Vrije Universiteit Brussel

VRIJE UNIVERSITEIT BRUSSEL

Social pressure for religious conformity and anti- gay sentiment among Muslim and Christian youth

Van Droogenbroeck, Filip; Spruyt, Bram

Link to publication

a. Title

Social pressure for religious conformity and anti-gay sentiment among Muslim and Christian

youth.

b. Author names and affiliations

Filip Van Droogenbroeck (Professor Ph. D.) Filip.Van.Droogenbroeck@vub.be*

Bram Spruyt (Professor Ph. D.)*

* Vrije Universiteit Brussel

Sociology Department

Pleinlaan 2

1050 Brussel

Belgium

c. Corresponding author

Filip Van Droogenbroeck (Ph. D.) Filip.Van.Droogenbroeck@vub.be*

Sociology Department

Pleinlaan 2

1050 Brussel

Belgium

Tel: 0032474481384

Social pressure for religious conformity and anti-gay sentiment among Muslim and Christian youth.

Abstract

Research on civic education for the most part investigates the alleged outcomes of deliberate civic education programs. Remarkably little research has investigated how the outcomes of group process (e.g., based on religion) in schools, and more specifically, the pressure to conform to in-group norms, relate to civic educational goals (e.g., promoting tolerance for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender people). Against that background, this paper has two objectives. First, we assess social variation in perceived social pressure for religious conformity among Christian and Muslim Youth enrolled in secondary education in Flanders (N = 2,765). Second, we investigate the relationship between perceived social pressure for religious conformity and anti-gay sentiment. Our analyses are guided by social identity theory and rely on multilevel analysis. We find that for both Christian and Muslim youth, anti-gay sentiment is higher among young people who experience higher social pressure through the perceived expectations from talking with significant others about religion.

Keywords: Social pressure for religious conformity, Anti-gay sentiment, Muslim, Christian, Religious identity, Group norms, Negative attitudes towards homosexuality

Introduction

Most research on civic education since the nineties has been concerned with deliberate programs of instruction within classes or schools aimed at developing political knowledge, skills or attitudes (Crittenden & Levine, 2016). Research has shown that although deliberate civic education programs within schools have taken an important place in education, civic education does not need to be intentional nor is it limited to the formal curriculum (Scheerens, 2011). Indeed, research on the so called 'hidden curriculum' has shown that aspects related to the fact that schools are societies in miniature affect the way pupils think and feel about society at large (Kentli, 2009). Young people receive their civic education through various institutions such as friends, families, governments, religions, and mass media and bring their impressions and experiences of these socialization contexts to schools. For this reason, it is important to gain insight into how belonging to groups and group processes interfere with the goals of civic education.

Indeed, according to social identity theory the self-concept of individuals is partly derived from the social groups and categories they belong to (Hogg, 2016). Groups describe and prescribe norms that influence the civic education of people in ways that can (dis)empower them. Some social identities such as religious identities are considered to be more central to the self-concept and become particularly salient in times of uncertainty (Allen, 2010; Muldoon, Trew, Todd, Rougier, & McLaughlin, 2007; Ysseldyk, Matheson, & Anisman, 2010). Paradoxically, religious identities have received less attention than other social identities based on race, gender or social class. This is surprising because most European countries are faced with a growing group of youth of foreign origin who are highly religious and have a socially deprived background (Heath, Rothon, & Kilpi, 2008; Hellyer, 2009). This material deprivation and the

experienced prejudice and discrimination which these young members of ethnic minorities and cultural out-groups face, adds to the general insecurity that characterizes the quest for identity of teenagers and adolescents (Kalkan, Layman, & Uslaner, 2009). Uncertainty-identity theory indicates that group identification, and particularly religious identities, are effective for reducing and managing uncertainty related to the self (Hogg, Adelman, & Blagg, 2010). Religious identification protects members from distress and is positively related to a sense of belonging and psychological well-being. On the other hand, religious group identification leads to self-categorization effects and compliance to prescribed religious norms (see Turner, 1991), which are sometimes at odds with the secular values that are promoted and cultivated in schools. For this reason, it is important to investigate how religious identities, religious group norms and the pressure to conform to them are related to civic education goals (e.g., promotion of tolerance towards Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender [LGBT] people).

In 2010, the Council of Europe unanimously adopted measures to combat discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation or gender identity. Member states were advised to take measures 'at all levels [of education] to promote mutual tolerance and respect in schools, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity' (Committee of Ministers, 2010). This led to the inclusion of LGBT education in official school curricula in most European school systems. Given the fact that homosexuality is at odds with conservative interpretations of Abrahamic religions it makes an excellent case-study to investigate how group processes relate to anti-gay sentiment and influence civic educational goals (Moon, 2002; Swidler, 1993).

Against this background and guided by the social identity approach, we assessed (1) social differences in perceived social pressure for religious conformity and (2) how perceived

4

social pressure for religious conformity is related to anti-gay sentiment among Christian and Muslim youth enrolled in secondary education in Flanders (N = 2,765).

This article contributes to the literature in two ways. Firstly, although considerable attention has been given to group norms in self-categorization theory, Hogg and Reid (2006) indicate that little research has investigated how communication within groups influences group norms. Social pressure for religious conformity may constitute one concrete pathway along which specific attempts of schools to promote tolerance in general, and towards homosexuality in particular, may be undermined. To the best of our knowledge this is the first article that goes beyond simply using religious identity as a proxy for adherence to religious group norms and instead investigates the specific influence of perceived social pressure for religious conformity by talking with, and expectations from, significant others such as parents and peers. Secondly, because data were gathered in schools, we were able to assess context effects (i.e., the effect of school composition) and the extent to which the identified patterns vary between schools. In short, the data we rely on in this paper are suitable to explore the full relevance of perceived social pressure for religious conformity with regard to anti-gay sentiment.

