

**Assessing Religious Xenophilia: Christian Love of the “Stranger” within Religious
Fundamentalist and Biblical Foundationalist Ideological Surrounds**

P. J. Watson

University of Tennessee at Chattanooga

Benjamin S. Reagan

Bryan College

Zhuo Job Chen

Clemson University

Ronald J. Morris

University of Tennessee at Chattanooga

(Address all correspondence to P. J. Watson, Psychology/Department #2803, 350 Holt Hall –
615 McCallie Avenue, University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, Chattanooga, TN 37403, U.S.A.
E-mail: paul-watson@utc.edu.)

Abstract

While research documents conservative religious tendencies toward a fear (“phobia”) of the stranger (“xeno”), this investigation sought to demonstrate additional potentials for a love (“philia”) of the stranger (“xeno”). A new Religious Xenophilia Scale defined Xenophilic Love and Xenophilic Grace factors in a sample of 279 American Christians. Xenophilic linkages with Religious Fundamentalism, Biblical Foundationalism, Religious Orientation, Extrinsic Cultural Religious Orientation, Religious Schema, Social Dominance Orientation, and Dark Triad scales uncovered conservative religious potentials for social openness. Partial correlations controlling for Biblical Foundationalism described a more closed and less xenophilic Religious Fundamentalist ideological surround, whereas partial correlations controlling for Religious Fundamentalism revealed a more open and more xenophilic Biblical Foundationalist surround. These data supported the Ideological Surround Model of psychology and religion in further confirming conservative religious potentials for psychosocial openness.

Keywords: Xenophilia, Xenophobia, Ideological Surround Model, Religious Openness Hypothesis, Religious Fundamentalism, Biblical Foundationalism

Assessing Religious Xenophilia: Christian Love of the “Outsider” within Religious Fundamentalist and Biblical Foundationalist Ideological Surrounds

Not uncommon in social scientific research are findings that cognitive and social rigidities define conservative religious commitments in the West. An Intrinsic Religious Orientation Scale, for instance, records efforts to make religion the guiding motivation in life (Gorsuch & McPherson, 1989), and this correlate of orthodoxy does seem to predict religious and psychological adjustment (Hood, Hill, & Spilka, 2009). A broad ranging research program, nevertheless, depicts intrinsic religiousness as inadequate in addressing the existential complexities of life and as cognitively constrained, motivated by superficial social desirability concerns, and narrow-minded in its reactions to others (Batson, Schoenrade, & Ventis, 1993). A Quest Scale seeks to redress this problem by recording a more doubting and open-minded religious search for meaning in life.

Findings describing fundamentalism further document the problem. The Religious Fundamentalism Scale predicts xenophobia in, for example, a fear (“phobia”) of such strangers (“xeno”) as immigrants, different races, Jews, and homosexuals (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992, 2004). Religious Schema measures describe Truth of Texts and Teachings (TTT) as an index of fundamentalism along a developmental continuum next to Fairness, Tolerance, and Rationality (FTR) and opposite Xenosophia (Streib, Hood, & Klein, 2010). TTT theoretically anchors the immature pole of this continuum with an ability to see wisdom (“sophia”) in the religious perspectives of strangers (“xeno”) defining Xenosophia at the mature pole. Negative linkages of TTT with Xenosophia support this developmental model. A Post-Critical Beliefs Scale includes an essentially fundamentalist Transcendence factor and a Symbolism factor that operationalizes a rejection of literalistic and thus fundamentalist interpretations of religious texts (e.g., Duriez,

Soenens, & Hutsebaut, 2005). Findings that Transcendence predicts more closed and Symbolism more open forms of functioning further illustrate an extensive research literature that describes conservative religiosity as closed-minded.

Religious Openness Hypothesis

Despite such findings, a Religious Openness Hypothesis has recently argued that conservative religious commitments have at least some potentials for openness (e.g., Watson, Chen, Ghorbani, & Vartanian, 2015; Ghorbani, Watson, Sarmast, & Chen, in press). Origins of this hypothesis began with the adaptation of a Religious Reflection Scale developed with Muslims in Australia and Malaysia (Dover, Miner, & Dowson, 2007) for use with Christians in the United States (Watson, Chen, & Hood, 2011). Christian Religious Reflection had two factors. Faith Oriented Reflection appeared in such self-reports as, “Faith in Christ is what nourishes the intellect and makes the intellectual life prosperous and productive.” Intellect Oriented Reflection included such other claims as, “I believe as humans we should use our minds to explore all fields of thought from science to metaphysics.” Negative correlations between these two factors and their linkages with other variables supported the broader research literature in describing a life of conservative religious faith as being incompatible with a life of the mind

Three lines of evidence, nevertheless, demonstrated that any such conclusion would be too simple. First, the intellectual closed-mindedness of Christian Religious Reflection proved to be ideologically specific (Watson et al., 2011). According to an Ideological Surround Model, research within the psychology of religion invariably reflects the somewhat non-empirical, normative, and sociological influences of ideology (Watson, 1993, 2011). Measures of relevant constructs will consequently have normative presumptions built into their operationalization. The Religious Fundamentalism Scale, for instance, seems to presuppose a religious rigidity that may reflect participation in a culture war against secularism. A Biblical Foundationalist Scale

translates this instrument into a less aggressive and more thoughtful language that seems more sensitive to non-fundamentalist perspectives (Watson, Sawyers, Morris, Carpenter, Jimenez, Jonas, & Robinson, 2003). Partial correlations controlling for Biblical Foundationalism define a Religious Fundamentalist ideological surround whereas statistical controls for Religious Fundamentalism construct a Biblical Foundationalist surround. Religious closed-mindedness only appeared within the Religious Fundamentalist surround. Within the Biblical Foundationalist surround, Faith and Intellect Oriented Religious Reflection correlated positively with each other and with Biblical Foundationalism. Data for Biblical Foundationalism, therefore, confirmed potentials for openness within conservative religious perspectives.

