did not feel very realistic to all participants, thus skewing the results; participants may be more likely to donate money in a hypothetical way than if they had the money in hand.

Furthermore, manipulation checks were not included after the religious primes. Without a statistical analysis of the religious primes, it is impossible to be certain that the manipulations were successful. A manipulation check where participants rated how forgiving or punishing God was in the passage they read would have been beneficial to the study.

The study also had a smaller sample size than expected. The small sample size likely reduced power; moral licensing studies already tend to have small-to-medium effect sizes (Blanken et al., 2015). With a larger sample size, it is possible that additional significant effects would have been found.

Additionally, the findings may not generalize to a broad population. The study was conducted at a small, private, religious university, so variability of socioeconomic class and religiosity was limited. Participants also came from a western, educated, industrialized, rich, and democratic (WEIRD) population, which limits generalizability to other populations (Henrich et al., 2010). Because the study focused on religiosity and

morality, having a highly religious sample may have contributed to inconsistencies with previous research, as participants may have been especially sensitive to religious primes. Also, because participants were all undergraduate students, the age range was limited.

Finally, it is possible that the COVID-19 pandemic affected the results of the study. Because a money allocation task was used as a measure of morality, participants' responses may have been affected by the financial impacts of the pandemic. While some participants may have been more likely to give because of the great need for charity during the pandemic, other participants who were financially struggling at the time of completing the study may have been less likely to donate. However, analyses suggested that effects were not moderated by measures of COVID impacts or threat (Conway et al., 2020), suggesting that the pandemic may not have impacted the results in systematic ways.

Despite the limitations of this research, the current study is beneficial in light of inconsistent findings in previous research. We included several individual differences measures after the money allocation task in order to analyze potential moderating effects. Additionally, because the research was conducted during a global pandemic, it may contribute to understanding human behavior during crises. Finally, this study was beneficial in testing whether the same mechanisms active in religious primes for moral hypocrisy studies are relevant in moral licensing studies as well. In previous studies, the Bible passages used in the current research were used to study moral hypocrisy, not moral licensing, so results can be compared. It is important to see if the same religious primes have similar effects in different constructs relevant to morality.

Future Research

Future research is needed to understand the mechanisms that contribute to both moral licensing and moral consistency. Because of inconsistent results, further studies should be done, specifically utilizing additional potential moderating variables. For example, research could be conducted on the potential effects of participants' relationships with their parents on moral behavior (dos Santos et al., 2020). Furthermore, it would be useful to conduct a study utilizing a direct and immediate, rather than hypothetical and distant, money allocation task. Doing so may produce different results, and it would shed light on which specific behaviors are more prone to moral licensing effects. The use of a behavioral measure where participants receive money upon completion of their respective condition tasks and are provided with an immediate opportunity to donate those funds might be more sensitive to moral licensing effects. Additionally, further research is needed to analyze the effects of different types of religious priming on moral behavior. Again, because of inconsistencies in the findings, both previous and current research indicate that it is necessary to determine what mechanisms contribute to the effects. While inconsistent with part of the conclusions of Debono et al. (2016) as mentioned above, this research is still consistent with their finding that a punishing God prime increases prosocial behavior above a control condition. It would be useful to utilize Bible passages that are different from the ones used in this study as well, as participants may respond differently to differently worded texts. Perhaps differing texts, even with similar punishing or loving themes, contribute to how participants behave in a later task. Finally, it is important to study different religions

and different cultures in order to assess whether varying cultures respond differently to the passages.

Conclusion

This study contributes to the overall body of research regarding morality and religiosity, as it focuses on both moral licensing and religious priming in a single study. Understanding morality is important to society as a whole, and it affects all people. Furthermore, as religious priming is rampant throughout society, both intentionally and unintentionally, it potentially affects many decisions people make, especially moral decisions. The study addresses the potential ramifications of common religious priming. If religious primes, especially a punishing God prime, are more salient, it could affect the way many people behave, perhaps encouraging more moral consistency. This aspect is important because moral inclinations contribute to prosocial behavior and, therefore, to the good of society.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Preregistration Form

Title: *Effects of Religious Priming on Moral Licensing*

Authors: Madeline Pettit & Jo-Ann Tsang

Background:

Previous moral licensing research has shown that when primed to think about personal recent moral behavior, participants engage in moral licensing (Blanken et al., 2015). Furthermore, research has shown that participants who were primed to think about God as forgiving behaved less morally than participants who were primed to think about God as punishing (DeBono et al., 2017). However, there is a gap in the literature for religious priming on moral licensing effects. Priming different God concepts may affect moral licensing.

Conditions

1. Neutral No Licensing Condition: Participants will be asked to describe their classes and their typical day. They will then be asked to read a passage about making bread and write their thoughts about the passage.
2. Moral Behavior Punishment Condition: Participants will be asked to write about a personal recent moral behavior. They will then be asked to read Deuteronomy 29:20, a Bible verse about God's wrath, and write their thoughts about the passage.
3. Moral Behavior Love Condition: Participants will be asked to write about a personal recent moral behavior. They will then be asked to read James 3:17, a Bible verse about God's love, and write their thoughts about the passage.
4. Moral Behavior Neutral Condition: Participants will be asked to write about a personal recent moral behavior. They will then be asked to read a passage about making bread and write their thoughts about the passage.

Research hypotheses

1. The Moral Behavior Neutral Condition will induce moral licensing in participants compared to the Neutral No Licensing Condition.
2. Priming differing God concepts will affect moral licensing.
 - a. Priming a forgiving God concept will increase moral licensing effects compared to the Moral Behavior Neutral Condition.

