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ABSTRACT
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Religion is a pervasive and important part of many people’s lives in the US (Hill, Pargament, Wood, McCullough, Swyers, Larson, & Zinnbauer, 2000). Surveys within this country show that religion is important to over 80% of the population, while 55% feel that religion is very important to them (Pollingreport.com, 2006). Their opinions are often heavily considered in business resolutions for publicly held companies. Most often these viewpoints are representative of disproportionate Christian religious groups (given that more than 75% of the U.S. population practices Christianity of some form) (Chusmir & Koberg, 1988; Kosmin, Mayer, & Keysar, 2001). Religious individuals also influence organizations as shareholders, consumers (Chusmir & Koberg), as well as employees (Miller, 2003).

Once compartmentalized from their professional lives, more and more people are starting to connect their religion and religious beliefs to their work (Miller, 2003). Miller has described this growing phenomenon as the “Faith at Work Movement”. This movement has participants from nearly all religions, faiths, and philosophies; although, due in large part to sheer numbers, Christians comprise the majority. With over 12,000 Christian Faith at Work groups as of 2003, the ubiquitoussness of religion is made apparent (Miller, 2003). With an increase in the number of people who do bring their faith to the workplace, there has been a resulting rise in requests made to HR managers to accommodate these beliefs (Cash, Gray, & Rood, 2000).

Examples of such accommodations include employees’ requests to be off from work to observe religious holidays (e.g., Yom Kippur, the Jewish day of atonement) (Hansen, 2002).
Additionally, permission is often asked to be able to wear religious items that some faiths may require (e.g., yarmulkes worn by Jews, veils and/or turbans worn by Muslims) (Cooper, 1993). Religious individuals may also ask for accommodations in allowing religious activities in the workplace (e.g., prayer time for Muslims, bible study) (Cash et al., 2000). More and more of these religious individuals utilize Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to secure these accommodations, and also to protect themselves from discriminatory acts (King, 2006).

Title VII requires employers to “reasonably accommodate” (a clarifier added in 1972 to the Civil Rights Act) religious faiths and beliefs in the workplace unless there is undue hardship to the employer (Hansen, 2002). As a result of a Supreme Court Case involving TWA in 1977, however, hardship is now defined as “di minimis”, or anything more than a minimal burden. In this case, an employer did not have to allow the employee to have Saturdays off to observe his Sabbath (as the system was designed around a Christian population that practices its religion on Sundays) because it would have caused the minimal burden of 150 dollars over three months in administrative fees to arrange schedules (Hansen). Other more recent court cases allude to a presupposed norm here in the US.

In Spitzer v. Sears, Roebuck and Co. (2000), an Orthodox Jew was not hired as a repairman (despite having the highest score on selection devices) because he would not be able to work the Jewish Sabbath, Saturday, with the explanation that this was the busiest repair day (Hansen, 2002). Court investigations revealed that Tuesday was actually the busiest day, and that no repairmen were required to work all Saturdays. Spitzer won the case and Sears was required to produce a tape that emphasized “employers’ legal obligations to accommodate religious beliefs in the workplace”. This case is yet another example of the nations’ Christian majority values being imposed upon other non-Christian employees. (Hansen)
In the case of *EEOC v. Townley Engineering and Manufacturing Co.* (1988), the employers (having made a covenant with God to run a Christian business) required all employees to attend weekly devotional services (Hansen, 2002). When one employee requested to not participate, the reply was that he needed to be present, participating actively or not. The courts found in favor of the employee because his not being present would not have caused an undue burden to the employer. In this, as well as in other situations, the religious majority can send the message that their set of religious customs is the norm. (Hansen)

This message has even been sent from employers in the highest levels of government. Within the White House, former Attorney General John D. Ashcroft frequently held morning Bible studies in the Justice Department before the day (Hansen, 2002). Although the White House guidelines advise supervisors that (as people in positions of power) their engagement in religious activities can be seen as coercive, it is permissible so long as their viewpoints are communicated and viewed as being clearly personal and that there should be no suggestion (implicit or explicit) that participation is expected. However, stated one Justice Department employee, “It feels extremely exclusive, that if you don’t participate in that type of religion your career could be affected by it.” Throughout the country, as within the Justice Department, non-Christians face adverse conditions in the world of business. (Hansen, 2002)

Muslims, and those perceived as Muslims (i.e., Middle Easterners) have especially had great difficulties since the events of 9/11 in exercising their constitutionally-protected religious rights in the workplace (Hansen, 2002). Indeed, since 9/11 there has been an interest and focus on Islam (Melloan, 2002). In the eight months following 9/11, there were 488 discrimination cases filed with the EEOC claiming a direct connection with the terrorist attacks by those who either were Muslim, or were perceived to be Muslim (Hansen, 2002).
The Role of the Media After 9/11

In describing challenges that Muslims face in a society predominantly Christian, Cooper (1993) states “the biggest problems are negative stereotyping, which equates Islam with terrorism, anti-Semitism and a fanaticism with destroying Western Civilization”. This was exacerbated at the time because of coverage of the bombing of the World Trade Center in February of 1993, reported to be carried out by Islamic terrorists (BBC, 1993). These challenges are arguably tougher and more complicated since the 9/11 attacks in the US.

During and since the terrorist attacks on 9/11, the media broadcast the vivid images and showed the impacting footage that most people now visualize when thinking of the attack. Photo mug shots of the attackers were quickly made available, and the attackers were described as fanatical Muslims who had carefully and methodically planned out the attacks. Quickly, government officials were starting to describe a “war on terrorism” and American Nationalism became the discourse from then onwards, characterized by such comparisons as good versus evil, and civilized versus barbaric (Grewal, 2003).

The Christian majority responded in various ways. Within a short time afterwards, for example, there was a large billboard in Atlanta, Georgia that read “Jesusaves” (McCarthy, n.d.). The middle three letters of the billboard (USA) however, were boldly colored in red, white, and blue. The resulting implicit message is that Christianity and the US are intimately linked, and that this Jesus becomes one that belongs to/saves only the US. This billboard, in addition, clearly reaffirms normative assumptions concerning the US identity.

More recent events, such as the linking of Islam to violence (intentional or not) after Pope Benedict XVI’s speech in September, 2006, speak to the continuing negative associations and perceptions of Islam (he received praise afterwards from conservatives around the globe for
saying what many felt that no one else would) (Van Biema & Isrealy, 2006). In addition, there was much commotion over Congress’ first Muslim representative, Keith Ellison’s announcement that he planned to use the Quran (the Islamic holy book) in his swearing in ceremony before Congress (Frommer, 2006). In response, one columnist reasoned that Ellison should use the “Bible of this country”, and that “America is only interested in one book, the Bible” (Frommer). In implying that Christianity is synonymous with America, these statements also identify what the columnist believes is not American, Islam. Associating Christianity with a national identity is something that has been reinforced and exacerbated by the increase of nationalism and patriotism that the country has seen since 9/11, due in part to the media (Grewal, 2003). This increase in nationalism and patriotism, in turn, has led to an increase in stereotyping and discriminatory behaviors towards Muslims (Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 2002; Li & Brewer, 2004).