Second, studies outside the West found that Faith and Intellect Oriented Reflection correlated positively rather than negatively as they do in the United States. Such outcomes appeared with Muslims in Iran (Ghorbani, Watson, Chen, & Dover, 2013), Malaysia (Tekke, Watson, İsmail, & Chen, 2015), and Pakistan (Khan, Watson, & Chen, 2017) and with Hindus in India (Kamble, Watson, Marigoudar, & Chen, 2014). Contrasts with American data could not be explained in terms of Muslim and Hindu differences with Christians, because Faith and Intellect Oriented Reflection also correlated positively in Christians living in Iran (Watson, Ghorbani, Vartanian, & Chen, 2015).

Third, one explanation of such cross-cultural contrasts could be that a culture war against secularism operates as a more prominent sociological reality in the West that encourages a defensive closing of the conservatively religious mind. A test of this hypothesis began with the development of a Defense against Secularism Scale that expressed a religious rejection of secular reason (Watson, Chen, Morris, & Stephenson, 2015). Items said, for instance, “Reason is a weapon that the culture uses to destroy faith” and “Secularist beliefs urge the use of reason and open-mindedness in political life because the real motive is to destroy our religious beliefs.”

Defense against Secularism correlated positively with both Religious Fundamentalism and Biblical Foundationalism, but this relationship was stronger within the Religious Fundamentalist surround (also see, Watson, Chen, & Morris, in press). Mediation analyses more importantly demonstrated that Defense against Secularism at least partially and often wholly explained connections of conservative religiousness with intellectual narrow-mindedness. Religious closed-mindedness in the United States, therefore, seemed to reflect external sociological factors more than the internal non-empirical and normative dictates of ideology.

Xenophilia as Religious Social Openness

Evidence, therefore, reveals conservative religious potentials for intellectual openness. But do potentials for social openness exist as well? This study examined that possibility by developing a Religious Xenophilia Scale for assessing a religious love (“philia”) rather than fear (“phobia”) of the stranger (“xeno”). Jewish (Leviticus 19:18) and Christian (Mark 12:31) traditions, for instance, encourage people to love their neighbors as themselves. The Christian parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37) then goes on to imply that a “neighbor” is anyone who happens to be “nearby.” As Placher (1994) notes, “The New Testament word for ‘hospitality,’ *philoxenia*, means ‘love of strangers’; it is the opposite of xenophobia, the fear of those whom one does not know” (p. 153). “New Testament texts,” he adds, “find a variety of ways to challenge the model of a community of insiders who exclude” (p. 153). A quote from the Second Century Christian apologist Justin Martyr further illustrates Christian commitments to love the stranger, “There is not ... one single race of [people] – whether barbarians, Greeks, or persons called by any other name, nomads, or vagabonds, or herdsmen dwelling in tents – among whom prayers and thanksgiving are not offered to the Father and Creator of the universe in the name of the Crucified Jesus” (Justin Martyr as quoted in Placher, p. 154). A “hospitable” Christianity is a religion of inclusion, not exclusion.

In the present investigation, Christians responded to potential Religious Xenophilia items along with psychological and other religious variables. Additional religious measures included Religious Fundamentalism (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 2004), Biblical Foundationalism (Watson et al., 2003), Religious Schema (Streib et al., 2010), Religious Orientation (Gorsuch & McPherson, 1989), and Extrinsic Cultural Religious Orientation (Watson, Chen, & Ghorbani, 2014) scales. This procedure first made it possible to test the hypothesis that Xenophilia would be more obvious within Biblical Foundationalist than within Religious Fundamentalist ideological surrounds. A further expectation was that Xenophilia would correlate positively not only with the “fundamentalism” of TTT but also with the relatively greater openness of FTR and Xenosophia. Religious Orientation Scales helped define the religious motivational foundations of Xenophilia. Extrinsic Cultural factors recorded commitments to religion to promote the well-being of society. Most important was the expectation that its Peace and Justice factor would more likely reflect Xenophilia and a Biblical Foundationalist ideological surround.

Psychological measures included Social Dominance Orientation (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994). and the Dark Triad Machiavellianism, Narcissism, and Psychopathy (Jonason & Webster, 2010) scales. The Social Dominance Orientation records “the extent to which one desires that one's in-group dominate and be superior to outgroups” and predicts the xenophobia of racism (Pratto et al., 1994, p. 742). Dark Triad measures record subclinical tendencies to be exploitative in relationships with others. Xenophobic and exploitative relationships would presumably be incompatible with Xenophilic “hospitality.”

Hypotheses

In a sample of American Christians, this investigation sought to develop a Religious Xenophilia Scale for recording conservatively religious commitments to love (“philia”) rather

than fear (“phobia”) of strangers (“xeno”). Evidence of scale validity would appear with the confirmation of five most important sets of hypotheses.

First, Religious Xenophilia should demonstrate a broad compatibility with basic motivations for being religious. Such outcomes would appear in positive correlations with Religious Orientation and Extrinsic Cultural Religious Orientation scales. Especially important would be the observation of a positive Xenophilic linkage with Peace and Justice as a religious motivation that seeks to promote the well-being of all members of a society.