Perceived Social Pressure for Religious Conformity and Anti-gay Sentiment

Anti-gay sentiment is often referred to as 'homophobia' (e.g., Weinberg, 1972), 'sexual prejudice' (e.g., Herek, 2004), 'negative attitudes toward homosexuals' (e.g., Van Droogenbroeck, Spruyt, Siongers, & Keppens, 2016) or 'homonegativity' (e.g., Stulhofer & Rimac, 2009). We focus on generalized anti-gay sentiment because research has shown that attitudes toward gay men and attitudes toward lesbians are strongly correlated and are predicted by the same variables (Herek, 2004). Although, anti-gay sentiment is an attitude, research has indicated that it is related to anti-gay behaviors like gay bashing and bullying, and discrimination

of gays (Maher, 2013; Poteat, DiGiovanni, & Scheer, 2013; Rey & Gibson, 1997). For this reason, combatting anti-gay sentiment remains an important topic in civic education and the last decades a growing body of research investigates anti-gay sentiment (e.g., Camicia, 2016; D'haese, Dewaele, & Houtte, 2016; Maher, 2013; Poteat et al., 2013; Russell, Toomey, Crockett, & Laub, 2010; Schwartz, 2011; Stulhofer & Rimac, 2009; Whitley, 2009). This research has well established that less educated (Loftus, 2001; Ohlander, Batalova, & Treas, 2005; Roggemans et al., 2015), male (Kite & Whitley, 1998; Poteat, 2007; Van Droogenbroeck et al., 2016), and more authoritarian (Van Droogenbroeck et al., 2016; Whitley & Lee, 2000; Wilkinson, 2004) people report more anti-gay sentiment than higher educated, female and less authoritarian people. Authoritarianism is usually defined as the intertwinement of the unreflexive submission to authority (e.g., unquestioningly following authority figures), conventionalism (e.g., strong support for traditional values), and authoritarian aggression (e.g., hostility towards groups seen as violating conventional values) (Altemeyer, 1981, 1996). It is often used to help explain the relationship between religion and prejudice. The determinants above will be included as controls in our models.

In general, schools in most West-European countries present themselves as inclusive, non-discriminating democratic institutions and as places par excellence that can foster awareness on LGBT issues among youth. In practice, however, schools and curricula sometimes contribute to the reproduction of the dominant societal views which exclude those at the margin, such as LGBT people (Camicia, 2016; Mayo, 2017). High school cultures often assume and encourage heterosexual norms. Through the inclusion of LGBT topics in civic education curricula students are enabled to deepen their understanding of democratic processes and increase critical thinking skills as it requires critical reflection of heterosexual assumptions within school cultures (Beck,

2013; Mayo, 2017). The manner in which LGBT topics are framed and debated in society at large has an important influence for discussions in schools because these discourses are used by students when they engage in debates concerning LGBT rights. Including LGBT topics could be perceived to be too controversial for teachers when taking into account their school community and the risk of negative consequences (Schmidt, 2010). For this reason it is important that teachers understand the group dynamics that support heteronormativity. As Beck (2013) indicates, at this point awareness is needed of the social pressure some students will feel to be congruent with heterosexuality. This might be especially relevant for religious students as research shows that religious identities are primarily shaped in the family (Madge, Hemming & Stenson, 2014) and this social environment may have a great influence in how young people engage with LGBT topics.

Therefore, in this paper, we focus on the social environment of religious young people. More specifically, we draw on the social identity approach to understand the relationship between perceived social pressure by peers and parents for religious conformity, religious identity and anti-gay sentiment.

The social identity approach holds that a portion of our self-concept is derived from the perceived membership of relevant social groups (Hogg & Reid, 2006). Self-categorization theory builds on social identity theory and aims to understand and explain the basic social cognitive processes by which people identify themselves and others in group terms and how group behavior becomes manifest (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). When social identities are salient, individuals tend to favor persons of the in-group over those from the out-group and tend to see themselves (and other group members) less as individuals and more as interchangeable exemplars of the group prototype (Hogg, 2016). In this process, within-group

similarities, intergroup differences and stereotype-consistent attitudes and behaviour are emphasized. The process of self-categorization generates group identification, a feeling of belonging and causes conformity to the prototype, a fuzzy set of characteristics, of the in-group. These prototypes describe and prescribe group-specific ways to behave, think, react and feel (Turner, 1991). The prescriptive force of such prototypes or in-group norms depends on how important the in-group is to who we are and the strength of our identification with the group.

Although considerable attention has been given to social identities based on gender, race, social class, sexuality, and age, fewer studies have investigated the implications of a social identity based on religion (Greenfield & Marks, 2007; Ysseldyk et al., 2010). Given that religions are social groups involving group norms that specify beliefs, attitudes, values, behavior, and the importance of religion for the self-concept of many people, religious identity should have a strong impact on psychosocial intergroup processes (Batson, Schoenrade, & Ventis, 1993; Hunsberger & Jackson, 2005).

Research has indicated that group identification is particularly effective for reducing and managing uncertainty related to the self (Hogg et al., 2010; Mullin & Hogg, 1998). Social identity theory indicates that when individuals experience uncertainty they identify more strongly with groups they belong to, such as their religion. Religions are considered to be particularly effective at self-uncertainty reduction because they are often highly entitative. These are groups that are considered to be homogeneous, clearly structured, with well-established convictions, behavioral norms and rituals. For example, dress-codes, activities on holy days, church or mosque related activities, collective prayer rituals, all provide structure that pervade life and validates social identity.