Nationalism and Patriotism

These discriminatory acts are in large part due to the media portrayal of 9/11 (and thusly Islam), and the resulting raising levels of nationalism that in turn, via fallacious cognitive processes, foster stereotypes and discriminatory behaviors towards Muslims in the Christian majority US.

Through group membership, people receive feelings of social belonging and self worth (Tajfel and Turner, 2004). People are also motivated to feel positively about both themselves and their groups via favorable comparisons (Tajfel & Turner). Group identification on the national level then is related to nationalism and patriotism, or feelings of belongingness and worth as related to the nation (Li & Brewer, 2004).

Li and Brewer (2004) explain that patriotism is related to affect for the nation as a result of intragroup comparisons (i.e., comparisons that are temporal, compared to some standard or
ideal) (Mummendey, Kilnk, & Brown, 2001) and can be associated with “pride and love for country”. Nationalism, however, is the result of intergroup comparisons made between other nations. Within nationalism, therefore, a positive in group comparison (achieved via comparatively negative views of other nations) results in feelings of superiority to other nations, and has been related to authoritarianism and chauvinism. Blank and Schmidt (2003) have found that nationalism is positively related to outgroup hostility. Li & Brewer (2004) report that both nationalism and patriotism have been found to increase in response to outside threats.

Patriotism alone has not been found to have negative outgroup effects, but when combined with nationalism it has been found to be related to less tolerance to diversity, negativity towards minorities, and also results in a “restricted criterion for identification as a ‘true’ American” (Li & Brewer, 2004), which has thus far been defined by a Christian majority.

According to Social Identity Theory, when individuals have a high commitment level to a group (US), there are different reactions that can be predicted depending on the type of threat, threat to value and threats to distinctiveness (Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 2002). When there is a threat to values (as was portrayed and presented in the media following 9/11) (Grewal, 2003), Ellemers et al. (2002) state that there is an increase in group affiliation and that groups with more power will tend to have anger and contempt for outgroups (with hostility only related to anger). When there is a threat to distinctiveness there is an increase in self-stereotyping (as US groups distance and further themselves from Islam by polarized stances that reaffirm their own identities i.e. Jesusaves, what is “truly American”) and an increase in differentiation through stereotypic dimensions. High levels of commitment, amalgamated with distinctiveness threats, can lead to hatred and disgust towards the out group, and most certainly discriminatory behaviors (Ellemers
et al.). A case in point is the widespread use of racial profiling since 9/11 on peoples who were perceived to be Muslim (Grewal, 2003).

As mentioned before, the vivid images of 9/11, including but not limited to Muslims, are ones with which many people both associate and are familiar with (Grewal, 2003). Since then, there has been much discrimination towards those who are associated with Islam and or Muslims, as evidenced by EEOC cases and racial profiling cases against Sikh men (Hansen, 2002).

Sikhism (a religion dating back close to 500 years in India), as with other religions, has tenets or rules (for the Orthodox) to follow with respect to men that dictate grooming and dress. The Sikh man must wear a turban, is not allowed to cut his hair, and must carry a ceremonial knife. Visually, a Sikh man could fit inside what some people might stereotype as being Muslim (reinforced through pictures of Bin Laden in a turban with a long beard for example) (Grewal, 2003). In the weeks after 9/11 a Sikh man was pulled off of an Amtrack train, and a Sikh man was even killed in Arizona not long after as well. These stereotypes and resulting discrimination are a result of a weakness inherent in humans as a species. People are by nature creatures with limited cognitive processing resources (Devine & Monteith, 1989).

Cognitive Processes

In order to simplify the extremely complex environment in which we live, people rely on preconceived forms to help organize and process incoming information (Nisbett & Ross, 1980; Stayman & Kardes, 1992). These preconceived forms, a type of social categorization which helps to quicken classification, come from most any interaction with the environment that is possible, ranging from myth and childhood stories, to the media. A stereotype then is “a highly stylized and simplified image of the characteristics of a social category” that is socially shared on
Stereotyping is when people assign characteristics of a group onto that group’s perceived members, thereby drawing conclusions and inferring information based on group membership. When people attach an affective component to stereotypes (attitudinal evaluations of group/s), these stereotypes then become called prejudices (Rydgren) which, as mentioned before, can be produced as a result of responses to a distinctiveness threat from highly committed group members (Ellemers et al., 2002). These social categorizations are utilized based on rules, or heuristics, that favor faster and less laborious cognitive processing (Bodenhausen & Wyer, 1985; Hansen, 1980).

The heuristics which most influence stereotyping are the representativeness heuristic and the availability heuristic. Within the representativeness heuristic, people will assign and inference characteristics of a large group based on a few group members, with the belief that the few are truly representative of the majority (Rydgren, 2004). This would explain why after major incidents involving Christians (the David Koresh incident at Waco Texas for instance), all white males were not viewed with the same suspicion as have been Muslims. The lack of exposure that the Christian US majority had to Islam and Muslims, led them to assume that the few Muslims that were portrayed by the media and other sources (and included associations of terrorism and a image of a Muslim) were representative of Islam and Muslims everywhere, more readily thinking of Branch Davidians as extremists in Christianity than Jihadists as an extreme Islamic group. The other heuristic that plays a part in stereotyping and discrimination is the availability heuristic (Rydgren).

Within the availability heuristic, predictions are based on the ease with which information can be recalled. The more vivid the information is the greater ease with which information is remembered and made available (Rydgren, 2004). Nisbett and Ross (1980)
described vivid memories as ones that are interesting affectually, provoke imagery, and are proximal in either time or space. All of the aforementioned qualifiers for vividness are applicable to the images and information communicated in the media since 9/11, especially in regard to Islam and Muslims. For the US people lacking first hand knowledge of Muslims, the most vivid information concerning Muslims came from media reports. This would again explain the aforementioned case in which the Sikh man was discriminated against and, having been profiled as a Muslim, was pulled off the Amtrack train (Hansen, 2002).

Given the importance that religion plays in the lives of people in the US, the influence and size of the US Christian population, the increase in nationalistic and patriotic sentiment post 9/11, group (national) reactions formed as a result to threats to US values and distinctiveness, and stereotypes and prejudices held in regards to peoples associated with Islam (as evidenced through discriminatory acts and some resulting litigation); I expect that non-Christians (people of Islamic faith) will not be as highly recommended for the job as Christians, with the recommendation scores being negatively correlated with the evaluators level of nationalism. People of the Judaic faith (as an additional outgroup) are also expected to receive lower recommendations than Christians, but with lesser effects and with the same nationalism moderator effect.

**Hypothesis 1:** Applicant religious affiliation will have a main effect on hiring decisions, such that Christians will receive higher recommendations for hire than Muslims and Jews, and Jews receiving higher recommendations than Muslims only.

**Hypothesis 2:** Participants’ level of nationalism will moderate the selection decision such that participants who have high levels of nationalism will more negatively rate non-Christian
applicants and more positively rate Christian applicants, as compared to participants with low levels of nationalism. This relationship can be seen in Figure 1.

In addition, demographic variables will be examined with the expectation that there will be effects for gender. I would expect female participants to rate Muslims more negatively than males. Media portrayals of Islam at times focus on gender roles and interactions within Islamic cultures that are hostile towards females and frequently place females in subordinate positions. It is expected that females would be more attentive to issues of gender equality in general and would negatively assess the gender norms and practices attributed to some Islamic cultures (second hand information) when viewed through a US cultural perspective.