Second, Religious Xenophilia should correlate positively with TTT and with both FTR and Xenosopia. This pattern of relationships would reveal a biblically conservative openness to outside religious perspectives.

Third, Religious Xenophilia should correlate negatively with the xenophobic tendencies of a Social Dominance Orientation and with the interpersonal exploitation that characterize Machiavellianism, Narcissism, and Psychopathy.

Fourth, Religious Xenophilia should correlate positively with Biblical Foundationalism and negatively with Religious Fundamentalism.

Fifth, Religious Xenophilia should be more influential within a more open Biblical Foundationalist than within a more closed Religious Fundamentalist ideological surround.

Method

Participants

Research participants were undergraduates enrolled in an Introductory Psychology class at a state university in the southeastern United States. The final sample included 279 out of 348 students who had indicated that they were Christian. Average age of these 131 males and 148 females was 19.1 ($SD = 1.7$).

Measures

All instruments used 0 to 4 Likert response formats. Scales appeared in a single booklet in the order of their descriptions below, which also presents internal reliabilities and descriptive statistics observed with the present sample.

Religious Orientation. Gorsuch and McPherson (1989) Religious Orientation Scales used eight statements to operationalize the Intrinsic Religious Orientation ($\alpha = .85$, M response per item = 2.62, $SD = 0.83$) with three items each recording the Extrinsic Personal ($\alpha = .69$, $M = 2.52$, $SD = 0.86$) and Extrinsic Social ($\alpha = .78$, $M = 1.14$, $SD = 0.89$) Orientations. Indicative of the Intrinsic Orientation was the claim, “My whole approach to life is based on my religion.” Extrinsic Personal items said, for example, “What religion offers me most is comfort in times of trouble and sorrow.” “I go to church mostly to spend time with my friends” was representative of the Extrinsic Social motivation.

Social Dominance Orientation. Sixteen items expressed the Social Dominance Orientation (Pratto et al., 1994: $\alpha = .91$, $M = 1.23$, $SD = 0.77$). An illustrative item said, "Some groups of people are more worthy than others."

Dark Triad. Four statements each measured Machiavellianism ($\alpha = .70$, $M = 1.68$, $SD = 0.92$), Psychopathy ($\alpha = .76$, $M = 1.09$, $SD = 0.91$), and Narcissism ($\alpha = .73$, $M = 1.90$, $SD = 0.91$) (Jonason & Webster, 2010). Representative of Machiavellianism was the admission, “I have used deceit or lied to get my way.” Psychopathy appeared in such self-reports as, “I tend to lack remorse.” Narcissism items said, for instance, “I tend to want others to admire me.”

Religious Schema. Each Religious Schema Scale included five statements (Streib, et al., 2010). A representative expression of TTT said, “What the texts and stories of my religion tell me is absolutely true and must not be changed” ($\alpha = .83$, $M = 2.61$, $SD = 0.90$). “When I make a decision, I look at all sides of the issue and come up with the best decision possible,” exemplified FTR ($\alpha = .74$, $M = 3.01$, $SD = 0.71$). Xenosophia appeared in such beliefs as, “It is

important to understand others through a sympathetic understanding of their culture and religion” ($\alpha = .60, M = 2.27, SD = 0.68$).

Xenophilia. Potential Xenophilia items appeared next. Four of these 27 statements served as distractor items. Through error, one Xenophilia item appeared twice, and its removal left 22 to be analyzed for possible inclusion in a final scale.

Religious Fundamentalism. The shorter Religious Fundamentalism Scale included 12 statements (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 2004: $\alpha = .87, M = 2.39, SD = 0.78$). An illustrative statement was the reverse scored claim, “Satan’ is just the name people give to their own bad impulses. There really is no such thing as a diabolical ‘Prince of Darkness’ who tempts us.”

Biblical Foundationalism. The Biblical Foundationalism Scale (Watson et al., 2003) included 15 statements that translated items from the Religious Fundamentalism Scale into a less condemning, more open, and thoughtful language ($\alpha = .93, M = 2.73, SD = 0.76$). One positively scored translation said, for instance, “The bloodshed of human history makes it clear that evil cannot be dismissed as the effect merely of ‘bad human impulses.’ The reality of evil is captured instead in the biblical depiction of Satan as the ‘Prince of Darkness’ who tempts us.”

Extrinsic Cultural Religious Orientation. The Extrinsic Cultural Religious Orientation Scale included 32 statements (Watson, Chen, & Ghorbani, 2014). Sixteen operationalized Family and Social Order ($\alpha = .84, M = 1.99, SD = 0.82$) and said, for instance, “A religious life is important because it promotes better family relationships.” The 5-item Disorder Avoidance factor ($\alpha = .85, M = 1.96, SD = 0.71$) included such self-report as, “Most of the problems of society result from the failure of people to be sincerely religious.” Illustrative of the 5-item Peace and Justice factor ($\alpha = .81, M = 2.40, SD = 0.80$) was the assertion, “My motivation for being religious is a desire to develop a human society that is peaceful, just, and happy.” Cultural Foundations ($\alpha = .79, M = 2.05, SD = 0.65$) included six statements (e.g., “I am religious because I know that the loss of religious life leads to the decline of civilization and culture”).