Moreover, the groups we study in this paper, Christian and Muslim pupils that follow secondary education, are in a life phase characterized by the quest towards their own identity, a road which is paved with feelings of uncertainty (Steger, Bundick, & Yeager, 2011). In addition, a disproportionately large number of Muslim youth experience material uncertainty because of their socio-economically disadvantaged background (OECD, 2016). In Belgium, like most European countries, Muslims generally live in the poorer districts of cities with high unemployment rates; indeed, these rates can be four times as high as non-Muslims (Agirdag, Driessen, & Merry, 2017; Hellyer, 2009). Furthermore, Muslim youth experience increased uncertainty because they are both an ethnic and cultural outgroup which makes them a regular target of prejudice and discrimination (e.g., experienced discrimination, negative portrayal in the media, etc.) (Hellyer, 2009; Kalkan et al., 2009). This uncertainty-identity process resembles the rejection-identification model which holds that out-group threats such as discrimination, or negative portrayals in the media, strengthens the identification with the in-group and creates a buffer against the negative effects of the threat (Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999). The uncertainty-identity mechanism might explain why research shows that Muslims report higher levels of religious identification than Christians in countries such as Belgium and Germany (Fischer, Greitemeyer, & Kastenmüller, 2007; Hooghe, Claes, Harell, Quintelier, & Dejaeghere, 2010; Roggemans, Spruyt, Van Droogenbroeck, & Keppens, 2015; Van Droogenbroeck et al., 2016). For this reason, we expect that young Muslim people will have a stronger religious identity than young Christian people.

Although the benefits of religious identification for individual well-being and sense of belonging are well-established (Green & Elliott, 2010; Greenfield & Marks, 2007; Hackney & Sanders, 2003; Levin & Chatters, 1998), religion can also give rise to conflicts between groups.

Indeed, research in the social identity theory tradition has shown time and again that the mere awareness of belonging to one group (as opposed to another) triggers intergroup processes of competition and discrimination that favors the ingroup (Hogg, 2016). People try to achieve a positive self-evaluation of their own social group (so called collective self-esteem) by intergroup differentiation, a process during which intergroup differences are enlarged and within-groups differences downplayed.

For example, most conservative interpretations of Abrahamic religions (including Christianity and Islam on which we focus here) share a group norm on heteronormativity that proscribes homosexuality which is not congruent with secular values (Moon, 2002; Swidler, 1993). Because religious group identification leads to self-categorization effects and compliance to prescribed religious norms, we expect that Muslim and Christian young people that have a stronger religious identity will report more anti-gay sentiment (Turner, 1991). In this article, we conceptualize religious identification through three sub-concepts: religious affiliation, self-rated religiosity, and religious behavior. The degree to which people are involved with their religion is generally considered more important than the specific religious groups that they belong to. Previous research has established that there is a strong relationship between religious affiliation (being Christian or Muslim), self-rated religiosity, religious behavior such as the frequency of attendance at religious services and anti-gay sentiment (e.g., Stulhofer and Rimac 2009; Whitley 2009).

Hogg and Reid (2006) indicate that in-group norms are established and reinforced by verbal and non-verbal communication. This communication can be direct as people intentionally talk about or nonverbally signal norms, or indirect when people infer norms from what other people say or do. In this process, some members embody group norms better than others and are

considered to be more "prototypical", which implies that they are more influential in determining what is normative and what group identification entails (Hogg, 2016). However, in their review, Hogg and Reid (2006) indicated that there exists little research that considers how communication within groups produces such a polarized norm. For religious young people it can be expected that talking with, or the perceived expectations from significant others (e.g., religious friends, parents) reinforces and demarcates religious identities which in turn can have a strong influence on conforming to group norms (i.e., heteronormativity which proscribes anti-gay sentiment). In this regard, it is important to take into account the school context as a socializing institution. Adolescents spend a lot of time with their peers at school and it can be expected that school context factors -emergent properties of groups at schools- play a role in group norms. We will test whether being in an environment where pupils report more social pressure for religious conformity predicts higher anti-gay sentiment of all religious pupils. One reason to expect a contextual effect of pressure for religious conformity is that a higher mean-level of pressure for religious conformity may increase the attention given to possible violations of religious group norms of all pupils.

The analyses in our paper consists of two distinct parts. First, we investigate social differences of perceived social pressure for religious conformity. In this part, we analyze who reports more perceived social pressure for religious conformity where we control for social-demographic background and religious identification. Second, guided by social identity theory, we investigate how perceived social pressure for religious conformity is related to anti-gay sentiment and to what extent this relationship remains when we take religious identification (self-rated religiosity and religious behavior) into account. Social identity theory suggests that

once controlled for religious identification, there will be no direct relationship anymore between perceived social pressure for religious conformity and anti-gay sentiment

Context of the Study

Flanders (the Dutch speaking part of Belgium) is considered a suitable case study for two reasons. First, Belgium is often considered a progressive country regarding LGBT rights which is illustrated by several facts. Since 2001, preventing anti-gay sentiment has been incorporated in the curriculum of civic education classes in secondary education in Flanders. In 2003, Belgium became the second country to allow same-sex couples to marry or register in civil union. In 2006, same-sex couples acquired the right to adopt children. Second, in Flanders most of the non-Western immigrants are Muslim and have Moroccan or Turkish roots. Turkish and Moroccan (second- and third generation) immigrants are socially and economically deprived compared to their native counterparts, which are mostly Christian or nonreligious (Bradt, Pleysier, Put, Siongers, & Spruyt, 2014; Phalet, Fleischmann, & Stojčić, 2012).