Hypothesis 3: Participants’ gender will moderate the selection decision for Muslims such that female participants will more negatively rate Muslim applicants than males will.
CHAPTER 2

METHODS

Participants

For this study, 436 participants from a research pool in a university located in the Southeastern United States were recruited to complete the survey. After removing 29 participants who had failed to complete the survey, 407 participants remained. This sample included 296 females and 111 males.

Materials

*Personnel file.* Materials included one personnel file (including one of three résumés, one of three personnel sheets used internally within the organization, as well as a job description), a scale that measures nationalism, a scale that measures religiosity, and an evaluation sheet to rate the résumés that also asks for demographic information. All résumés contained the same work history, education level, and qualifications [similar to the resume used by Harrison & Thomas (2006)], but differed on names used (refer to Appendices A, B, and C). The genders of the résumés were held constant (male), to eliminate the possibility of effects due to applicant gender.

The personnel sheets (participants were told that these were produced internally by the company) all contained identical lists of vacation requests but differed in the list of types (but not number) of requests that have been filed with HR that would accommodate their religious freedoms under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act (refer to Appendices D, E, and F). Lastly, a job description was also included in the personnel file which listed briefly the responsibilities of the job, as well as the required knowledge, skills, and abilities (refer to Appendix G).
One of the conditions for the experiment (Christian condition) contained a résumé with the name Luke Smith with a personnel sheet with requests to be allowed a space to read the Bible during the work day and time off on Fridays to attend a prayer group. The next condition (Muslim condition) contained a résumé with the name Abdul Hanifah (Muttaqun Online, 2006) with a personnel sheet containing requests to be allowed a space to read the Koran during the work day and time off briefly on Fridays to attend Jumu'ah, a community prayer service. The final condition’s personnel file (Jewish condition) contained a résumé with the name Seth Goldberg with a personnel sheet with requests to be allowed off early on Friday to observe the Sabbath and for permission for a space in the workplace to be able to briefly read and recite from a siddur (prayer book used by Jews) during the workday. There were three main conditions (Christian, Jewish, and Muslim) where the stimulus came before all of the measures and three conditions where the scale for Nationalism came before the stimulus (Christian 2, Jewish 2, and Muslim 2).

**Measures**

For the following scales, participants indicated their level of agreement with the statements on a 5 – point Likert scale, with the higher scores being indicative of a high level of agreement. A summary of scale reliabilities, mean scores, standard deviations, and ranges can be found in Table 2.

*Hiring Decision Scale.* The hiring decision dimension, Recommendation, was used to assess the probability of promoting the job applicant. Three recommendation items were combined to form a composite measure ($\alpha = .849$, $M = 4.03$, $SD = .62$, range 1.83 – 5.0). One of the items was as follows; “Based on the resume, how likely are you to recommend the applicant for hire?” (See Appendix H for the complete questionnaire.)
Nationalism. A scale of nationalism utilized by Li and Brewer (2004) was included to measure participants’ level of nationalism. This measure consists of items from the Kosterman and Feshbach (1989) scale for nationalism which has also been used (in its entirety) by Keller (2005). Six items were used to form a composite measure ($\alpha = .744$, $M = 2.80$, $SD = .64$, range 1.17 – 4.67) with one of the items being “In view of America’s moral and material superiority, it is only right that we should have the biggest say in deciding United Nations policy.” These items were embedded within 14 other items that appeared to assess attitudes on traffic in cities in order to receive an accurate measure of nationalism (see appendix I for the complete questionnaire).

Religiosity. A scale of religiosity utilized by Haraldson (1981) was included to measure participants’ level of religiosity. This scale consisted of four items from a scale previously constructed by Rohrbaugh and Jessor (1975), which captures several dimensions of religiosity including ritual, consequence, experience, as well as an overall rating of religiosity. Four items were used to construct a composite measure ($\alpha = .928$, $M = 3.33$, $SD = 1.23$, range 1.0 – 5.0) and included “How often do you attend religious services?” (refer to Appendix J for the full scale).

Finally, the participant was asked to provide their demographic information (race/ethnicity, gender, and age), as well as their religious affiliation. Please refer to Appendix K for the demographic information questionnaire.

Procedure

Participants in the experiment were recruited from a research pool in a university located in the Southeastern United States using Experimetrix. Participants who signed up for the experiment were then randomly assigned to one of three conditions (within which counterbalancing was used whereby fifty percent of each of the three conditions had the
nationalism scale precede the stimulus) and provided an appropriate link to the survey, posted on SurveyMonkey. Each survey contained one of three randomly assigned personnel files, Christian, Jewish, or Muslim. Participants were told that the study had been designed to assess how influential personnel files can be in the selection processes. Participants were then told that they were reviewing an application for an internal promotion for a marketing position in a fictitious company that performs business functions every day of the week. After being told to rate the applicant based on the personnel file, participants read the personnel profiles and then evaluated the applicants. Participants were then directed to fill out a scale to assess nationalism and another scale to assess the participant’s religiosity (both possible moderators). Participants then answered questions asking for the participant’s demographic information. After asking for demographic information, participants were then asked to answer a manipulation check, asking the participant to identify the job applicant’s religious affiliation as well as gender. Participants were then led to a debriefing screen and thanked for their time and participation in the study.

**Manipulation Check**

After removing 76 participants who incorrectly answered the manipulation check, 331 participants remained. The gender manipulation check affected 24 participants, while 63 participants were unable to correctly identify the applicant’s religious affiliation. This final sample included 238 females and 93 males. For more information and further details regarding the demographics of the sample, please refer to Table 3. Participation in this study was voluntary and participants received one hour of research credit for their participation.

**Pilot Study for Concessions**

A pilot study was conducted in order to attain manipulations to be used for religious concessions in the personnel files of the applicants. Items selected for use in the study were
qualitatively comparable amongst conditions. Please refer to Appendix L as well as Appendix M for information concerning the pilot study.

*Correlation Analyses*

The significant relationships between variables were examined. See Table 4 for a complete summary of variable intercorrelations. The correlation between Nationalism and Religiosity is positive and significant ($r = .16; p < .01$). Participants that were higher in Nationalism also tended to be high in Religiosity. There was also a significant relationship between Religiosity and Recommendation that was positive ($r = .13; p < .05$). Participants that were higher in Religiosity tended to rate candidates more favorably on the Recommendation dimension. The effects of Religiosity were controlled for in further analyses by including them within the regression analyses.

*Order Effects Analyses*

Counterbalancing was utilized amongst the three conditions (Christian, Jewish, and Muslim) to check for order effects. Fifty percent of the participants in each condition were presented the stimulus first, while the remaining 50 percent of participants in each condition completed the Nationalism scale first followed by the stimulus and remaining scales. A condition (3) x counterbalance (2) analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilized twice (once using Nationalism as a dependent variable, then Recommendation as a dependent variable) to determine if there were significant differences. Results showed that there was not a significant difference attributable to order effects for either Nationalism ($F (2, 325) = .880, n.s$) or Recommendation ($F (2, 325) = .251, n.s$). Thus, hypotheses testing and post-hoc analyses compiled participants by applicant religion, leaving a Christian condition (N = 113), a Jewish
condition (N= 104), and a Muslim condition (N=114). For a more detailed summary of participants, please refer to Table 3.
CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

The first set of analyses explored the role of applicant’s religion on recommendation.