Procedure

All procedures conformed with university research ethics requirements. Responding was voluntary and confidential. Students received the questionnaire in a large classroom setting. They entered reactions to all items on standardized answer sheets that optical scanning equipment later read into a computer data file for analyses using SPSS.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Statistical procedures first clarified the measures used to evaluate Religious Fundamentalism, Biblical Foundationalism, and Xenophilia. Except for FTR and Xenosophia, all religious constructs correlated positively with each other. The weakest of these significant relationships was between the Intrinsic and Extrinsic Social Orientation (.13, $p < .05$) with the strongest appearing between Disorder Avoidance and Family and Social Order (.82, $p < .001$). FTR predicted higher TTT (.21, $p < .001$) and Xenosophia (.39, $p < .001$) and lower Extrinsic Social scores (-.19, $p < .001$). Xenosophia also correlated positively with Peace and Justice (.22, $p < .001$) and negatively with the Intrinsic Orientation (-.15, $p < .01$).

With regards to psychological constructs, Machiavellianism correlated .45 ($p < .001$) with both Narcissism and Psychopathy. The linkage of Narcissism with Psychopathy was .19, ($p < .001$). Social Dominance Orientation predicted higher Machiavellianism (.18, $p < .01$) and Psychopathy (.19, $p < .001$), but displayed no association with Narcissism (.09, $p > .09$).

Most relationships of psychological scales with religious constructs were nonsignificant. Social Dominance Orientation did, however, correlate negatively with FTR (-.19, $p < .001$) and positively with the Extrinsic Social Orientation (.19, $p < .001$), Family and Social Order (.13), and Cultural Foundations (.13, $p < .05$). Machiavellianism only predicted lower FTR (-.13, p

< .05). Psychopathy displayed inverse relationships with TTT (-.18, $p < .01$), FTR (-.38, $p < .001$), and Xenosophia (-.16, $p < .01$).

Religious Fundamentalism and Biblical Foundationalism

Religious Fundamentalism and Biblical Foundationalism correlated at .77 ($p < .001$). Their zero-order relationships with other measures appear in Table 1. Both correlated positively with the Intrinsic Orientation, TTT, FTR, Family and Social Order, Disorder Avoidance, and Cultural Foundations. Only Biblical Foundationalism correlated positively with the Extrinsic Personal Orientation and with Peace and Justice. Religious Fundamentalism displayed an inverse connection with Xenosophia. The inverse linkage of Biblical Foundationalism with Psychopathy was its only significant zero-order relationship with a psychological construct.

 Insert Table 1 about here

Most important in Table 1 were partial correlations defining a Religious Fundamentalist ideological surround by controlling for Biblical Foundationalism and a Biblical Foundationalist surround by controlling for Religious Fundamentalism. The Biblical Foundationalist surround was more and the Religious Fundamentalist surround was less adjusted. Evidence supporting this conclusion appeared in Biblical Foundationalist partial correlations that were positive with FTR, Xenosophia, and Peace and Justice and negative with Social Dominance Orientation. Opposite relationships appeared within the Religious Fundamentalist surround. Only the Biblical Foundationalist surround predicted lower Psychopathy and higher Cultural Foundations and Extrinsic Personal scores.

Xenophilia Scale and Factors

Analysis of Xenophilia items rested upon the assumption that dimensions within this instrument would be correlated. Examinations of its factor structure, therefore, involved use of a principal components analysis (PCA) with an oblique rotation. Three components displayed eigenvalues greater than 1.0. However, only a single statement defined the third factor, and it loaded more strongly on another factor. A second PCA, therefore, eliminated this dimension and forced all items into the two-factor structure presented in Table 2.

 Insert Table 2 about here

Sixteen of the 22 items loaded on a first Xenophilic Love factor (eigenvalue = 9.78; variance explained = 44.4%). Each expressed a religiously based love for others. Some expressed that love as a general principle (e.g., “My religious beliefs motivate me to love all people”). Others indicated more specifically who should be loved, including people with HIV, those who were sinful, individuals with emotional problems, and people of different races, countries, occupations, educational levels, political beliefs, and religions. Six statements defined a second Xenophilic Grace factor (eigenvalue = 1.56; variance explained = 7.1%). Loading most strongly on this component was the reverse scored assertion, “My religious traditions make it clear that love should only be shown to those who are moral.” Responses to this factor basically reflected a rejection of morality-based rejections of people and thus suggested a loving grace directed toward those deemed to be insufficiently righteous. Xenophilic Love ($\alpha = .93$, $M = 3.33$, $SD = 0.66$) and Xenophilic Grace ($\alpha = .77$, $M = 3.17$, $SD = 0.74$) factors were internally reliable, as was the full scale ($\alpha = .93$, $M = 3.29$, $SD = 0.63$).

Xenophilia Relationships

Correlations for the Xenophilia factors and scale appear in Table 3. The strong connection of Xenophilic Love with the full scale identified these two measures as essentially equivalent. Each also correlated positively, though less robustly with Xenophilic Grace. All three Xenophilia measures exhibited direct relationships with Religious Fundamentalism, Biblical Foundationalism, the Intrinsic Orientation, TTT, and FTR. Xenophilic Grace predicted a lower Extrinsic Social Orientation. Only Xenophilic Love correlated positively with Xenosophia. Xenophilic Love and the full scale displayed direct linkages with all four Extrinsic Cultural factors. An inverse association appeared between Xenophilic Grace and Cultural Foundations. Xenophilia generally predicted lower Social Dominance Orientation and Psychopathy. Xenophilic Grace also correlated negatively with Machiavellianism.