- b. Priming a punishing God concept will decrease moral licensing effects compared to the Moral Behavior Neutral Condition.

Sampling Plan

Existing Data: NA

Explanation of existing data: NA

Data Collection Procedures

- Population – students at Baylor University in the Department of Psychology and Neuroscience participant pool.
- Eligibility requirements (inclusion and exclusion) – Participants must be 18 years or older to participate.
- Recruitment method – SONA systems, an online participant sign-up system.
- Payment – Participants will receive course credit or extra credit for their participation.
- Collection timeline – The survey will be available until a sample size of about 728 participants has been reached, or until a year after posting.
- Procedure – Participants will write about a recent moral behavior or a neutral task. Then, they will be primed with religion or complete a non-religious neutral writing task. Finally, individual differences measures will be presented.

Sample Size (For unit(s) of interest) – 728 participants

Sample size rationale (Power analysis, constraints imposed by time, money, or personnel): In their meta-analysis on moral licensing, Blanken et al. (2015) found that moral licensing studies have an average small-to-medium effect size of $d = 0.31$. We will have 80% power with 660 participants (Blanken et al., 2015). We will oversample (final sample size $N = 728$), as moderation tends to be underpowered (<http://davidakenny.net/cm/moderation.htm>).

Stopping rule – when $n = 728$

Variables

Manipulated Variables:

- Personal behavior description
 - Manipulation of the moral behavior description is based on materials from Conway and Peetz (2012).
 - All participants will be asked to write a description of their behavior.
 - Participants in the **moral behavior** conditions will be asked to describe a personal recent moral behavior.
 - Participants in the **no licensing** condition, a control condition, will be asked to describe their classes and what their typical day looks like.

- God concept
 - Manipulation of God concept is based on materials from DeBono et al. (2016). Materials will be posted on Qualtrics.
 - Participants will be assigned to the punishing God concept or the forgiving God concept in a randomized block fashion.
 - Participants in the **punishment** condition will be asked to read Deuteronomy 29:20. Then, they will be asked to write about how the passage applies to their belief in God as punishing.
 - Participants in the **love** condition will be asked to read James 3:17. Then, they will be asked to write about how the passage applies to their belief in God as forgiving.
 - Participants in the **neutral** condition will be asked to read a passage about making bread. Then, they will be asked to write about the passage.

Measured Variables (If applicable to a-priori hypothesis testing and confirmatory inferences)

1. Allocation of prize money
2. Moral Identity Scale (Aquino & Reed, 2002)
3. Big Five Inventory of Personality II (Soto & John, 2017)
4. LAMBI Scale (Johnson et al., 2019)
5. Intrinsic and Extrinsic Religiosity Scale (Batson et al., 1993)
6. Moral Foundations Questionnaire (Graham et al., 2008)
7. Two questionnaires about how COVID-19 has affected them generally (Conway et al., 2020), in order to include this as a covariate
8. Demographics, which will include questions about age, gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and political orientation

Indices

- The five moral foundations (care, fairness, loyalty, ingroup, and purity) will be analyzed separately as well as combined into the individualizing (care and fairness) and binding (loyalty, ingroup, purity) dimensions.
- If multicollinearity indices are above the acceptable thresholds (tolerance < .2), we may combine indices into latent variables and run our regression analyses in this way.

Design Plan

Study type: Experimental

Study Design: Randomized between-group factorial design (without Angry God and Forgiving God prime/no licensing conditions for efficient use of resources).

Randomization: Participants will be assigned to one of four conditions using a randomized block procedure.

Analysis Plan

Statistical models

- We will use one-way ANOVAs to test the omnibus effect of priming on moral licensing. Then, we will examine differences between the neutral condition and the priming of a forgiving God and a punishing God concept. Moderation effects of God concept (LAMBI) will be tested to see if effects are stronger when participants more strongly endorse a punishing or loving God concept. Moderation effects of moral identity will be tested to see if participants with stronger moral identities are not morally licensed.

Transformations

- If data are nonnormally distributed, they may be transformed to meet assumptions of the statistical test.

Follow-up analyses (For confirmatory models. Subgroup analyses, contrasts, interaction probing; anything not here will be considered exploratory.)

- If moderation analyses are significant, we will test simple effects.
- Any further analyses will be reported as exploratory analyses.

Inference Criteria

- We will use two-tailed tests with $\alpha = .05$.

Data Exclusion – Data will be excluded if participants do not pass manipulation checks. We will read participants' behavior descriptions and descriptions of either a Bible verse or the bread passage to ensure that participants carefully read the directions and passages.

Missing Data – Participants with >50% missing data will be excluded from analyses.

Exploratory Analysis

- We will test for differences related to moral foundations. Participants with different moral foundations may be affected differently by moral licensing.
- We will test for differences related to personality. Participants with different personality traits may be affected differently by moral licensing.