Examination of means results for applicant religion on Recommendation revealed that the Jewish applicant was ranked first, the Christian ranked second, and the Muslim ranked third (means values and ranking for various Recommendation and recommendation items can be found in Table 5). A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was then used to test for differences among the three applicants $F(2, 328) = 2.861, p = .05$. Tukey post-hoc comparisons of the three groups indicate that the Muslim applicant ($M = 3.91$) was scored significantly lower than the Jewish applicant ($M = 4.13$) on Recommendation, $p = .046$. The Muslim applicant was not, however, rated significantly lower than the Christian applicant. See Table 6 for results. Therefore, although significant differences were found, hypothesis one was not supported.

For the remaining analyses, as needed, various coding strategies were employed as outlined by Cohen, Cohen, West, and Aiken (2003). One strategy that was used included dummy coding, which allowed for comparisons to a referent group. Contrast coding was also implemented in order to be able to create sets of categories in a way that allowed them to be contrasted. Coding schemes, where implemented, are indicated within the pertaining set of analyses.

A second set of analyses was utilized to test for any moderating effects of nationalism, as well as moderating effects of religiosity, on recommendation. To test for the possible moderating effects of nationalism and religiosity on Recommendation, procedures outlined by
James and Brett (1984) were employed, utilizing hierarchical regression analysis. In step 1, Recommendation was regressed onto the Jew applicant (dummy coded, 0 = Christian, 1 = Jew, 0 = Muslim) and Muslim applicant (dummy coded, 0 = Christian, 0 = Jew, 1 = Muslim). For Step 2, the hiring dimension Recommendation was then regressed onto the Jewish applicant, Muslim applicant, as well as Religiosity and Nationalism (both centered). Product terms were then created by multiplying each applicant religion first by Nationalism (to create Jew x Nationalism and Muslim x Nationalism) and then, separately, Religiosity (to create Jew x Religiosity and Muslim x Religiosity). Step 3 of the regression regressed Recommendation onto all of the aforementioned variables including the product terms. Although evidence of moderation was not found (and thusly Hypothesis 2 was not supported), in Step 2 there is a main effect for Religiosity such that those higher in Religiosity rated the Christian applicant more favorably ($\beta = .154, p = .005$). All results of this hierarchical regression can be found in Table 8.

A third set of analyses was used to explore moderating effects of gender on recommendation. To test for any moderating effects of gender on Recommendation, hierarchical regression was once again utilized. In Step 1, Recommendation was regressed onto gender (0 = Males, 1 = Females), Christian and Jewish applicants compared to Muslim (contrast coded, 1 = Christian, 1 = Jew, -2 = Muslim), and Jewish applicant compared to Muslim (contrast coded, 0 = Christian, 1 = Jew, -1 = Muslim). In Step 2, Recommendation was regressed onto the variables entered in Step 1 as well as the product terms created from multiplying each applicant religion first by Nationalism (to create Christian and Jewish to Muslim x Nationalism and Jewish to Muslim x Nationalism) and then, separately, Religiosity (to create Christian and Jewish to Muslim x Religiosity, and Jewish to Muslim x Religiosity) (results in Table 9). Although there was no support for Hypothesis 3 (evidence for moderation via gender) there was a main effect in
Step 1 such that the Jewish applicant was rated significantly more favorably than the Muslim applicant on recommendation ($\beta = .138, p = .012$). A summary of findings for all hypotheses testing may be found in Table 16.

Post Hoc Analyses

Condition Effects: Recommendation Items

Two recommendation items were identified via a One Way ANOVA as showing significant mean differences in the scoring of various applicants’ religions. These include Likeability, ($F (2, 328) = .010$, Christian > Muslim, $p = .020$; Jewish > Muslim, $p = .029$) and Hire, ($F (2, 328) = 3.409$, Jewish > Muslim, $p = .036$). See Table 10 for results. Following is further examination into the aforementioned variables.

Likeability. Regressing Likeability onto applicant religion (contrast coded, 1= Christian, 1= Jew, -2= Muslim) showed that the Muslim applicant was rated significantly lower than the Christian applicant and Jewish applicant together ($\beta = .164, p = .011$) (table 11). Next, a hierarchical regression was run, regressing Likeability onto the Jewish applicant and Muslim applicant, religiosity, nationalism and their respective cross products. This regression revealed that the Muslim was rated significantly worse on Likeability than the Christian ($\beta = -.174, p = .006$). Additionally, religiosity was found to moderate the rating of the Jewish applicant on Likeability such that participants higher in religiosity rated the Jewish applicant significantly lower than the Christian ($\beta = -.230, p = .003$) (see Figure 2 and Table 12).

Another hierarchical regression was run, regressing Likeability onto applicant religion (contrast coded contrast coded, 1= Christian, 1= Jew, -2= Muslim), religiosity, nationalism, and their cross products (see table 13 for steps and results). The Muslim was rated significantly lower than the Christian and the Jewish applicants as a group ($\beta = .169, p = .008$). Religiosity was once
again found to serve as a moderator such that participants higher in religiosity rated the Jew and Muslim as a group significantly less likeable than the Christian ($\beta = -0.182, p = .003$) (Figure 3).

Would you hire this applicant. Regressing Hire, applicant religion (contrast coded, 1= Christian, 1= Jew, -2= Muslim), Religiosity, Nationalism, and their respective cross products revealed that the Christian and Jewish applicants grouped together were rated significantly higher than the Muslim applicant ($\beta = 0.159, p = .013$) (Table 14). An additional regression was run regressing Hire onto the Jewish applicant (dummy coded), Muslim applicant (dummy coded), Nationalism, Religiosity, and their respective cross products. This analysis revealed that the Muslim applicant was rated significantly lower than the Christian applicant ($\beta = -0.125, p = .045$). Furthermore, Nationalism was shown to have a moderating effect on ratings such that participants higher in Nationalism rated Muslims significantly lower than Christians on Hire ($\beta = -0.168, p = .034$) (Figure 4).

Condition Effects: Skills and Abilities

Three recommendation items were identified via a One Way ANOVA as showing significant mean differences in the scoring of various applicants’ religions. These include Oral Expression, ($F(2, 328) = 2.965, \text{Jew} > \text{Muslim}, p = .048$; Speech Clarity, ($F(2, 328) = 4.864, \text{Jewish} > \text{Muslim}, p = .009$); and Speaking, ($F(2, 328) = 3.209, \text{Jew} > \text{Muslim}, p = .036$). See Table 16 for results and Appendix N for the skills and abilities rated. Following is further examination into the aforementioned variables.

Oral Expression

Regressing Oral Expression onto applicants’ religion (contrast coded), Religiosity centered, Nationalism centered, and their respective cross products revealed that Muslims were
rated significantly worse on Oral Expression than Christians and Jews as a group ($\beta = -.157, p = .014$).

**Speech Clarity**

Regressing Speech Clarity onto applicants’ religion (contrast coded), Religiosity centered, Nationalism centered, and their respective cross products showed that Muslims were rated significantly worse on Speech Clarity than Christians and Jews as a group ($\beta = -.194, p = .003$).