 Insert Table 3 about here

In partial correlations controlling for Biblical Foundationalism, Religious Fundamentalism correlated negatively with Xenophilic Love ($-.12, p < .05$) and non-significantly with Xenophilic Grace ($.09, p > .25$) and the full scale ($-.06, p > .25$). Biblical Foundationalism after controlling for Religious Fundamentalism instead predicted higher Xenophilic Love ($.40, p < .001$), Xenophilic Grace ($.12, p < .05$), and full-scale ($.35, p < .001$) scores. These partial correlations, therefore, suggested that Xenophilia was broadly consistent with a Biblical Foundationalist ideological surround while being incompatible with or irrelevant to a Religious Fundamentalist surround.

Table 4 summarizes other Xenophilia relationships within each surround. Xenophilia predicted greater psychosocial openness regardless of surround. In both surrounds, Xenophilic Love and the full scale correlated positively with FTR, Xenosophia, and Peace and Justice while

displaying inverse connections with Social Dominance Orientation and Psychopathy. Xenophilic Grace also predicted greater FTR and lower Social Dominance Orientation, Machiavellianism, and Psychopathy. The full Xenophilia Scale also correlated negatively with Machiavellianism. Across both ideological surrounds, Xenophilia associations were positive with TTT and negative with the Extrinsic Social Orientation.

Insert Table 4 about here

Positive Xenophilia zero-order correlations with the Intrinsic and Extrinsic Personal Orientations became nonsignificant in partial correlations. Variance associated with both Religious Fundamentalism and Biblical Foundationalism, therefore, explained Xenophilia linkages with these two religious motivations. Previously positive relationships with Family and Social Order, Disorder Avoidance, and Cultural Foundations became negative in partial correlations. Inverse connections of Xenophilic Grace with Cultural Foundations appeared in both zero-order and partial correlations.

Discussion

In line with the Religious Openness Hypothesis, conservative religious commitments demonstrated at least some potentials for social openness. The conservative credentials of the new Religious Xenophilia measures seemed obvious in positive zero-order correlations with Religious Fundamentalism, Biblical Foundationalism, the Intrinsic Religious Orientation, and TTT. Evidence of social openness appeared in other zero-order relationships with greater FTR and lower Social Dominance Orientation and Psychopathy. The Xenophilic Love factor also displayed direct linkages with Xenosophia and Peace and Justice, and Xenophilic Grace correlated negatively with Machiavellianism.

Religious Xenophilia proved to be more congruent with a Biblical Foundationalist than with a Religious Fundamentalist ideological surround. Biblical Foundationalism once again defined a more open and Religious Fundamentalism a more closed religious perspective. Biblical Foundationalism, for example, displayed partial correlations that were positive with FTR, Xenosophia, and Peace and Justice and negative with Social Dominance Orientation. Opposite partial correlations appeared for Religious Fundamentalism. Centrally important, therefore, were additional partial correlations demonstrating that Biblical Foundationalism predicted higher levels of both Xenophilia factors and the full scale, whereas Religious Foundationalism correlated negatively with Xenophilic Love and non-significantly with Xenophilic Grace and the full scale. In short, Christian love of the stranger was compatible with the Biblical Foundationalist surround and either incompatible with or irrelevant to the Religious Fundamentalist surround.

Perhaps surprising, therefore, were further observations that Religious Xenophilia had similar implications across both ideological surrounds. In both sets of partial correlations, Xenophilic Love correlated positively with FTR, Xenosophia, and Peace and Justice and negatively with Social Dominance Orientation and Psychopathy. Xenophilic Love and Xenophilic Grace also consistently predicted higher TTT, documenting their compatibility with conservative religiousness. Hence, Biblical Foundationalism seemed to reflect a more harmonious integration of Religious Xenophilia within a conservative Christian openness. Xenophilia also described conservative openness even within the Religious Fundamentalist ideological surround, but negative and nonsignificant zero-order Xenophilic relationships with Religious Fundamentalism suggested a failure to integrate xenophilic potentials within a conservative and relatively more xenophobic ideological surround.

A lack of integration within the Religious Fundamentalist surround may serve as further evidence of ideological splitting within Western fundamentalist perspectives (Watson, Chen, & Morris, in press). Beliefs that conservative religious commitments are under attack by secularism may lead to anxieties associated with a culture war. Defense mechanisms reduce anxiety, and the defense mechanism of splitting reduces anxieties by minimizing ambiguities in perceptions of self and others as all good or all bad (Kernberg, 1985). The Religious Fundamentalist disintegrative isolation of Religious Xenophilia may reflect ideological splitting in which the conservatively Christian self is evaluated as all good and the secular and all other non-conservative and non-Christian selves are deemed to be all bad. Previous demonstrations that Defense against Secularism explained at least some forms of conservative Christian closed-mindedness may support this possibility (Watson, Chen, Morris, & Stephenson, 2015; Watson, Chen, & Morris, in press). The Religious Xenophilia of Biblical Foundationalism instead suggests an absence of ideological splitting.

Several findings appeared to connect Religious Xenophilia with the sociological dimensions of ideology. Within one or both ideological surrounds, Religious Xenophilia correlated negatively with the Extrinsic Social Religious Orientation, Family and Social Order, Disorder Avoidance, and Cultural Foundations. Each of these measures suggested a grounding of religious commitments within social concerns of the present. These Extrinsic Cultural factors also seemed germane to a culture war against secularism. Hence, negative Religious Xenophilia relationships with these measures may have further revealed a xenophilic potential to rise above ideological conflicts of the present. Findings that both Religious Fundamentalism and Biblical Foundationalism displayed positive partial correlations with Disorder Avoidance, Family and Social Order, and/or Cultural Foundations suggested that neither ideological surround had the same potential. Partial correlations with Peace and Justice that were negative for Religious

Fundamentalism and positive for Biblical Foundationalism nevertheless identified the latter ideological surround as less aggressive.