Other

References

Aquino, K., & Reed, A. (2002). The self-importance of moral identity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(6), 1423-1440. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.83.6.1423

- Batson, C. D., Schoenrade, P., & Ventis, W. L. (1993). Religion and the individual: A social-psychological perspective. *Oxford University Press*.
- Blanken, I., van de Ven, N., & Zeelenberg, M. (2015). A meta-analytic review of moral licensing. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 41(4), 1-19. doi: 10.1177/0146167215572134
- Carpenter, T. P., & Marshall, M. A. (2009). An examination of religious priming and intrinsic religious motivation in the moral hypocrisy paradigm. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 48(2), 386-393.
<http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.baylor.edu/10.1111/j.1468-5906.2009.01454.x>
- Conway, L. G., Woodward, S. R., & Zubrod, A. (2020). Social psychological measurements of COVID-19: Coronavirus perceived threat, government response, impacts, and experiences questionnaires. Manuscript in progress.
- Conway, P., & Peetz, Johanna. (2012). When does feeling moral actually make you a better person? Conceptual abstraction moderates whether past moral deeds motivate consistency or compensatory behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38(7), 907-919. doi: 10.1177/0146167212442394
- DeBono, A., Shariff, A. F., Poole, S., & Muraven, M. (2016). Forgive us our trespasses: Priming a forgiving (but not a punishing) God increases unethical behavior. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 9(1), S1-S10.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/rel0000105>
- Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., Haidt, J., Iyer, R., Spassena, K., & Ditto, P. H. (2011). Moral foundations questionnaire. <http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.baylor.edu/10.1037/t05651-000>
- Johnson, K. A., Okun, M. A., Cohen, A. B., Sharp, C. A., & Hook, J. N. (2019). Development and validation of the five-factor LAMBI measure of God representations. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 11(4), 339-349.
<http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.baylor.edu/10.1037/rel0000207>
- Mullen, E., & Monin, B. (2016). Consistency versus licensing effects of past moral behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 67, 363-385.
<http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.baylor.edu/10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115120>
- Soto, C. J., & John, O. P. (2017). Big five inventory-2.
<http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.baylor.edu/10.1037/t64008-000>

APPENDIX B

Qualtrics Survey

Qualtrics Survey Software

4/15/21, 2:42 PM

Consent

Baylor University
Psychology & Neuroscience

Consent Form for Research

PROTOCOL TITLE: Behavior and Opinions Study
PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Madeline Pettit & Jo-Ann Tsang, Ph.D.
SUPPORTED BY: Baylor University

Purpose of the research: The purpose of this study is to examine behaviors and various opinions. Up to 728 participants, ages 18 and older, will take part in this study.

Study activities: If you choose to be in the study, you will be asked to read over materials, write about your thoughts, and complete some online surveys. This study should take you no longer than an hour.

Risks and Benefits: To the best of our knowledge, there are no risks to you for taking part in this study. It is possible that you may get tired during the tasks. You can rest at any time and resume the survey.

This research study involves psychological testing. The questions being asked may be sensitive and personal in nature. It is possible that answering some questions may cause some stress. You are welcome to skip these questions if you choose, without being penalized. If you skip over any questions, you will still earn course credit.

Additionally, as part of this research, you will not be told about some of the study details. If you were told these details at the beginning of the study, it could change the research results. If you decide to be part of the study, you will be given an explanation of what information was withheld from you at the end of your study participation. You may also direct any further questions to the research team. Contact information is available at the end of this form, as well as at the end of the study.

The major benefits to you will be the satisfaction of knowing that you have made a contribution to scientific knowledge, and a bit of insight into how psychological research is conducted. You may also learn new things about yourself. Others may benefit in the future from the information that is learned in this study. The findings from this study may further inform our understanding of the psychological variables under investigation.

You do not have to take part in this research study to receive course credit. Your alternative for equal credit is given on a case-by-case basis by the instructor. Please check with your professor if you want to choose another option to earn credit.

Confidentiality:

So you can feel comfortable responding honestly and openly to the questionnaires in this study we will take care to insure the privacy of your responses. We will not ask for any identifying information and all your responses will be anonymous. No one other than the Principal Investigator and his associates will have access to these data, and they will be stored in a password protected computer in a locked office until the end of the study. As you may be aware, electronic communication may be subject to interception, illegally by another party, while the information is in transit. Therefore, it is possible that your information might be seen by another party and the

researchers cannot control whether that happens. Although none of the information requested is of a personal nature, if you are concerned about your data security, please contact the researcher to schedule a time to complete a printed survey with the same questions.

Results of this study may be disseminated in psychological journals and conference presentations. Participants will not be identified in these reports, which will focus on aggregate (rather than individual) responses.

Authorized staff of Baylor University may review the study records for purposes such as quality control or safety.

Compensation:

We will give you one SONA credit for taking part in this study. Upon completion of the study, you will be entered into a drawing for a single prize of \$50.

Questions or concerns about this research study:

You can call us with any concerns or questions about the research. Our contact information is listed below:

Jo-Ann Tsang, JoAnn_Tsang@baylor.edu, 254-710-2259

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, or wish to obtain information, ask questions, or discuss any concerns about this study with someone other than the researcher(s), you may contact the Baylor University IRB through the Office of the Vice Provost for Research at 254-710-3708 or irb@baylor.edu.

Taking part in this study is your choice. You are free not to take part or to stop at any time for any reason. No matter what you decide, there will be no penalty or loss of benefit to which you are entitled. If you decide to withdraw from this study, the information that you have already provided will be kept confidential. Information already collected about you cannot be deleted.

By continuing with the research and completing the study activities, you are providing your consent.

- Yes
 No

Neutral Writing + Neutral Reading

The first part of this study is a writing task. Please write for 5-10 minutes on the topic below:

Please describe your classes and what a typical day looks like for you.

The next task is a reading and writing task. Please read the following passage about making bread. After you read it, please write your thoughts about the passage for 5-10 minutes.