By investigating Christian and Muslim youth we were able to assess if the influence of perceived social pressure for religious conformity on anti-gay sentiment is a general mechanism which happens irrespective of the specificity of a religion. In addition, it allowed us to test empirically if increased uncertainty results in higher religious identification and adherence to in-group norms.

Method

Data

We use data from the "JOP school monitor 2013" gathered by the Youth Research Platform (JOP see http://www.jeugdonderzoeksplatform.be/eng/), an interdisciplinary and inter-university cooperation. The monitor surveys a representative sample of Flemish youth in

secondary education in Flanders and Brussels. By administering the survey in schools, socially disadvantaged respondents are included; these are generally missed by other survey types (e.g., postal surveys) (Bradt et al., 2014). A two-step design was used, in which schools and classes were randomly selected. Within the selected classes, all pupils were asked to complete the questionnaire.

The response rate was 88% at the pupil level (4594 pupils between 14 and 23 years old) and 44.7% at the school level (87 schools). The non-response rate at the school level was mainly a consequence of schools refusing to cooperate due to being overburdened by other surveys. The non-response at the pupil level was mainly the consequence of absent classes which were on a school field trip and illness of pupils (see the technical report see Bradt et al., 2014 for more information). Of the 4594 respondents, 40% were Christians, 20% Muslims, 38.6% non-believers and 1.4% belonged to another religion (e.g., Buddhism, Hinduism, etc.). We selected Christian (n=1840) and Muslim (n=925) pupils (61%; N=2765) in order to answer our research questions.

Measures

Anti-gay sentiment. Anti-gay sentiment was measured using a reduced version of the Homophobia Scale (Wright Jr, Adams, & Bernat, 1999) and the Attitudes Toward Gay Men Scale (Ellis, Kitzinger, & Wilkinson, 2003). Six items were used to measure anti-gay sentiment (e.g., "Aggression against homosexuals is acceptable") on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree". These items were used to construct a sum scale ranging from 0 to 100 comprising both the behavioral and cognitive dimensions of anti-gay sentiment ($\alpha_{Christians}$=.86; $\alpha_{Muslims}$=.83).

Perceived social pressure for religious conformity. This feeling was measured at the student-level for Christians and Muslims by "My parents expect me to live by the rules of my religion", "My friends call me out if I do something against my religion" and "I often talk with friends about religion". Items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree" ($\alpha_{Christians}$=.75; $\alpha_{Muslims}$=.63). A sum scale was constructed ranging from 0 to 10.

Religious identity and behavior. Religious identity was measured by religious affiliation, self-rated religiosity, and religious behavior. Respondents had to choose one of 15 possible categories. An open space was provided to respondents who did not recognize themselves in any of the provided categories. Self-rated religiosity was measured by the item "How important is religion for you?" on a 11-point Likert scale ranging from 0 "Not important at all" to 10 "Very important".

A proxy for religious behavior was measured for Christians by the item 1 "I am a religious Christian and I go to church regularly" versus 0 "I am a religious Christian, but I don't go to church often" or "I'm doubting, but in the end I consider myself Christian". For Muslims this was measured by the item 1 "I am a religious Muslim and I strictly follow the religious prescriptions" versus 0 "I am a religious Muslim, but I don't strictly follow the religious prescriptions" or "I'm doubting, but in the end I consider myself Muslim".

School-level variables. To assess context effects, we construct school-level variables by aggregating individual responses by students within schools for (1) perceived social pressure for religious conformity, (2) self-rated religiosity, (3) regularly goes to church (Christians) or strictly following religious prescriptions (Muslims) (means for all scales were calculated per school).

Control variables. The key variables that we focus on were embedded in a large survey that covered a broad range of topics comparable with surveys like the Europeans Social Survey (ESS) or the International Social Survey Program (ISSP). To avoid spurious correlations between our key variables, we included age, gender, subjective financial situation, the educational track (general, technical, and vocational education), the educational level of the parents, and authoritarianism as control variables.

Subjective financial situation was measured by the item "Can your family manage with the monthly income?". The item was rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 "Very difficult" to 5 "Very easy". Nearly all Muslim youngsters in Belgium are (children of) immigrants. We included a variable that measured how often respondents spoke Dutch with family and friends (ranging from 0 "With nobody" to 4 "With everybody") for Muslims. This is a proxy for the degree respondents are directed towards their own community as different levels of cultural retention can be expected in the Muslim group. Migration history was operationalized by constructing a variable based on the ethnic origin of the mother which distinguished between young people with Moroccan, Turkish, or other roots.

Authoritarianism was measured by a 3-item selection from the F-scale developed by Adorno, and which is often used in sociological research (e.g., Achterberg & Houtman, 2009; Roggemans et al., 2015). The items (e.g. "We need strong leaders who tell us what to do.") were rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree" ($\alpha_{Christians}$=.57; $\alpha_{Muslims}$=.57). A sum scale was constructed ranging from 0 to 100.

Data Analysis

Statistical analyses were performed using STATA 14 (Statacorp, 2015). Descriptives are reported in Table 1 and ANOVAwith post hoc Bonferonni tests were used to analyse mean differences in religious variables and anti-gay sentiment between Muslim and Christian young people. Multilevel linear regression analysis was used for every model in Tables 2-4 to investigate factors associated with (1) the perceived social pressure for religious conformity and (2) anti-gay sentiment. Four models were constructed for each group for perceived social pressure for religious conformity (Table 2). In each regression analysis, a null-model was estimated to investigate variance components (model 0). The individual-related socio-demographic control variables were entered in model 1. Subsequently, in models 2-3 the individual and school-level religious identity and behavior variables were added. For Anti-gay sentiment, five models were analyzed in both groups. Starting with a null-model (model 0) and perceived social pressure for religious conformity (model 1). Individual-level socio-demographic control variables were entered in model 2. Respondents' religious identity and behavior were entered in model 3 and school-level perceived pressure for religious conformity in model 4. Due to the clustered nature of the data a multilevel model was needed (Hox, Moerbeek, & Schoot, 2017).