Xenophilic Love correlated positively with both TTT and Xenosophia. These two Religious Schemas theoretically anchor opposite ends of a continuum of religious development (Streib et al., 2010). Xenophilic Love, therefore, predicted greater religious “immaturity” and “maturity” at the same time. FTR displayed a similar pattern of relationships, which is unsurprising given that it theoretically defines an intermediate location along the presumed continuum. Future studies might, therefore, examine whether Xenophilia mirrors FTR in its religious developmental implications or whether data for Xenophilia might have deeper implications for how religious maturity might be described.

Zero-order correlations for Religious Xenophilia predicted a higher Intrinsic Religious Orientation. None of these linkages remained significant in any partial correlation. Hence, partial correlations seemed to support critiques of the Intrinsic Religious Orientation Scale as a questionable index of religious openness (Batson et al., 1993). An inverse zero-order association of Xenosophia with the Intrinsic Orientation suggested the same thing. Future research might examine whether Religious Xenophilia predicts the more existentially open Quest religious motivation, but analyses of that issue might also need to remain sensitive to ideological influences on how Quest is conceptualized and measured (Watson, Chen, & Morris, 2014).

Correlations among the Xenophilia measures perhaps had implications for how they should be used. The Xenophilic Love correlation with the full scale was so strong that the two measures seemed essentially equivalent. The full scale also was no better than Xenophilic Love in describing relationships with other constructs. Xenophilic Grace linkages with other Xenophilia measures were less robust, and Xenophilic Grace but not Xenophilic Love correlated

negatively with Machiavellianism. In future studies, Xenophilic Love and Xenophilic Grace, but not the full scale, may consequently deserve analysis.

Limitations

Any single study will have limitations that dictate caution in the interpretation of its results. Perhaps most basically, the fact that these data reflected the responding of university undergraduates may limit their generalizability. A skeptic might argue, for instance, that Religious Xenophilia would not predict conservative religious openness in samples of older and perhaps more culturally engaged Christians. This may be true, but the Religious Openness Hypothesis only argues that conservative Christian perspectives have at least some potentials for openness. The claim is not that all conservative Christians will be open, as results for the Religious Fundamentalist ideological surround made clear.

Two other limitations may be noteworthy. Internal reliabilities for the Extrinsic Personal Orientation and Xenosophia measures were relatively low. Confident conclusions about the relationships of these construct with social openness may require further analysis with additional samples in which these two measures prove to be more psychometrically adequate. In addition, the correlations of this study could say nothing definitive about causality. It cannot be said, for example, that Xenophilic Love caused Xenosophia or vice versa. Demonstrations of causality will require the use of different research designs.

Conclusion

According to the Religious Openness Hypothesis, conservative religious commitments have at least some potentials for openness. Evidence of intellectual openness has appeared in studies conducted with Muslims and Hindus living outside the West and in procedures that account for the more secular sociological context of the West. This investigation established that conservative religious potentials for social openness exist as well. A new Religious Xenophilia

Scale demonstrated that a love (“philia”) for the stranger (“xeno”) was incompatible with the xenophobia of a Social Dominance Orientation while simultaneously predicting the traditional religiousness of TTT. Future studies might extend the analysis of Religious Xenophilia to non-Westerns cultural contexts and examine its further implications in the West.

Perhaps most broadly, Religious Xenophilia data supported an assertion of the Ideological Surround Model that epistemological sufficiency in the psychology of religion requires analyses of traditions as a whole (Watson, Chen, & Morris, in press). More atomistic evaluations of discrete elements within a tradition undoubtedly make invaluable contributions. Attempts to clarify the xenophobic potentials of Religious Fundamentalism are clearly important, for instance. At the same time, however, a narrow focus on a single element of a tradition could be misleading. Partial correlations for Religious Fundamentalism and Biblical Foundationalism illustrated that possibility by better documenting the complexity of conservative religious commitments. Traditional religions, like the social sciences and all other cultural institutions, operate within the dynamics of ideology. Comprehensive understandings of all traditions may require at least some social scientific research programs that direct their level of analysis toward ideologies considered more holistically. Among other things, this means that researchers should work to operationalize traditions in an array of constructs that validly record both their potentials and limitations (Watson, 2011). This operationalization of Religious Xenophilia exemplified the effort. Advancements in psychology of religion may, therefore, be available within conceptual frameworks supplied by the Ideological Surround Model.

References

- Altemeyer, B., & Hunsberger, B. (1992). Authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, quest and prejudice. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 2*, 113–133.
- Altemeyer, B., & Hunsberger, B. (2004). A revised religious fundamentalism scale: The short and sweet of it. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 14*, 47-54.
- Batson, C. D., Schoenrade, P., & Ventis, W. L. (1993). *Religion and the individual*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dover, H., Miner, M., & Dowson, M. (2007). The nature and structure of Muslim religious reflection. *Journal of Muslim Mental Health, 2*, 189-210.
- Duriez, B., Soenens, B., & Hutsebaut, D. (2005). Introducing the shortened Post-Critical Belief Scale. *Personality and Individual Differences, 38*, 851-857.
- Ghorbani, N., Watson, P. J., Chen, Z., & Dover, H. (2013). Varieties of openness in Tehran and Qom: Psychological and religious parallels of faith and intellect oriented Islamic religious reflection. *Mental Health, Religion, & Culture, 16*, 123-137.
- Ghorbani, N., Watson, P. J., Sarmast, Z., & Chen, Z. J. (In press). Post-critical beliefs and religious reflection: Religious openness hypothesis in Iranian university and Islamic seminary students. *Journal of Empirical Theology*.
- Gorsuch, R. L., & McPherson, S. E. (1989). Intrinsic/extrinsic measurement: I/E revised and single-item scales. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 28*, 348-354.
- Hood Jr, R. W., Hill, P. C., & Spilka, B. (2009). *The psychology of religion: An empirical approach*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Jonason, P. K., & Webster, G. D. (2010). The dirty dozen: A concise measure of the dark triad. *Psychological Assessment, 22*, 420-432.