In order to make bread, you will need several ingredients. Homemade bread requires yeast, flour, sugar, water, oil, and salt. Once the ingredients are mixed, knead the dough, let it rise, and shape it. Let the dough rise one more time, and then it will be ready to bake.

Now, write down your thoughts about the passage.

Personal Moral Behavior and Loving

The first part of this study is a writing task. Please write for 5-10 minutes on the topic below:

Describe a time in the past week that you felt especially righteous or honorable. Perhaps you were loyal to a friend, were generous when you could have been selfish, were kind to someone for no particular reason, or caring toward someone who needed you. Please spend about 5-10 minutes on this task.

The next task is a reading and writing task. Please read the following passage in the Bible. We want you to really think about what the passage means to you and how it applies to your belief in God. We especially want you to think about how God is eternally forgiving. After you absorb the passage, we would like you to write about the passage for 5-10 minutes. Write about your interpretation of the Bible passage and how it conveys God as always compassionate and forgiving.

"But the wisdom that comes from heaven is first of all pure; then peace-loving, considerate, submissive, full of mercy and good fruit, impartial and sincere."
James 3:17

Now, write down your thoughts about the passage.

Personal Moral Behavior and Punishing

The first part of this study is a writing task. Please write for 5-10 minutes on the topic below:

Describe a time in the past week that you felt especially righteous or honorable. Perhaps you were loyal to a friend, were generous when you could have been selfish, were kind to someone for no particular reason, or caring toward someone who needed you. Please spend about 5-10 minutes on this task.

The next task is a reading and writing task. Please read the following passage in the Bible. We want you to really think about what this passage means to you and how it applies to your belief in God. We especially want you to think about how God is eternally punishing. After you absorb the passage, we would like you to write about the passage for 5-10 minutes. Write about your interpretation of the Bible passage and how it conveys God as always vengeful and punishing.

"The LORD will not be willing to forgive him, but rather the anger of the LORD and his jealousy will smoke against that man, and the curses written in this book will settle upon him, and the LORD will blot out his name from under heaven."
Deuteronomy 29:20

Now, write down your thoughts about the passage.

Personal Moral Behavior and Neutral

The first part of this study is a writing task. Please write for 5-10 minutes on the topic below:

Describe a time in the past week that you felt especially righteous or honorable. Perhaps you were loyal to a friend, were generous when you could have been selfish, were kind to someone for no particular reason, or caring toward someone who needed you. Please spend about 5-10 minutes on this task.

The next task is a reading and writing task. Please read the following passage about making bread. After you read it, please write your thoughts about the passage for 5-10 minutes.

In order to make bread, you will need several ingredients. Homemade bread requires yeast, flour, sugar, water, oil, and salt. Once the ingredients are mixed, knead the dough, let it rise, and shape it. Let the dough rise one more time, and then it will be ready to bake.

Now, write down your thoughts about the passage.

Allocation of Prize Money

We are now at the half-way point in the study. To thank you for participating in this study thus far, you will be entered into a drawing for a \$50 gift card. If you win, you have the opportunity to donate some or all of your prize money to the Ronald McDonald House, which provides a safe and welcoming place for families to stay while their children are receiving treatment at the hospital. It allows families who may live far from the hospital to remain close to their children. Donations help the Ronald McDonald House to stay in operation, and they also go toward food for the families. If you choose to donate, please state how much you would like to give if you were to win the drawing prize.

Donation

0 5 10 15 20 25 30 35 40 45 50

If you would like to donate, how much would you like to give?

Questionnaire Instructions

Now we will ask you several questions about your personality and attitudes. Please answer these as honestly as possible.

Moral Identity Scale

Listed alphabetically below are some characteristics that might describe a person:

Caring, Compassionate, Fair, Friendly, Generous, Hardworking, Helpful, Honest, Kind

The person with these characteristics could be you or it could be someone else. For a moment, visualize in your mind the kind of person who has these characteristics. Imagine how that person would think, feel, and act. When you have a clear image of what this person would be like, answer the following questions:

	Completely Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Mostly Agree	Completely Agree
It would make me feel good to be a person who has these characteristics.	<input type="radio"/>						
Being someone who has these characteristics is an important part of who I am.	<input type="radio"/>						
I often wear clothes that identify me as having these characteristics.	<input type="radio"/>						
I would be ashamed to be a person who had these characteristics.	<input type="radio"/>						
The types of things I do in my spare time (e.g., hobbies) clearly identify me as having these characteristics.	<input type="radio"/>						
	Completely Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Mostly Agree	Completely Agree
The kinds of books and magazines that I read identify me as having these characteristics.	<input type="radio"/>						
Having these characteristics is not really important to me.	<input type="radio"/>						
The fact that I have these characteristics is communicated to others by my membership in certain organizations.	<input type="radio"/>						
I am actively involved in activities that communicate to others that I have these characteristics.	<input type="radio"/>						
I strongly desire to have these characteristics.	<input type="radio"/>						
	Completely Disagree	Mostly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Mostly Agree	Completely Agree

Big Five Inventory of Personality II

Here are a number of characteristics that may or may not apply to you. For example, do you agree that you are someone who *likes to spend time with others*? Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