Results

Table 1 presents the frequency distribution and means of the different items and scales. Muslim young people have more socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds than Christian young people. Moreover, Muslim youth (34.68%) were twice as likely to be enrolled in vocational tracks than Christian youth (15.13%). Approximately 69.33% of the young Christians in our study had at least one parent that obtained a higher education degree, which is twice as many when compared to Muslim youth (34.82%). Of the Flemish Muslim youth, around 51%

has Moroccan roots, 29.57% Turkish roots, and 19.37% has other roots. Differences in religious attitudes and behavior between Muslim and Christian young people were considerable. Approximately 10% of Christian youth regularly went to church while 52% of Muslim youth strictly followed religious prescriptions. ANOVA with post-hoc Bonferroni tests indicated that self-rated religiosity was twice as high for Muslim (8.90) than for Christian (4.42) youth. The perceived social pressure for religious conformity for Muslim youth (6.28) was more than three times as high when compared to Christian youth (1.82). Muslim youth (45.97) reported more than twice as much anti-gay sentiment than Christian youth (20.45). For authoritarianism, differences were less pronounced but Muslim youth (48.90) also scored significantly and substantially higher than Christian youth (42.20). In sum, Muslim youth reported higher levels of anti-gay sentiment, are more religious, authoritarian, perceived more social pressure for religious conformity, and had a more precarious background than Christian youth.

We estimated the models for Christian and Muslim young people separately because (1) the observed differences between Muslim and Christian youth and (2) it is unclear to what extent the determinants of perceived social pressure for religious conformity and characteristics of religiosity on anti-gay sentiments are dependent on a specific religion which implies a large number of possible interactions.

[INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

Following our research questions, our analyses consisted of two parts. First, we investigated social differences in perceived social pressure for religious conformity. Subsequently, we assessed how perceived social pressure for religious conformity and other determinants were related to anti-gay sentiment.

Perceived Social Pressure for Religious Conformity

The high level of religiosity among Muslim youth has consequences for the multilevel analyses on perceived social pressure for religious conformity (Table 2 – model 0). There was much less variation in perceived social pressure for religious conformity between schools for Muslim youth (intra class correlation: 5.94%) than for Christian youth (intra class correlation: 20.87%). In model 1, socio-demographic variables and authoritarianism were entered. For both Christian and Muslim youth, we found no relationship between gender, age, educational background of the parents, the subjective financial situation, and perceived social pressure for religious conformity. Christian youth enrolled in vocational education (0.97; p<.001) reported more perceived social pressure for religious conformity than those in general education. Educational background had no effect for Muslim youth. Among both Muslim (0.01; p<.001) and Christian (0.01; p<.001) youth authoritarianism was positively related to perceived social pressure for religious conformity.

[INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

In models 2-3, individual and school-level religious indicators were entered. Self-reported religiosity had the strongest relationship for both Christian (0.27; p<.001) and Muslim (0.51; p<.001) youth. In both groups, higher self-reported religiosity predicted higher levels of perceived social pressure for religious conformity. In addition, model 2 shows that Muslim youth who strictly followed religious prescriptions (0.49; p<.01) reported more perceived social pressure for religious conformity. A similar pattern was found among Christian youth that go to church regularly (1.39; p<.001). The two religious variables in model 2 accounted for 20.20% (Muslims) and 29.44% (Christians) of the total variation in perceived social pressure for religious conformity. The final model 3 included aggregated self-reported religiosity and

religious behavior at the school-level. Aggregated self-reported religiosity was positively related to perceived social pressure for religious conformity for Christian (0.23; p<.001) youth but not for Muslim youth. This implies that a higher average level of self-rated religiosity amongst pupils within a school was related to an individual's perceived social pressure for religious conformity for Christian youth irrespective of pupils' own self-rated religiosity. Aggregated religious behaviour was not related to perceived social pressure for religious conformity for both groups. The final model explained 31.45% and 38.56% of the variation in perceived social pressure for religious conformity for Muslim and Christian youth respectively.

Anti-gay Sentiment

In the second part, we assessed whether perceived social pressure for religious conformity predicted anti-gay sentiment for Muslim (Table 3) and Christian (Table 4) youth. For this outcome the intra class correlation for anti-gay sentiment was half as large for Muslim youth (6.71%) than Christian youth (13.90%). For both Muslim (1.42; p<.001) and Christian (2.32; p<.001) youth, perceived social pressure for religious conformity was positively related to anti-gay sentiment (model 1 in Tables 3 and 4). In model 2, socio-demographic variables and authoritarianism were entered. In line with previous research, Christian and Muslim youth that were male, enrolled in lower educational tracks, and more authoritarian, reported more anti-gay sentiment than those that were female, enrolled in general educational tracks, and less authoritarian. Age, subjective financial situation, and having at least one parent that is highly educated, were not related to anti-gay sentiment. Muslim (-2.32; p<.01) youth who spoke more Dutch with family and friends reported less anti-gay sentiment. Also, Muslim youth with Moroccan (-9.47; p<.001) or other (-11.38; p<.001) roots reported less anti-gay sentiment than Muslim youth with Turkish roots.