- Kamble, S. V., Watson, P. J., Marigoudar, S., & Chen, Z. (2014). Varieties of openness and religious commitment in India: Relationships of attitudes toward Hinduism, Hindu religious reflection, and religious schema. *Archive for the Psychology of Religion, 36*, 172-198.
- Kernberg, O. (1985). *Borderline conditions and pathological narcissism*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson.
- Khan, Z. H., Watson, P. J., & Chen, Z. J. (2017). Religious reflection in Pakistan: Further evidence of integration between Muslim faith and intellect. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1080/13617672.2017.129272
- Placher, W. C. (1994). *Narratives of a vulnerable god*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*, 741-763.
- Streib, H., Hood, R. W, Jr., & Klein, C. (2010). The Religious Schema Scale: Construction and initial validation of a quantitative measure for religious styles. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 20*, 151-172.
- Tekke, M., Watson, P. J., İsmail, N. A., & Chen, Z. J. (2015). Muslim religious openness and *ilm*: Relationships with Islamic religious reflection, religious schema, and religious commitments in Malaysia. *Archive for the Psychology of Religion, 37*, 295-320.
- Watson, P. J. (1993). Apologetics and ethnocentrism: Psychology and religion within an ideological surround. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 3*, 1-20.

- Watson, P. J. (2011). Whose psychology? Which rationality? Christian psychology within an ideological surround after postmodernism. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, *30*, 307-316.
- Watson, P. J., Chen, Z., & Ghorbani, N. (2014). Extrinsic cultural religious orientation: Analysis of an Iranian measure in university students in the United States. *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, *35*, 61-78.
- Watson, P. J., Chen, Z., Ghorbani, N., & Vartanian, M. (2015). Religious openness hypothesis: I. Religious reflection, schemas, and orientations within religious fundamentalist and biblical foundationalist ideological surrounds. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, *34*, 99-113.
- Watson, P. J., Chen, Z., & Hood, R. W., Jr. (2011). Biblical foundationalism and religious reflection: Polarization of faith and intellect oriented epistemologies within a Christian ideological surround. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, *39*, 111-121.
- Watson, P. J., Chen, Z., & Morris, R. J. (2014). Varieties of quest and the religious openness hypothesis within religious fundamentalist and biblical foundationalist ideological surrounds. *Religions*, *5*, 1-20.
- Watson, P. J., Chen, Z. J., & Morris, R. J. (In press). Sanctification of learning and religious openness: Contrasts across religious fundamentalist and biblical foundationalist ideological surrounds. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*.
- Watson, P. J., Chen, Z., Morris, R. J., & Stephenson, E. (2015). Religious Openness Hypothesis: III. Defense against secularism within fundamentalist and biblical foundationalist ideological surrounds. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, *34*, 125-140.

- Watson, P. J., Ghorbani, N., Vartanian, M., & Chen, Z. (2015). Religious openness hypothesis: II. Religious reflection and orientations, mystical experience, and psychological openness of Christians in Iran. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 34*, 114-124.
- Watson, P. J., Sawyers, P., Morris, R. J., Carpenter, M., Jimenez, R. S., Jonas, K. A., & Robinson, D. L. (2003). Reanalysis within a Christian ideological surround: Relationships of intrinsic religious orientation with fundamentalism and right-wing authoritarianism. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 31*, 315-328.

Table 1

Zero-Order (r) and Partial ($r_{ab,c}$) Correlations of Religious Fundamentalism and Biblical Foundationalism with Other Measures Used to Clarify Xenophilia

Measure	Religious Fundamentalism		Biblical Foundationalism	
	r	$r_{ab,c}$	r	$r_{ab,c}$
Intrinsic Orientation	.63***	.35***	.58***	.19**
Extrinsic Personal Orientation	.08	-.09	.18**	.19**
Extrinsic Social Orientation	.02	.05	.00	-.04
Truth of Texts and Teaching	.71***	.38***	.69***	.33***
Fairness, Tolerance, Rationality	.17**	-.15*	.34***	.33***
Xenosophia	-.32***	-.41***	-.09	.27***
Family and Social Order	.46***	.20**	.45***	.17**
Disorder Avoidance	.56***	.28***	.52***	.18**
Peace and Justice	.06	-.21***	.25***	.32***
Cultural Foundations	.40***	.09	.47***	.24***
Social Dominance Orientation	-.00	.13*	-.11	-.17**
Machiavellianism	.04	.11	-.05	-.12
Narcissism	.02	-.02	.04	.04
Psychopathy	-.11	.04	-.18**	-.14*

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Note: Partial Correlations for Fundamentalism control for Biblical Foundationalism whereas partial correlations for Biblical Foundationalism control for Fundamentalism.