	Disagree strongly	Disagree a little	Neutral; no opinion	Agree a little	Agree strongly
Is outgoing, sociable	<input type="radio"/>				
Is compassionate, has a soft heart	<input type="radio"/>				
Tends to be disorganized	<input type="radio"/>				
Is relaxed, handles stress well	<input type="radio"/>				
Has few artistic interests	<input type="radio"/>				
Has an assertive personality	<input type="radio"/>				
Is respectful, treats others with respect	<input type="radio"/>				
Tends to be lazy	<input type="radio"/>				
Stays optimistic after experiencing a setback	<input type="radio"/>				
	Disagree strongly	Disagree a little	Neutral; no opinion	Agree a little	Agree strongly
Is curious about many different things	<input type="radio"/>				
Rarely feels excited or eager	<input type="radio"/>				
Tends to find fault with others	<input type="radio"/>				
Is dependable, steady	<input type="radio"/>				
Is moody, has up and down mood swings	<input type="radio"/>				
Is inventive, finds newer ways to do things	<input type="radio"/>				
Tends to be quiet	<input type="radio"/>				
Feels little sympathy for others	<input type="radio"/>				
Is systematic, likes to keep things in order	<input type="radio"/>				
	Disagree strongly	Disagree a little	Neutral; no opinion	Agree a little	Agree strongly
Can be tense	<input type="radio"/>				
Is fascinated by art, music, or literature	<input type="radio"/>				
Is dominant, acts as a leader	<input type="radio"/>				
Starts arguments with others	<input type="radio"/>				
Has difficulty getting started on tasks	<input type="radio"/>				
Feels secure, comfortable with self	<input type="radio"/>				
Avoids intellectual, philosophical discussions	<input type="radio"/>				
Is less active than other people	<input type="radio"/>				
Has a forgiving nature	<input type="radio"/>				

	Disagree strongly	Disagree a little	Neutral; no opinion	Agree a little	Agree strongly
Can be somewhat careless	<input type="radio"/>				
Is emotionally stable, not easily upset	<input type="radio"/>				
Has little creativity	<input type="radio"/>				
Is sometimes shy, introverted	<input type="radio"/>				
Is helpful and unselfish with others	<input type="radio"/>				
Keeps things neat and tidy	<input type="radio"/>				
Worries a lot	<input type="radio"/>				
Values art and beauty	<input type="radio"/>				
Finds it hard to influence people	<input type="radio"/>				
	Disagree strongly	Disagree a little	Neutral; no opinion	Agree a little	Agree strongly
Is sometimes rude to others	<input type="radio"/>				
Is efficient, gets things done	<input type="radio"/>				
Often feels sad	<input type="radio"/>				
Is complex, a deep thinker	<input type="radio"/>				
Is full of energy	<input type="radio"/>				
Is suspicious of others' intentions	<input type="radio"/>				
Is reliable, can always be counted on	<input type="radio"/>				
Keeps their emotions under control	<input type="radio"/>				
Has difficulty imagining things	<input type="radio"/>				
	Disagree strongly	Disagree a little	Neutral; no opinion	Agree a little	Agree strongly
Is talkative	<input type="radio"/>				
Can be cold and uncaring	<input type="radio"/>				
Leaves a mess, doesn't clean up	<input type="radio"/>				
Rarely feels anxious or afraid	<input type="radio"/>				
Thinks poetry and plays are boring	<input type="radio"/>				
Prefers to have others take charge	<input type="radio"/>				
Is polite, courteous to others	<input type="radio"/>				

Is persistent, works until the task is finished	<input type="radio"/>				
Tends to feel depressed, blue	<input type="radio"/>				
	Disagree strongly	Disagree a little	Neutral; no opinion	Agree a little	Agree strongly
Has little interest in abstract ideas	<input type="radio"/>				
Shows a lot of Enthusiasm	<input type="radio"/>				
Assumes the best about people	<input type="radio"/>				
Sometimes behaves irresponsibly	<input type="radio"/>				
Is temperamental, gets emotional easily	<input type="radio"/>				
Is original, comes up with new ideas	<input type="radio"/>				

Moral Foundations Questionnaire

When you decide whether something is right or wrong, to what extent are the following considerations relevant to your thinking? Please answer on a scale from

Not At All Relevant (This consideration has nothing to do with my judgments of right and wrong)
to
Extremely Relevant (This is one of the most important factors when I judge right and wrong)

Whether or not someone was good at math.

Not At All Relevant	Not Very Relevant	Slightly Relevant	Somewhat Relevant	Very Relevant	Extremely Relevant
<input type="radio"/>					

Whether or not someone acted in a way that God would approve of.

Not At All Relevant	Not Very Relevant	Slightly Relevant	Somewhat Relevant	Very Relevant	Extremely Relevant
<input type="radio"/>					

Whether or not someone did something to betray his or her group.

Not At All Relevant	Not Very Relevant	Slightly Relevant	Somewhat Relevant	Very Relevant	Extremely Relevant
<input type="radio"/>					

Whether or not someone conformed to the traditions of society.

Not At All Relevant	Not Very Relevant	Slightly Relevant	Somewhat Relevant	Very Relevant	Extremely Relevant
<input type="radio"/>					

Whether or not someone was cruel.

Not At All Relevant	Not Very Relevant	Slightly Relevant	Somewhat Relevant	Very Relevant	Extremely Relevant
<input type="radio"/>					

Whether or not someone cared for someone weak or vulnerable.

Not At All Relevant	Not Very Relevant	Slightly Relevant	Somewhat Relevant	Very Relevant	Extremely Relevant
<input type="radio"/>					

Whether or not someone acted unfairly.

Not At All Relevant	Not Very Relevant	Slightly Relevant	Somewhat Relevant	Very Relevant	Extremely Relevant
<input type="radio"/>					

Whether or not someone did something disgusting.