**Speaking**

Regressing Speaking onto applicants’ religion (contrast coded), Religiosity centered, Nationalism centered, and their respective cross products showed that Muslims were rated significantly worse in Speaking ability than Christians and Jews as a group.
CHAPTER 4
DISCUSSION

To date, this study was the first to explore religiosity and nationalism for their roles in selection systems for applicants of various faiths. This experiment is particularly relevant given the increase in the number of discrimination cases that the EEOC receives concerning Muslims in work settings (Hansen, 2002). One of the main focuses of the study was the underlying issues that lead to the discrimination of people of Islamic faith (including but certainly not limited to phenotypical stereotyping). The saliency of this issue also brings to light the discrimination that other non-Christian groups (i.e., Jewish) experience. Interesting to note however is that of the major world philosophies and religions in the world, all three of the religions (Judaism, Christianity, and Islam) have been described as Abrahamic, or sharing in a common ancestral history. If the non-Christian groups used in this study (who have mutual faith defining components with Christians) are discriminated against for requesting concessions to practice their faith, it could be expected that other non-Abrahamic faith groups would fare even worse (i.e., a Wiccan pagan requesting concessions in their workplace).

By using a pilot study to rate the concessions used in the study, the experimenter assured that participants perceived the magnitude of the concessions to be equal. This allowed the experimenter to eliminate any effect due to perceived levels of disruptiveness that participants might otherwise have had. Additionally, by stating that the job operates seven days of the week, effects for perceived disruptiveness should also be eliminated for the day of the week that is requested (i.e. Saturday as the Sabbath for Jewish applicants). The job position of marketing was
chosen in order to eliminate possible confounds resulting from people hiring “an image” for
other positions that might entail greater face to face interaction with clients (i.e., a sales position,
pharmaceutical representative). Looking at the means ranking of applicants across
recommendation dimensions and items, however, points to a possible positive stereotype towards
the Jewish applicant. This may be due to participants understanding and perceptions of what the
job context, marketing, entailed. If the participants perceived the field of marketing to be
involved greatly with money, this may have activated participants’ stereotypes about Jewish
people having exceptional skill and aptitude with money matters. Interestingly, this stereotype
arose from the medieval ages of the early church, when the Christians of that time period were
not allowed to collect interest on loans (Glassman, 1975). The business of loans and money
lending, therefore, then became the only business that people of the Jewish faith were allowed to
engage in. The resulting stereotype of Jewish people being good with money matters persists to
this day and may explain why the Jewish applicant scored so well over various recommendation
items and dimensions.

Religiosity. There were three instances in which religiosity moderated participants’
recommendations for the various applicants. For the composite Recommendation variable,
participants higher in religiosity rated the Muslim applicant significantly worse than the Jewish
applicant. As for the recommendation item Likeability, participants higher in religiosity more
negatively rated the Jewish applicant as compared to the Christian, and also rated the Muslim
significantly lower than the Christian and Jewish applicant as a group. These findings may help
to guide rater training initiatives and programs to include different aspects of the rater (e.g.
religiosity) that may influence their ratings of applicants.
Additionally, other aspects and conceptualizations of religiosity should be examined in future studies. Intrinsic (people view religion as central to their identity and internalize its teachings) and extrinsic (people view religion as an opportunity for social support of achieving status) orientations have been examined in earlier studies in relation to prejudice (Batson & Ventis, 1982; Batson & Burris, 1996). More recently, a quest orientation towards religion, characterized by an open searching attitude towards religion, has been examined (Batson & Ventis). Although findings vary, Griffin, Gorsuch, & Davis (1987) suggest that while no singular relationship exists between religious orientation and prejudice, attention must be paid to the surrounding religious and social norms.

To add the existing body of literature on the study of religiosity, future studies should include diverse populations and collect as much varied demographic information as possible. These studies could examine differences in participant religiosity by age, ethnicity, religious affiliation, and even provide enough data to derive new dimensions and scales to measure various conceptualizations of religiosity.

_Nationalism._ In this study, nationalism was found to moderate applicant ratings for Hire such that participants higher in nationalism rated the Muslim applicant significantly worse than the Christian applicant. This item in particular is interesting in that while nationalism did not moderate the other recommendation items or dimensions, when it came down to asking the participant directly if they would hire the participant, nationalism did act as a moderator. Given this finding, organizations should place more attention to nationalism and its role in religious discrimination. This may point to the need for organizations to be explicit in the reasoning behind hiring and promotion decisions, holding the rater accountable for explaining their decisions.
Additionally, larger more diverse samples could be used in future studies that would provide more information on possible differences in nationalism among various subordinate group members (e.g. Latino, African-American, and Asian-American). It may be that participants who do not benefit from systems of privilege (non-White, Male, Christian, Heterosexual, Able-bodied) may have lower levels of nationalism (or different manifestations of nationalism) as compared the dominant groups that do benefit from systems of privilege.

*Muslim Ratings on Skills.* In the exploratory analyses of this study, it was apparent that the Muslim applicant was rated significantly worse on several skill dimensions relating to the ability to verbally communicate, namely Oral Expression, Speech Clarity, and Speaking. This suggests that regardless of the Muslim’s application, which ironically listed schooling and previous employment within the US from 1994 to the present, he was perceived as if he was a foreigner with limited skill in communicating. This effect may be attributable to either the name chosen for the Muslim applicant, or the mere fact that he is Muslim.

*Limitations.* One of the limitations with this study deals with how attendant the participants were to information about the hours of operation for the job itself. In order to eliminate effects for perceived disruptiveness as a result of the day of the week that is requested (i.e. Saturday as the Sabbath for Jewish applicants), it was stated that the job operates seven days of the week. The effectiveness of the strategy was difficult to ascertain however, because a participant check relating to the work days of the job was not implemented. While the results of this study favor the Jewish applicant in most cases, suggesting that the day of the week requested did not adversely affect the Jewish applicant, it is not know what role the day of week requested plays.
There exist some issues with the experimental design in regards to the area in which the experimental population is located. The location of the sample population (Southeastern city) could have attitudes and beliefs that differ from those of other sections of the country. This could be due to the cultural environment (i.e., Georgia versus New York) and also possible different levels of exposure to Muslim populations (and religious diversity) within the US. Also, populations that are closer to or are in large cities could possibly demonstrate more negative bias towards non Christians due to increased feelings of connections based on the physical environment. After news of the first attack on 9/11, most major cities could possibly have thought of themselves as possible targets for future attacks as well (i.e., inhabitants of Georgia quickly thought of the CDC and various military installations), increasing the vividness of “9/11 information” afterwards. Although an effect is expected, the strength of the effect might prove to be unrepresentative of US opinion and could affect generalizability to the population as a whole.

**Future Directions.** Future studies should include other industries and job titles for the context of the selection decision. While this study did control for a job situation in such a way that eliminated the perceived need for face to face client interaction, other job contexts may provide interesting finding. In particular, a job setting that participants would not perceive to have much to do with financial matters may remove participants’ stereotyping behaviors for Jewish applicants. In addition, various industries may be selected based on their perceived masculinity or femininity. This may show effects for differing religions depending on the industry’s gender context.