Table 2

Factor analysis of Statements from Xenophilia Scale

Statement (Item number)	Factor	
	1	2
My religion is mainly about caring for those who belong to my religion. (1) R	-.14	<u>.69</u>
All people are equally deserving of God's love, regardless of who they are. (2)	<u>.71</u>	-.06
My religion needs to focus more on loving those who do not belong to my religion. (3)	<u>.44</u>	-.14
A truly religious person would treat everyone with the same love and compassion, regardless of how they have lived their lives. (5)	<u>.60</u>	-.03
God wants me to love people of all races. (6)	<u>.78</u>	.03
My religious traditions make it clear that love should only be shown to those who are moral. (8) R	-.01	<u>.74</u>
My faith encourages me to treat people with the same love and kindness regardless of their educational level (10)	<u>.70</u>	.08
Only righteous people with faith deserve my love and compassion. (11) R	.18	<u>.63</u>
If I am true to my religious beliefs, I would love people with HIV the same way I love everyone else. (12)	<u>.50</u>	.31
My religion teaches me to be a loving peacemaker for those who are in conflict with each other. (13)	<u>.66</u>	-.11
People who sin constantly are not worthy of love. (14) R	.30	<u>.55</u>
God makes it clear that everyone deserves the same respect as a human being regardless of their occupation. (15)	<u>.76</u>	-.02
My faith teaches me that the poor are morally responsible for their own poverty and must solve their own problems. (16) R	.05	<u>.59</u>
My faith motivates me to care sincerely for all people in all countries. (17)	<u>.80</u>	.04
My faith helps me see the inherent worth in all people regardless of how they might differ from me. (19)	<u>.67</u>	.06
To be faithful to my religion, I should reject people whose political beliefs differ from mine. (20) R	<u>.45</u>	.31
My religious beliefs motivate me to love all people. (21)	<u>.81</u>	.04
God makes it clear that sin makes some people unlovable. (22) R	.26	<u>.54</u>
God encourages me to interact lovingly with people who hold different political and religious beliefs than me. (23)	<u>.68</u>	.20

XENOPHILIA SCALE

27

My faith in God motivates me to love people no matter what sins may exist in their lives. (25)	<u>.72</u>	.14
God calls me to love people whose religious beliefs differ from my own. (26)	<u>.75</u>	.16
In order to be the person my religious traditions want me to be, I try to love people with emotional difficulties with the same care and compassion as I try to love everyone else. (27)	<u>.68</u>	.17

Note. Underlines indicate maximal loadings. Statements followed by “R” were reverse scored. Numbers in the parenthesis indicate the order of item presentation within the scale. Through error, item 9 repeated item 3, and so was eliminated from the analyses. Four statements served as distractor items: My daily life helps me mature in my faith (4); My education and work experiences present challenges to my religious beliefs (7); Certain programs on television have made me feel uncomfortable as a person of faith (18); I wish there were more options for religious involvement in daily life. (24).

Table 3

Xenophilia Factor and Scale Correlations with Religious and Psychological Measures

Measure	Xenophilic Love	Xenophilic Grace	Xenophilia Scale
Xenophilic Love	-	.43***	.97***
Xenophilic Grace		-	.64***
Xenophilia Scale			-
Religious Fundamentalism	.44***	.16**	.41**
Biblical Foundationalism	.60***	.13***	.55***
Intrinsic Orientation	.43***	.14**	.40***
Extrinsic Personal Orientation	.39***	-.05	.32***
Extrinsic Social Orientation	.07	-.19***	.00
Truth of Texts and Teaching	.56***	.17**	.52***
Fairness, Tolerance, Rationality	.34***	.36***	.39***
Xenosophia	.14**	-.07	.10
Family and Social Order	.34***	-.06	.28***
Disorder Avoidance	.34***	-.07	.27***
Peace and Justice	.50***	-.01	.42***
Cultural Foundations	.36***	-.12*	.27***
Social Dominance Orientation	-.16**	-.26***	-.21***
Machiavellianism	-.08	-.13*	-.11
Narcissism	.07	-.07	.03
Psychopathy	-.20***	-.25***	-.24***

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Table 4

Xenophilia Partial Correlations with Religious and Psychological Measures Within Religious Fundamentalist and Biblical Foundationalist Ideological Surrounds

Measure	<u>Xenophilic Love</u>		<u>Xenophilic Grace</u>		<u>Xenophilia Scale</u>	
	RF	BC	RF	BC	RF	BC
Intrinsic Orientation	-.01	.11	.06	.05	.01	.10
Extrinsic Personal Orientation	.06	.12	-.06	-.02	.02	.08
Extrinsic Social Orientation	-.18**	-.18**	-.21***	-.21***	-.21***	-.20**
Truth of Texts and Teaching	.16**	.32***	.18**	.19**	.18**	.31***
Fairness, Tolerance, Rationality	.50***	.55***	.31***	.35***	.48***	.54***
Xenosophia	.19**	.24***	-.06	.01	.12*	.19**
Family and Social Order	-.16*	-.06	-.17**	-.17**	-.18**	-.10
Disorder Avoidance	-.24***	-.13*	-.20**	-.20**	-.25***	-.17**
Peace and Justice	.19*	.27***	-.03	.03	.13*	.22**
Cultural Foundations	-.20***	-.08	-.23***	-.20**	-.23***	-.13*
Social Dominance Orientation	-.27***	-.30***	-.26***	-.29***	-.29***	-.32***
Machiavellianism	-.07	-.09	-.13*	-.16**	-.10	-.12*
Narcissism	.03	.04	-.10	-.09	-.01	.00
Psychopathy	-.21***	-.25***	-.23***	-.25***	-.24***	-.27***

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$