Not At All Relevant	Not Very Relevant	Slightly Relevant	Somewhat Relevant	Very Relevant	Extremely Relevant
<input type="radio"/>					

Whether or not someone suffered emotionally.

Not At All Relevant	Not Very Relevant	Slightly Relevant	Somewhat Relevant	Very Relevant	Extremely Relevant
<input type="radio"/>					

Whether or not someone violated standards of purity and decency.

Not At All Relevant	Not Very Relevant	Slightly Relevant	Somewhat Relevant	Very Relevant	Extremely Relevant
<input type="radio"/>					

Whether or not someone's action showed love for his or her country.

Not At All Relevant	Not Very Relevant	Slightly Relevant	Somewhat Relevant	Very Relevant	Extremely Relevant
<input type="radio"/>					

Whether or not someone showed a lack of respect for authority.

Not At All Relevant	Not Very Relevant	Slightly Relevant	Somewhat Relevant	Very Relevant	Extremely Relevant
<input type="radio"/>					

Whether or not someone was denied his or her rights.

Not At All Relevant	Not Very Relevant	Slightly Relevant	Somewhat Relevant	Very Relevant	Extremely Relevant
<input type="radio"/>					

Whether or not some people were treated differently than others.

Not At All Relevant	Not Very Relevant	Slightly Relevant	Somewhat Relevant	Very Relevant	Extremely Relevant
<input type="radio"/>					

Whether or not an action caused chaos or disorder.

Not At All Relevant	Not Very Relevant	Slightly Relevant	Somewhat Relevant	Very Relevant	Extremely Relevant
<input type="radio"/>					

Part 2. Please read the following sentences and indicate your level of agreement or disagreement.

People should not do things that are disgusting, even if no one is harmed.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>					

I would call some acts wrong on the grounds that they are unnatural.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>					

It can never be right to kill a human being.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>					

Compassion for those who are suffering is the most crucial virtue.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>					

One of the worst things a person could do is hurt a defenseless animal.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>					

Men and women each have different roles to play in society.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>					

When the government makes laws, the number one principle should be ensuring that everyone is treated fairly.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>					

If I were a soldier and disagreed with my commanding officer's orders, I would obey anyway because that is my duty.

Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
<input type="radio"/>					

It is more important to be a team player than to express oneself.



People should be loyal to their family members, even when they have done something wrong.



I am proud of my country's history.



I think it's morally wrong that rich children inherit a lot of money while poor children inherit nothing.



Respect for authority is something all children need to learn.



Chastity is an important and valuable virtue.



It is better to do good than to do bad.



Justice is the most important requirement for a society.



LAMBI Scale

There are many ways of thinking about God, but some of God's traits seem more relevant to us than others. Using a wide range of the scale below, please rate how well each word describes God, a higher power, or divine life force—BASED UPON YOUR OWN, PERSONAL EXPERIENCES AND BELIEFS (as opposed to what you "should" believe or what is theologically or philosophically correct).

	1 strongly disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 strongly agree
Forgiving	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Merciful	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Gracious	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Compassionate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Tolerant	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Punishing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Strict	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1 strongly disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 strongly agree
Wrathful	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Stem	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Commanding	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Inconceivable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Incomprehensible	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Unimaginable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Unknowable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1 strongly disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 strongly agree
Unknown	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Nature	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Energy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Universe	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Consciousness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cosmic	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Vast	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1 strongly disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 strongly agree
Immense	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Infinite	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Boundless	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Limitless	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1 strongly disagree	2	3	4	5	6	7 strongly agree

Intrinsic and Extrinsic Religiosity Scale

This questionnaire includes some commonly heard statements about one's religious life. They are very diverse. Your task in this questionnaire is to rate your agreement or disagreement with each statement. For each statement there is a scale on which to make your judgment. The scale ranges from strongly disagree through disagree and agree to strongly agree; it is numbered from 1-9. Simply mark the number you feel best represents your own agreement or disagreement with the statement. Try to rate each of the statements, not leaving any blank. Work fairly rapidly, not brooding over any one statement too long.

These statements concern religious ideas and practices. Some statements refer to "church" or "the Bible"; if your religious background is other than Christianity, please substitute the religious institution or scripture appropriate to your background. Again, there is no consensus about right or wrong answers; some people will agree and others will disagree with each of the statements.

	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	Disagree 4	5	Agree 6	7	8	Strongly Agree 9
Although I believe in my religion, I feel there are many more important things in my life.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It is important to me to spend periods of time in private religious thought and meditation.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
It doesn't matter so much what I believe so long as I lead a moral life.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If not prevented by unavoidable circumstances, I attend church.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The primary purpose of prayer is to gain relief and protection.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The church is most important as a place to formulate good social relationships.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I try hard to carry my religion over into all my other dealings in life.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	Disagree 4	5	Agree 6	7	8	Strongly Agree 9
What religion offers me most is comfort when sorrows and misfortune strike.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I pray chiefly because I have been taught to pray.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The prayers I say when I am alone carry as much meaning and personal emotion as those said by me during services.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Although I am a religious person I refuse to let religious considerations influence my everyday affairs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A primary reason for my interest in religion is that my church is a congenial social activity.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Quite often I have been keenly aware of the presence of God or the Divine Being.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I read literature about my faith (or church/temple).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	Disagree 4	5	Agree 6	7	8	Strongly Agree 9
If I were to join a church group I would prefer to join a Bible study group rather than a social fellowship.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Occasionally I find it necessary to compromise my religious beliefs in order to protect my social and economic well-being.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
One reason for my being a church member is that such membership helps to establish a person in the community.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My religious beliefs are what really lie behind my whole approach to life.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Religion is especially important to me because it answers many questions about the meaning of life.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The purpose of prayer is to secure a happy and peaceful life.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Coronavirus Impacts Questionnaire long version

These next set of questions ask you about your experiences with COVID-19.