An additional area that bears further investigation would be to examine how people respond to atheists and/or agnostics as job applicants. People of a faith (regardless of denomination) may look less favorably upon atheists or agnostics, and the reverse may also be
true. Studies looking at these particular issues should also take into account regional differences, white-collar versus blue-collar settings, as well as race and ethnicity among other variables.

In future studies, the religious affiliation of the applicants could be broadened to include a larger sample of other non-Christian philosophies and religions. Eastern philosophies and more new age faiths may fair better than other non-Christian groups due to the integration of some of their ideas and practices in the US mainstream (i.e., the prevalence of yoga, popularity of meditation and new age healers). These groups may therefore be perceived as incorporable and thusly non-threatening, to previously established faith and belief systems.
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APPENDICES
Appendix A

LUKE SMITH

CAREER OBJECTIVE

To obtain a senior position in marketing.

SUMMARY OF QUALIFICATIONS

- Seven years experience as an organized, energetic, and client-focused professional with strong technical skills.
- A creative communicator and presenter; able to establish rapport with individuals and groups at all organizational levels.
- A motivated team player, with a reputation for perseverance and success in managing clients’ accounts.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2006-present Applied Solutions Inc. Atlanta, GA
Marketing specialist
- Successfully led team of other marketing professionals in managing regional accounts.
- Personally responsible for increasing client base by 15% since date of hire.
- Successfully implemented strategies within the department which led to a marked increase in productivity.

2000-2006 Ferguson and Henley South Ridge, SC
District Marketing Manager
- Mentored other accountants who transferred into the company.
- Managed 250 clients in 10 Eastern states.
- Implemented training course for new marketing employees, resulting in increased productivity and client retention.

EDUCATION

1994-1999 South Ridge State University South Ridge, SC
- B.A., Accounting.
- Graduated summa cum laude.
Appendix B

ABDUL HANIFAH

CAREER OBJECTIVE

To obtain a senior position in marketing.

SUMMARY OF QUALIFICATIONS

- Seven years experience as an organized, energetic, and client-focused professional with strong technical skills.
- A creative communicator and presenter; able to establish rapport with individuals and groups at all organizational levels.
- A motivated team player, with a reputation for perseverance and success in managing clients’ accounts.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2006-present  Applied Solutions Inc.  Atlanta, GA

Marketing specialist

- Successfully led team of other marketing professionals in managing regional accounts.
- Personally responsible for increasing client base by 15% since date of hire.
- Successfully implemented strategies within the department which led to a marked increase in productivity.

2000-2006  Ferguson and Henley  South Ridge, SC

District Marketing Manager

- Mentored other accountants who transferred into the company.
- Managed 250 clients in 10 Eastern states.
- Implemented training course for new marketing employees, resulting in increased productivity and client retention.

EDUCATION

1994-1999  South Ridge State University  South Ridge, SC

- B.A., Accounting.
- Graduated summa cum laude.
Appendix C

SETH GOLDBERG

CAREER OBJECTIVE

To obtain a senior position in marketing.

SUMMARY OF QUALIFICATIONS

- Seven years experience as an organized, energetic, and client-focused professional with strong technical skills.
- A creative communicator and presenter; able to establish rapport with individuals and groups at all organizational levels.
- A motivated team player, with a reputation for perseverance and success in managing clients’ accounts.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2006-present Applied Solutions Inc. Atlanta, GA
Marketing specialist
- Successfully led team of other marketing professionals in managing regional accounts.
- Personally responsible for increasing client base by 15% since date of hire.
- Successfully implemented strategies within the department which led to a marked increase in productivity.

2000-2006 Ferguson and Henley South Ridge, SC
District Marketing Manager
- Mentored other accountants who transferred into the company.
- Managed 250 clients in 10 Eastern states.
- Implemented training course for new marketing employees, resulting in increased productivity and client retention.

EDUCATION

1994-1999 South Ridge State University South Ridge, SC
- B.A., Accounting.
- Graduated summa cum laude.
Employee: Luke Smith
Department: Marketing

VACATION REQUESTS:
- February 20-26, 2009 for moving to a new house
- August 17, 2009 for family member’s graduation

OTHER REQUESTS AND CONCESSIONS:
- A space to pray and read the bible during the work day.
- Time off to attend prayer services on Fridays at church.
Appendix E

APPLIED SOLUTIONS INC.

Human Resources Department

Employee: Abdul Hanifah
Department: Marketing

VACATION REQUESTS:
- February 20-26, 2009 for moving to a new house
- August 17, 2009 for family member’s graduation

OTHER REQUESTS AND CONCESSIONS:
- A space to lay a prayer rug, kneel, and face east briefly during the work day.
- Time off on Fridays to attend Jumu’ah, a community prayer service
Employee: Seth Goldberg
Department: Marketing

VACATION REQUESTS:
- February 20-26, 2009 for moving to a new house
- August 17, 2009 for family member’s graduation

OTHER REQUESTS AND CONCESSIONS:
- A space to pray and read the siddur (Jewish prayer book) during the work day.
- Time off on Saturdays to observe the Sabbath.
Appendix G

INSTRUCTIONS: The current study will examine how strongly an applicant’s resume influences selection decisions and how information is used in selection decisions. You are viewing an application for an internal promotion to a senior marketing position at Applied Solutions Inc which has normal business functions every day of the week (Monday through Sunday). Using the information provided in the personnel file (which includes a resume and a list of employee concessions made to Human Resources), please evaluate the applicant based on the qualifications listed on the job description below. Afterwards, there will be a simple recall test.

Job Description:

Responsibilities:

This position is for those employees who have a passion for people and demonstrated competency in a junior marketing position. The job involves the coordination of multiple team members on various projects as well as new accounts. During the course of employment you will be exposed to: Team Management, Campaign Coordination, and Business to Business Marketing and Sales

Required knowledge, skills, and abilities:

- Sales and Marketing- Knowledge of principles and methods for showing, promoting, and selling products or services. This includes marketing strategy and tactics, product demonstration, sales techniques, and sales control systems.
- Critical Thinking- Using logic and reasoning to identify the strengths and weaknesses of alternative solutions, conclusions or approaches to problems.
- Coordination-Adjusting actions in relation to others' actions.
• Active Learning- Understanding the implications of new information for both current and future problem solving and decision-making.

• Reading Comprehension- Understanding written sentences and paragraphs in work related documents.

• Speaking- Talking to others to convey information.

• Writing- Communicating effectively in writing as appropriate for the needs of the audience.

• Written Comprehension- The ability to read and understand information and ideas presented in writing.

• Oral Comprehension- The ability to listen to and understand information and ideas presented through spoken words and sentences.

• Oral Expression- The ability to communicate information and ideas in speaking so others will understand.

• Speech Clarity- The ability to speak clearly so that others can understand you.
Appendix H

INSTRUCTIONS: Based on your reading and evaluation of the contents of the personnel file, please respond to the items below by circling the number that best reflects your opinion.

Please do not re-read the information in the personnel file that was distributed.

1) Based on the personnel file, how likely are you to recommend the applicant for the new position?

1                2            3            4               5

Not Likely         Definitely

2) Based on the qualifications, how professional does the résumé seem to be?

1                2            3            4               5

Not Professional       Very Professional

3) Based on the résumé, how confident are you that applicant can do the job?