[INSERT TABLE 3.ABOUT HERE]

In model 3, self-rated religiosity and religious behavior were added to the model which already included social pressure for religious conformity. Strength of religiosity fully mediated the association between social pressure for religious conformity and anti-gay sentiment for Muslim youth and partially for Christian youth. After adding self-reported religiosity, the coefficient for perceived social pressure for religious conformity decreased and became no longer statistically significant. For Christian youth, the relationship between social pressure for religious conformity and anti-gay sentiment became smaller in size but remained statistically significant after adding self-rated religiosity. For both Christian and Muslim youth, the proxy for religious behavior was positively related to anti-gay sentiment. Christian (9.90; p<.01) youth who went to church regularly and Muslim (4.83; p<.05) youth who strictly followed religious prescriptions scored higher on anti-gay sentiment. Indirect mediation effects were tested using the Monte Carlo method for assessing mediation (Preacher & Selig, 2012; Selig & Preacher, 2008). Indirect mediation effects were calculated for both groups of perceived social pressure for religious conformity, through self-rated religiosity and strictly following religious prescriptions, on anti-gay sentiment when controlling for the other variables (see Table 6 in the appendix). These analyses indicate that both indicators of religiosity (partially) mediated the effect of perceived social pressure for religious conformity, suggesting that the experience of perceived social pressure increases individual religiosity and along this way increases anti-gay sentiment. In model 4, the aggregated school-level social pressure for religious conformity was added to the model. For both Muslim (2.18; p<.05) and Christian (2.85; p<.001) youth we found that pupils who followed education in schools with a higher level of social pressure for religious conformity, reported more anti-gay sentiment regardless of their own individual characteristics

(including individual level perceived social pressure for religious conformity). This strongly suggests that context matters, and that the pressure for religious conformity influences (school) processes that exceed the strictly individual level. We did not include aggregated self-reported religiosity and behavior because we are mainly interested in the role of social pressure for religious conformity at the school-level on anti-gay sentiment. In addition, the low number of schools might cause power issues. We have tested these models which showed that when the school-level variables are entered individually the three aggregated variables are significant at p<.10 in both groups but explain each other away when entered simultaneously for the Muslim group (not in table).

[INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE]

Discussion and Conclusion

Civic education research within schools often focuses on educational programs that deliberately aim to develop political knowledge and democratic attitudes (Crittenden & Levine, 2016). Less attention has been paid to the different ways in which group identification of young people (e.g., with religions) and resulting group processes (e.g., pressure to conform to in-group norms) relate to civic educational goals (e.g., promoting tolerance for LGBT people). Such group processes can enhance or inhibit civic education's objectives.

Against that background, we assessed social variation in perceived social pressure for religious conformity among Christian and Muslim Youth enrolled in secondary education in Flanders (N = 2,765). Second, we investigated the relationship between perceived social pressure for religious conformity and anti-gay sentiment. Our findings are consistent with the social identity approach which predicts relationships between social groups such as religions, strength of individual identification, and adherence to group norms (e.g., heteronormativity which

21

proscribes anti-gay sentiment). Hogg and Reid (2006) indicated that little research exists that uses insights from self-categorization theory to investigate how communication within groups influences group norms. In this article, we investigated how perceived social pressure to conform to religious norms might influence anti-gay sentiment through increased religious identification. Our findings indicate that a religious in-group norm such as heteronormativity becomes more salient through the perceived expectations from, and talking with, significant others about religion and when the religious identity is an important part of the self-concept for the individual. Indeed, our results show that the direct effect of perceived social pressure for religious conformity disappeared completely for Muslims and partially for Christians after taking the strength of religious identification into account. This suggests that the experience of perceived social pressure for religious conformity strengthens individual religious identification and along this way increases anti-gay sentiment. These differential pathways stress 1) analyzing religious groups separately and 2) (at least for Christians) the importance of the concept of perceived pressure for religious conformity. Indeed, among young Christians the relationship between pressure for religious conformity and anti-gay sentiment could not fully be captured by more conventional indicators of religiosity.

In addition, for both Muslim and Christian youth, the perceived social pressure for religious conformity at the school-level was significantly and positively related to individual level anti-gay sentiment even after taking into account the individual level of perceived social pressure for religious conformity. These results clearly show that dynamics between the school context and composition, strength of religious identities and group processes should be taken into account if we wish to understand the (in)effectivity of civic education programs that target LGBT equality.

General similarities for Muslim and Christian youth were found which are in line with previous research on anti-gay sentiment. Having a higher self-rated religiosity (Van Droogenbroeck et al., 2016) and perceiving more social pressure for religious conformity, as well as being male (Poteat, 2007), being enrolled in lower educational tracks (Loftus, 2001; Ohlander et al., 2005), being more authoritarian (Whitley & Lee, 2000) predicted anti-gay sentiment for both Muslim and Christian youth. Especially the relationship between gender and anti-gay sentiment in both groups was particularly strong. Civic education research has repeatedly shown that girls are less ethnocentric (Yanglin & Ranger, 2003), engage more in prosocial behavior (Eagle, 2009), and have more supportive attitudes towards the political rights of marginalized groups (Barber and Ross, 2017). With regard to anti-gay sentiment gender roles are considered to be stricter for men than for women. When males deviate from the ideal masculine gender role this will be condemned more than deviation by females from the feminine gender role (Roggemans et al., 2015). This might be one explanation of why boys report more anti-gay sentiment than girls.