The Coronavirus (COVID-19) has impacted me negatively from a financial point of view.

1 (Not True of Me At All)	2	3	4	5	6	7 (Very True of Me)
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I have lost job-related income due to the Coronavirus (COVID-19).

1 (Not True of Me At All)	2	3	4	5	6	7 (Very True of Me)
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The Coronavirus (COVID-19) has NOT impacted my financial status at all.

1 (Not True of Me At All)	2	3	4	5	6	7 (Very True of Me)
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I have had a hard time getting needed resources (food, toilet paper) due to the Coronavirus (COVID-19).

1 (Not True of Me At All)	2	3	4	5	6	7 (Very True of Me)
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

It has been difficult for me to get the things I need due to the Coronavirus (COVID-19).

1 (Not True of Me At All)	2	3	4	5	6	7 (Very True of Me)
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The Coronavirus (COVID-19) has NOT affected my ability to get needed resources.

1 (Not True of Me At All)	2	3	4	5	6	7 (Very True of Me)
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I have become depressed because of the Coronavirus (COVID-19).

1 (Not True of Me At All)	2	3	4	5	6	7 (Very True of Me)
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The Coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak has impacted my psychological health negatively.

1 (Not True of Me At All)	2	3	4	5	6	7 (Very True of Me)
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic has NOT made me feel any worse than I did before.

1 (Not True of Me At All)	2	3	4	5	6	7 (Very True of Me)
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Perceived Coronavirus Threat Questionnaire

Thinking about the Coronavirus (COVID-19) makes me feel threatened.

1 (Not True of Me At All)	2	3	4	5	6	7 (Very True of Me)
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I am afraid of the Coronavirus (COVID-19).

1 (Not True of Me At All)	2	3	4	5	6	7 (Very True of Me)
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I am not worried about the Coronavirus (COVID-19).

1 (Not True of Me At All)	2	3	4	5	6	7 (Very True of Me)
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I am worried that I or people I love will get sick from the Coronavirus (COVID-19).

1 (Not True of Me At All)	2	3	4	5	6	7 (Very True of Me)
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I am stressed around other people because I worry I'll catch the Coronavirus (COVID-19).

1 (Not True of Me At All)	2	3	4	5	6	7 (Very True of Me)
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

I have tried hard to avoid other people because I don't want to get sick.

1 (Not True of Me At All)	2	3	4	5	6	7 (Very True of Me)
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Demographics with religion

Sex:

- Male
- Female

What is your current year in school?

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- Other

Please type your age (in years) in the space provided:

With which racial/ethnic group do you most closely identify? (Choose one):

- African American / Black
- Asian / Pacific Islander
- Hispanic
- Native American
- Caucasian / White
- Another race/ethnicity (please specify):

In what socio-economic bracket were you raised for most of your life?

- Upper class
- Upper-middle class
- Middle class
- Lower-middle class
- Lower class

What is your current socio-economic bracket?

- Upper class
- Upper-middle class
- Middle class
- Lower-middle class
- Lower class

In what type of area were you raised for most of your life?

- A large city
- A suburb near a large city
- A small city or town
- A rural area
- I don't know

In what type of area are you currently living?

- A large city
- A suburb near a large city
- A small city or town
- A rural area
- I don't know

How would you describe yourself politically?

- Very Conservative
- Conservative
- Leaning Conservative
- Moderate
- Leaning Liberal
- Liberal
- Very Liberal

Do you believe in God?

- Yes
- No
- Uncertain

What is your primary religious affiliation?

- Protestant (including Baptist)
- Catholic
- Buddhist
- Hindu
- Jewish
- Muslim
- None
- Atheist
- Agnostic
- Other religion (please specify):

How frequently do you pray?

- Never
- A few times a year
- A few times a month
- A few times a week
- Once a day
- More than once a day

How often do you attend religious services?

- Never
- Once or twice a year
- Several times a year
- Once or twice a month
- Once a week
- More than once a week

How interested are you in religion?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Not at all interested Moderately interested Extremely interested

To what extent do you consider yourself a RELIGIOUS person?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not at all Very much

To what extent do you consider yourself a SPIRITUAL person?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Not at all Very much

Where are you completing this survey?

- Home
- Place of employment
- Library
- School
- Public place (e.g., coffee shop, restaurant)
- Other (please specify):

How many other people are in the same room where you are completing this survey?

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5+

What other tasks are you doing while you complete this survey (choose ALL that apply)?

- Nothing - only completing this survey
- Watching TV
- Listening to music
- Talking with friends
- Reading something else (besides this survey)
- Eating
- Other (please specify):

Debriefing

We are going to change gears now and ask you about your impressions of this study. Your responses here are very important in helping us interpret the results.

What do you think this experiment was trying to study?

Did anything about the experiment stand out as weird or unusual?

Did you think that any of the different parts of the study were related in any way?

- Yes
- No

If you selected yes, please specify in what way you think they were related:

Did anything you did on one part of the study affect what you did on any other part of the study?