1                2            3            4               5

Not Confident        Very Confident

4) Based on the résumé, how likable do you perceive this applicant to be?

1                2            3            4               5

Not Likable        Very Likable

5) Based on the personnel file, how competent do you perceive this applicant to be?

1                2            3            4               5

Not Competent        Very Competent

6) If you were in charge for hiring for the position in question, what is the likelihood that you would hire this applicant?

1                2            3            4               5
7) Based on the résumé, how qualified is the applicant?

1                2            3            4               5
Not Qualified        Very Qualified

*Items in bold are dependent measures.
Appendix I

INSTRUCTIONS: For the questions below, please rank your opinion to the question posed on the 5-point scale provided. Please indicate your ranking circling the number that best reflects your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I find that traffic in the morning is more frustrating than traffic in the evening.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>U.S. cities should divert more funds to solve the problem of traffic at peak travel times.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>In view of America’s moral and material superiority, it is only right that we should have the biggest say in deciding United Nations policy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I believe that other countries have more advanced solutions to traffic than the U.S.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My state does a good job of maintaining its roads and interstates.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I believe that the government’s response to traffic issues is yet another way that the government can show how it cares for its citizens.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The first duty of every young American is to honor the national American history and heritage.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I believe that there are few, if any, transportation issues in this country.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I believe that radar detectors should be legal everywhere in the U.S.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Other countries should try to make their government as much like ours as possible.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>People today seem much more passive as compared to five years ago.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Foreign nations have done some very fine things but it takes America to do things in a big way.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The local government where I live is continuously working on improving road conditions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Americans today do not seem to care that much about the conditions of America’s roadways as compared to 50 years ago.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><strong>It is really NOT important that the U.S. be number one in whatever it does. (reverse scored)</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>As a whole, drivers have become progressively more aggressive with each new generation of drivers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td><strong>People should support their country even if the country is in the wrong.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I feel that on the average, men are more likely than women to obey traffic laws.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Indirectly, I feel that other countries negatively impact the transportation industry here in the U.S.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Items in bold are dependent measures.*
Appendix J

INSTRUCTIONS: For the questions below, please rank your opinion to the question posed on the 5-point scale. Please indicate your ranking circling the number that best reflects your opinion.

1) How often do you attend religious services?

   1                        2                                  3                                4                               5
   Almost Never               Extremely Often

2) In general, how important are religious or spiritual beliefs in your day-to-day life?

   1                        2                                  3                                4                               5
   Not Important at All              Very Important

3) When you do have problems or difficulties in your work, family, or personal life, how often do you seek spiritual comfort?

   1                        2                                  3                                4                               5
   Almost Never               Extremely Often

4) In general, would you say you are a religious person?

   1                        2                                  3                                4                               5
   Not at All               Absolutely
Appendix K

Demographic Information and Recall Test

Please provide the following demographic information about yourself:

1) Race:
   ___ Caucasian/White
   ___ African American/Black
   ___ Latino/a
   ___ Native American
   ___ Asian/Pacific Islander
   ___ Other- Please Specify: __________________________

2) Gender:
   ___ Male         ___ Female

3) Age: ______

4) Religious Affiliation:
   
   Do you identify as Christian?

   ___ Yes (Please mark below)
       
       ___ Anglican
       ___ Baptist
       ___ Catholic
       ___ Congregationalist
       ___ Episcopalian
       ___ Greek Orthodox
       ___ Lutheran
___ Methodists
___ Oriental Orthodox
___ Pentecostal
___ Presbyterian
___ Seventh Day Adventist
___ Other Christian- Please specify: ____________

___ No (Please mark below)
___ Muslim
___ Jewish
___ Hindu
___ Sikh
___ Buddhist
___ Atheist
___ Agnostic
___ Other: _________________

**INSTRUCTIONS:** The next set of questions is a recall test based on the information provided on the resume. Please indicate your response to each of the questions below. Keep in mind that not all information was blatantly stated on the applicant’s resume. Some questions may require inferences in order to select a response.

1) The applicant’s religious affiliation is
   ___ Christian
   ___ Jewish
   ___ Muslim

2) The applicant’s gender is
   ___ Male
   ___ Female
Appendix L

Pilot Study for Concessions

A pilot study was conducted in order to determine the religious concessions to be utilized as the manipulations on the concessions sheets for the main experiment. Participants in the pilot experiment used the Experimetrix website to sign up for the experiment. Within Experimetrix, participants were then provided a link to the pilot survey, posted on SurveyMonkey. Fifteen religious concession items were tested in the pilot and were embedded amongst fifteen non-religious concession distracter items (please refer to Appendix L for a full listing of items used in the pilot). Participants were instructed to rate the concessions on a five point Likert scale (1 Extremely Disruptive, 2 Strongly Disruptive, 3 Mildly Disruptive, 4 Slightly Disruptive, 5 Non Disruptive) as to how disruptive the action or statement would be in a workplace setting. Fifty-five participants participated in the pilot survey. A Concession Variable was computed that showed mean scale score per participant. The mean score of the Concession Variable was then found to be 3.54, with an SD of .58294. Religious concession items that comprised the Concession Variables that fell at or close to 1 SD from the mean or greater towards the more disruptive side of the scale (2.9006) were considered for use in the main experiment. Items include “An employee requests half days off for a particular day every week (M = 2.82, SD = 1.056)”, “An employee prays in the workplace in a volume that is audible for other co-workers to hear (M = 2.42, SD = 1.243)”, “A coworker plays religious themed music at their workstation (M = 2.98, SD = 1.340)”, “An employee requests a space in the workplace to read texts central to their faith during business hours (M = 2.98, SD = 1.114)”. Of the four resulting concessions, two (# 6, #19) were chosen as most likely to happen in the workplace.
Appendix M

**INSTRUCTIONS:** For the questions below, please rank your opinion to the question posed on the 5-point scale provided as to how disruptive the action or statement would be in a workplace setting. Please indicate your ranking circling the number that best reflects your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Extremely Disruptive</th>
<th>Strongly Disruptive</th>
<th>Mildly Disruptive</th>
<th>Slightly Disruptive</th>
<th>Non Disruptive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  An employee requests to move their vacation time to another part of the year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  An employee keeps office supplies in their area only.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  An employee requests permission to wear a religious garment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  The company copier is only allowed to be used with permission from managers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  Employees are required to recertify their qualifications for various software programs twice a year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  An employee request half days off for a particular day every week.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Religious objects are placed in view of coworkers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Paper usage is tracked by employee and all employees have the same allowance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>An employee requests time off to attend a religious event</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A portion of the workspace is dedicated for employees to use for faith purposes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A coworker plays religious themed music at their workstation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Requests for office supplies must pass through a manager and supervisor for approval.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>An employee requests that coworkers respect and accommodate all of his/her articles of faith.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>An employee requests that certain foodstuffs be kept out of site and/or separate from certain food items.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Long distance calls are not permitted using phones in the workplace. Employees must use their own means to contact clients and</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. **An employee does not toast or drink with clients/coworkers on business lunches and dinners.**

17. The workplace is being remodeled (painting and drywall) during business hours.

18. Break room areas are unkempt and rarely cleaned.

19. **An employee requests a space in the workplace to read texts central to their faith during business hours.**