Other differences between Muslims and Christians were noteworthy as well. Our descriptive statistics illustrated that Muslim youth had more socially and economically deprived backgrounds and reported a much higher level of religiosity, perceived social pressure for religious conformity, and anti-gay sentiment than Christian youth. This socio-economic deprivation and higher religiosity were interrelated. Uncertainty-identity theory predicts that people who experience more uncertainty lest that be of a material, existential or societal nature, tend to identify more strongly with entitative groups in an effort to reduce uncertainty (Hogg et al., 2010; Hogg, Sherman, Dierselhuis, Maitner, & Moffitt, 2007). This is especially the case for Muslim youth, that not only experience more socio-economic deprivation (e.g., less educated

parents, being enrolled in vocational education, etc.) than Christian youth, but also experience

stigmatization and discrimination because they are considered to be part of a cultural out-group

and ethnic minority (Hellyer, 2009; Kalkan et al., 2009). The insecurity that results from being

perceived as a member of a 'band of others', together with the general insecurity of being a

young person on an existential quest for identity, renders the religious identity a safe haven to

turn to for meaning and belongingness. Indeed, research has indicated that religious

identification offers a strong social support system, psychological enrichment, and a comforting

encompassing worldview which protects individuals from distress (Kinnvall, 2004; Park, 2007;

Ysseldyk et al., 2010). This protective function is even maintained in the case when people's

social identity is threatened by stigma and discrimination. In such cases the most strongly

identified individuals appear to experience the least distress (Branscombe et al., 1999; Muldoon,

Schmid, & Downes, 2009). The greater uncertainty experienced by Muslim youth in comparison

to Christian youth may explain the stronger religious identification for Muslim youth and

increased susceptibility to pressures for religious conformity which calls for adherence to in-

group norms such as heteronormativity and the prohibition of homosexuality. Interestingly,

Muslim young people with Turkish roots reported higher levels of anti-gay sentiment than those

with Moroccan or other roots. This might be explained by Turkish groups, in comparison with

Moroccan immigrants, being more entitative as they maintain higher degrees of ethnic retention

which means that they make more use of their ethnic language and media, and have a higher

degree of group cohesion which results in strong ethnic networks (Timmerman, Vanderwaeren,

& Crul, 2003). Religious identities are one among multiple group memberships which can

intersect and influence the way young people engage with religious norms. The religious

identities of students play an important role in interpretations of what students are learning from

society and how it shapes their understanding of each other and the world around them (James, Barton, Kunzman, Logan, & Schweber, 2015). In sum, we have shown that the strength of religious group identification for Muslim and Christian youth, and resulting group processes such as the pressure to conform to religious norms, are negatively related to anti-gay sentiment.

Although we made use of a large-scale representative study which made analyses on religious groups possible, our study has several limitations. One of the main limitations is that the cross sectional analyses reported here do not provide the basis for making any causal inferences. Longitudinal and experimental research is needed to disentangle the direction of causal relationships. Indeed, following the social identity approach, a reciprocal relationship may be expected between social pressure to conform to in-group norms and individual identity. This implies that perceived pressure to religious conformity would cause a stronger religious identity of an individual and vice versa. In addition, more research is needed to investigate how multiple identities are hierarchically organized and synergistically intersect. Second, we found similarities for both religious groups, but also important differences, which underscore the importance of taking into account religious affiliation when investigating religious identities (Exline & Rose, 2005; Ysseldyk et al., 2010). Although our religious indicators captured variation within religious groups our data only permitted to investigate several religious indicators. Other operationalisations of religious practices (e.g., frequency of prayer) and religious orientations (e.g., fundamentalism, quest orientation) were not investigated. Further investigation of these practices and orientations could give more insight into the religious pathways of being susceptible or resistant to social pressure for religious conformity. In addition, we explored perceived pressure for religious conformity by measuring individual experiences which when aggregated express the social norm at the school-level. An alternative could be to

measure perceived pressure for religious conformity directly as a level two construct by phrasing the items in such a way that the referent is a group attribute (e.g., parents of pupils in this school expect that students follow the rules of their religion – also see Marsh et al., 2012; Stapleton, Yang, & Hancock, 2016). Our school-level results might not be stable because of the small number of schools which was less than 100.

Notwithstanding these limitations, this paper has shown the importance of taking identity matters into account when studying civic education received in schools. In many aspects schools are societies in miniature whose impact cannot be reduced to the intentionally taught formal curriculum. In societies that become increasingly diverse in terms of religious and ethnic composition, schools, educators, and policy makers cannot ignore the question of how to deal with anti-gay sentiment that becomes activated along the lines of social identities. Indeed, social identities and the associated psychological processes (self-categorization, peer pressure, etc.) provide an important condition that cannot be ignored when devising and implementing citizenship education programs. So rather than pushing identity matters outside of the spotlights by relying on an 'isolated' program, we believe there is much to gain when such programs provide a safe environment where students can explore their multiple social identities and where they can take a critical stance towards Muslim and Christian traditions, and society in general.

References

Achterberg, P., & Houtman, D. (2009). Ideologically illogical? Why do the lower-educated Dutch display so little value coherence? *Social Forces*, *87*(3), 1649–1670.

Agirdag, O., Driessen, G., & Merry, M.S. (2017). The Catholic school advantage and common school effect examined: a comparison between Muslim immigrant and native pupils in Flanders. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, *28*(1), 123–135.

Allen, B.J. (2010). *Difference Matters: Communicating Social Identity* (2nd edition). Long Grove, Ill: Waveland Pr Inc.

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

Altemeyer, B. (1996). *The authoritarian specter*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Batson, C.D., Schoenrade, P., & Ventis, W.L. (1993). *Religion and the individual: a social-psychological perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Beck, T. A. (2013). Identity, discourse, and safety in a high school discussion of same-sex marriage. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, *41*(1), 1–32.