- Yes
- No

If you selected yes, please specify how exactly it affected what you did:

While you were completing the self-report (aka, survey) items, did you have any particular goal or strategy?

- Yes
- No

If you selected yes, please specify what particular goals and/or strategies you had:

How did you feel about the first task, where you were asked to describe your actions?

How did you feel about the next task, where you were asked to read a passage and write about it?

How did you feel about being asked if you would like to donate to the Ronald McDonald House?

Did either of your writing tasks or the passage you were asked to read affect your responses on any of the later tasks?

- Yes
- No

If you selected yes, please specify how they affected your responses:

Did either of your writing tasks or the passage you were asked to read affect your decision about donating to the Ronald McDonald House?

- Yes
- No

If you selected yes, please specify how they affected your decision:

Thank you for your participation today. Briefly, here is a bit more information about our study.

We are interested in moral behavior, and how thinking about God as punishing or loving may affect people's moral behavior. Our research investigates the idea that people behave more morally when they view God as punishing rather than loving and forgiving.

To study this, we had some people write about their recent moral behavior. We believed that this task would allow participants to feel that they have permission to help less in the future. Then, some people read a Bible passage discussing the punishment of God, and other people read a Bible passage discussing the love of God. Other people, in the control group, wrote about their experience in school and read a more neutral passage so that we could compare results. Then, all participants could choose if they wanted to donate any of their potential prize earnings to a charity. We wanted to see if people who read about the punishment of God would donate more money. We measured personality characteristics and attitudes to see if they affected people's responses as well.

Participating in this research has qualified you to be entered into a drawing for a \$50 prize. If you are selected as the winner, you will receive \$50 and will not have any portion allocated to charity despite your allocation in the study. If you would like to donate, please see the info provided.

We appreciate the time you took to fill out the survey. If you have any questions about the research, please feel free to contact Jo-Ann Tsang at JoAnn_Tsang@Baylor.edu.

Click next to complete the study.

Powered by Qualtrics

REFERENCES

- Aquino, K., & Reed, A. (2002). The self-importance of moral identity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(6), 1423-1440. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.83.6.1423
- Batson, C. D., Schoenrade, P., & Ventis, W. L. (1993). Religion and the individual: A social-psychological perspective. *Oxford University Press*.
- Batson, C. D., Thompson, E. R., Seufferling, G., Whitney, H., & Strongman, J. A. (1999). Moral hypocrisy: Appearing moral to oneself without being so. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(3), 525-537.
<http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.baylor.edu/10.1037/0022-3514.77.3.525>
- Blanken, I., van de Ven, N., & Zeelenberg, M. (2015). A meta-analytic review of moral licensing. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 41(4), 1-19. doi: 10.1177/0146167215572134
- Carpenter, T. P., & Marshall, M. A. (2009). An examination of religious priming and intrinsic religious motivation in the moral hypocrisy paradigm. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 48(2), 386-393.
<http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.baylor.edu/10.1111/j.1468-5906.2009.01454.x>
- Conway, L. G., Woodward, S. R., & Zubrod, A. (2020). Social psychological measurements of COVID-19: Coronavirus perceived threat, government response, impacts, and experiences questionnaires. Manuscript in progress.
- Conway, P., & Peetz, Johanna. (2012). When does feeling moral actually make you a better person? Conceptual abstraction moderates whether past moral deeds motivate consistency or compensatory behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38(7), 907-919. doi: 10.1177/0146167212442394
- DeBono, A., Shariff, A. F., Poole, S., & Muraven, M. (2016). Forgive us our trespasses: Priming a forgiving (but not a punishing) God increases unethical behavior. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 9(1), S1-S10.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/rel0000105>

- dos Santos, M. A., de Freitas e Castro, J. M., & de Freitas Lino Pinto Cardoso, C. S. (2020). The moral emotions of guilt and shame in children: Relationship with parenting and temperament. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 29(10), 2759-2769. <http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.baylor.edu/10.1007/s10826-020-01766-6>
- Graham, J., Nosek, B. A., Haidt, J., Iyer, R., Spassena, K., & Ditto, P. H. (2011). Moral foundations questionnaire. <http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.baylor.edu/10.1037/t05651-000>
- Henrich, J., Heine, S., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral & Brain Sciences*, 33(2-3), 61-83. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X>
- Johnson, K. A., Okun, M. A., Cohen, A. B., Sharp, C. A., & Hook, J. N. (2019). Development and validation of the five-factor LAMBI measure of God representations. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 11(4), 339-349. <http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.baylor.edu/10.1037/rel0000207>
- Mullen, E., & Monin, B. (2016). Consistency versus licensing effects of past moral behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 67, 363-385. <http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.baylor.edu/10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115120>
- Shariff, A. F., & Norenzayan, A. (2007). God is watching you: Priming God concepts increases prosocial behavior in an anonymous economic game. *Psychological Science*, 18(9), 803-809. <http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.baylor.edu/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01983.x>
- Shariff, A. F., & Norenzayan, A. (2011). Mean gods make good people: Different views of God predict cheating behavior. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 21, 85-96. doi: 10.1080/10508619.2011.556990
- Soto, C. J., & John, O. P. (2017). Big five inventory-2. <http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.baylor.edu/10.1037/t64008-000>
- Yilmaz, O., & Bahçekapili, H. G. (2016). Supernatural and secular monitors promote human cooperation only if they remind of punishment. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 37(1), 79-84. <http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.baylor.edu/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2015.09.005>