20. Due to a shortage, some employees must share computer terminals throughout the workweek.

21. Technical support is short staffed and longer time estimates are given for repairs.

22. **An employee informs coworkers that he/she will not attend workplace holiday parties or events.**

23. Coworkers distribute political propaganda in the workplace.
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The use of couriers is limited to employees with supervisor status only.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td><strong>Religious texts are posted such that they are visible for all to see.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Paper clips, staples, and other items are never in full supply in the workplace.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td><strong>An employee spends time during the workday to focus on issues of faith.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td><strong>An employee requests that their vacation time be moved to another time of year.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Mileage is not reimbursed when traveling for business related issues.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Coworkers listen to music at their workstations at a level that is audible to their coworkers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Items in bold are concessions related to religion.*
Appendix N

**INSTRUCTIONS:** Based upon your review of this applicant’s résumé, how qualified do you evaluate him/her to be on the following characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Unqualified</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Very Qualified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sales and Marketing</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Active Learning</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Written Comprehension</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Oral Comprehension</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Oral Expression</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Speech Clarity</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Level of nationalism as a moderator on the religious affiliation and selection relationship
Figure 2. Level of Religiosity as a moderator on the religious affiliation and selection relationship
Figure 3. Level of Nationalism as a moderator on the religious affiliation and selection relationship
Figure 4. Level of nationalism as a moderator on the religious affiliation and selection relationship
### Table 1. Descriptives for conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent of Men</th>
<th>Percent of Total for Condition</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent of Women</th>
<th>Percent of Total for Condition</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.83</td>
<td>18.64</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20.17</td>
<td>81.36</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17.82</td>
<td>17.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian 2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.51</td>
<td>37.04</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>62.96</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16.31</td>
<td>34.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.20</td>
<td>32.65</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>67.35</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14.80</td>
<td>48.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew 2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.35</td>
<td>32.73</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15.55</td>
<td>67.27</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16.62</td>
<td>65.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.13</td>
<td>23.44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20.59</td>
<td>76.56</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>19.34</td>
<td>84.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim 2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.98</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15.55</td>
<td>74.00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15.11</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>28.10</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>71.90</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Scale reliabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Recommendation</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>4.015</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>1.33 – 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Nationalism Scale</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>2.798</td>
<td>0.643</td>
<td>1.17 – 4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Religiosity Scale</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>3.329</td>
<td>1.226</td>
<td>1.0 – 5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Sample size was 331. All scales were based on a 5 point scale, with a higher value indicating a higher degree of the construct.
Table 3. Descriptives for conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent of Men</th>
<th>Percent of Total for Condition</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent of Women</th>
<th>Percent of Total for Condition</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>27.43</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>34.45</td>
<td>72.57</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>34.14</td>
<td>34.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36.56</td>
<td>32.69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>29.41</td>
<td>67.31</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>31.42</td>
<td>65.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30.11</td>
<td>24.56</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>36.13</td>
<td>75.44</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>34.44</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>28.10</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>71.90</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Zero order correlations of variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Applicant Religion</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gender</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Nationalism</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Religiosity</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Recommendation</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a 1= Christian, 2 = Jew, 3 = Muslim

*b 0= Male, 1= Female

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Table 5. Ranking of applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation Dimension/Item</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Recommendation Mean</td>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Likeability Mean</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hire Mean</td>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Speaking Mean</td>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Oral Expression Mean</td>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Speech Clarity Mean</td>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. ANOVA Post Hoc Tukey Mean Comparison of Recommendation by Applicant Religion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>.219*</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>-.219*</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.
Table 7: Regression Analysis Predicting Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>Adjusted R2</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jew and Muslim to Christian</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian and Jew to Muslim</td>
<td>.153*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level
** Significant at the .01 level
Table 8. Religiosity and Nationalism Moderation Effects on Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps/Variables</th>
<th>Adjusted R2</th>
<th>Δ R2</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Δ F</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STEP 1:</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>2.861</td>
<td></td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP 2:</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>4.248*</td>
<td>5.556</td>
<td>.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.154*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP 3:</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>2.644*</td>
<td>1.037</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.258*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew x Nationalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew x Religiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim x Nationalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim x Religiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level
Table 9. Gender Moderation Effects on Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps/Variables</th>
<th>Adjusted R2</th>
<th>Δ R2</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Δ F</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STEP 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Main Effect</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>3.111*</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion Main Effect, Christian and Jew to Muslim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion Main Effect, Jew to Muslim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.138*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP 2:</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>2.014</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Main Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion Main Effect, Christian and Jew to Muslim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion Main Effect, Jew to Muslim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x Christian and Jew to Muslim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender x Jew to Muslim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level
Table 10. ANOVA means comparison for recommendation items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation Item</th>
<th>(I) Applicant Religion</th>
<th>(J) Applicant Religion</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likeability</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>.298*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>.289*</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>-.289*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>-.289*</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>.292*</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>-.219</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>-.292*</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.
Table 11. Moderating effects of Religiosity on Likeability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps/Variables</th>
<th>Adjusted R²</th>
<th>Δ R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Δ F</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STEP 1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>4.684</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.169**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STEP 2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>3.248</td>
<td>1.790</td>
<td>-.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.174*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STEP 3:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>3.138</td>
<td>2.949</td>
<td>-.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.178**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.300**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew x Nationalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew x Religiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.230**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim x Nationalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim x Religiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level
** Significant at the .01 level
Table 12. Religiosity Moderation Effects on Likeability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps/Variables</th>
<th>Adjusted R2</th>
<th>Δ R2</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Δ F</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STEP 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew and Muslim to Christian</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>4.684**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian and Jew to Muslim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.169*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP 2:</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>3.248*</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew and Muslim to Christian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian and Jew to Muslim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.169*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP 3:</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>3.138*</td>
<td>2.949</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew and Muslim to Christian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian and Jew to Muslim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.166*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.109*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew and Muslim to Christian x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew and Muslim to Christian x Religiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.182*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian and Jew to Muslim x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian and Jew to Muslim x Religiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.092</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level
Table 13. Regression Analysis Predicting Hire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>Adjusted R2</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jew and Muslim to Christian</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>3.409*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian and Jew to Muslim</td>
<td>.039*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level
Table 14. Religiosity Effects on Hire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps/Variables</th>
<th>Adjusted R2</th>
<th>Δ R2</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Δ F</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STEP 1:</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>3.409*</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP 2:</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>3.573**</td>
<td>3.682</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.125*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.125*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP 3:</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>2.462*</td>
<td>1.337</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.126*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew x Nationalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jew x Religiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim x Nationalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.168*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim x Religiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the .05 level
** Significant at the .01 level
**Table 15. ANOVA post hoc Tukey means comparison for applicant skills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation Item</th>
<th>(I) Applicant Religion</th>
<th>(J) Applicant Religion</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Expression</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>.273*</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>-.184</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>-.273*</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Clarity</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>.353*</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>-.271</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>-.353*</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>.287*</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>-.185</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>-.287*</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.
### Table 16. Summary of hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Supported</th>
<th>Not Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1: Applicant religion’s effect on recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2: Moderating effects of nationalism on recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderating effects of religion on recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3: Moderating effects of gender on recommendation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>