Bradt, L., Pleysier, S., Put, J., Siongers, J., & Spruyt, B. (Eds.). (2014). *Jongeren in cijfers en letters. Bevindingen uit de JOP-monitor 3 en de JOP-schoolmonitor 2013*. ["Youth in numbers and letters. Findings from the JOP-monitor 3 and the JOP-schoolmonitor 2013"] Leuven: Acco.

Branscombe, N.R., Schmitt, M.T., & Harvey, R.D. (1999). Perceiving pervasive discrimination among African Americans: Implications for group identification and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *77*(1), 135–149.

Camicia, S.P. (2016). *Critical democratic education and LGBTQ-inclusive curriculum: opportunities and constraints*. New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Committee of Ministers. (2010). Council of Europe: Recommendation CM/Rec(2010)5 of the

Committee of Ministers to Member States on Measures to Combat Discrimination on

Grounds of Sexual Orientation or Gender Identity. CM/Rec(2010)5.

Crittenden, J., & Levine, P. (2016). Civic education. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford

Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2016). Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford

University.

D'haese, L., Dewaele, A., & Van Houtte, M. (2016). Homophobic violence, coping styles,

visibility management, and mental health: A survey of Flemish lesbian, gay, and bisexual

individuals. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *63*(9), 1211–1235.

Ellis, S.J., Kitzinger, C., & Wilkinson, S. (2003). Attitudes towards lesbians and gay men and

support for lesbian and gay human rights among psychology students. *Journal of

Homosexuality*, *44*(1), 121–138.

Exline, J.J., & Rose, E. (2005). Religious and spiritual struggles. In R. F. Paloutzian & C. L.

Park (Eds.), *Handbook of the psychology of religion and spirituality* (pp. 315–330). New

York: Guilford Publications.

Fischer, P., Greitemeyer, T., & Kastenmüller, A. (2007). What do we think about Muslims? The

validity of Westerners' implicit theories about the associations between Muslims'

religiosity, religious identity, aggression potential, and attitudes toward terrorism. *Group

Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *10*(3), 373–382.

Green, M., & Elliott, M. (2010). Religion, health, and psychological well-being. *Journal of

Religion and Health*, *49*(2), 149–163.

Greenfield, E.A., & Marks, N.F. (2007). Religious social identity as an explanatory factor for associations between more frequent formal religious participation and psychological well-being. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, *17*(3), 245–259.

Hackney, C.H., & Sanders, G.S. (2003). Religiosity and mental health: A meta–analysis of recent studies. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *42*(1), 43–55.

Heath, A.F., Rothon, C., & Kilpi, E. (2008). The Second Generation in Western Europe: education, unemployment, and occupational attainment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *34*(1), 211–235.

Hellyer, H.A. (2009). *Muslims of Europe: the 'other' Europeans*. UK: Edinburgh University Press.

Herek, G.M. (2004). Beyond "homophobia": Thinking about sexual prejudice and stigma in the twenty-first century. *Sexuality Research & Social Policy*, *1*(2), 6–24.

Hogg, M.A. (2016). Chapter 1 Social Identity Theory. In S. McKeown, R. Haji, & N. Ferguson (Eds.), *Understanding Peace and Conflict Through Social Identity Theory* (pp. 3–17). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Hogg, M.A., Adelman, J.R., & Blagg, R.D. (2010). Religion in the face of uncertainty: an uncertainty-identity theory account of religiousness. *Personality and Social Psychology Review: An Official Journal of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Inc*, *14*(1), 72–83.

Hogg, M.A., & Reid, S.A. (2006). Social Identity, self-categorization, and the communication of group norms. *Communication Theory*, *16*(1), 7–30.

Hogg, M.A., Sherman, D.K., Dierselhuis, J., Maitner, A.T., & Moffitt, G. (2007). Uncertainty, entitativity, and group identification. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *43*(1), 135–142.

Hooghe, M., Claes, E., Harell, A., Quintelier, E., & Dejaeghere, Y. (2010). Anti-gay sentiment among adolescents in Belgium and Canada: A comparative investigation into the role of gender and religion. *Journal of Homosexuality*, *57*(3), 384–400.

Hox, J.J., Moerbeek, M., & Schoot, R. van de. (2017). *Multilevel Analysis: Techniques and Applications, Third Edition* (3 edition). New York, NY: Routledge.

Hunsberger, B., & Jackson, L.M. (2005). Religion, meaning, and prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues*, *61*(4), 807–826.

ILGA-Europe. (2013). *Annual Review of the Human Rights Situation of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and Intersex People in Europe*. ILGA-Europe.

James, J.H., Barton, K.C., Kunzman, R., Logan, K., & Schweber, S. (2015). *Religion in the classroom: dilemmas for democratic education*. New York: Routledge.

Kalkan, K.O., Layman, G.C., & Uslaner, E. M. (2009). "Bands of Others"? Attitudes toward Muslims in contemporary American society. *The Journal of Politics*, *71*(3), 847–862.

Kentli, F.D. (2009). Comparison of hidden curriculum theories. *European Journal of Educational Studies*, *1*(2), 83–88.

Kinnvall, C. (2004). Globalization and religious nationalism: Self, identity, and the search for ontological security. *Political Psychology*, *25*(5), 741–767.

Kite, M.E., & Whitley, B.E. (1998). Do heterosexual women and men differ in their attitudes toward homosexuality? A conceptual and methodological analysis. In G.M. Herek (Ed.), Psychological perspectives on lesbian and gay issues, Vol. 4. *Stigma and sexual*

orientation: Understanding prejudice against lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals (pp. 39–61). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.

Levin, J.S., & Chatters, L.M. (1998). Religion, health, and psychological well-being in older adults: Findings from three national surveys. *Journal of Aging and Health*, *10*(4), 504–531.

Loftus, J. (2001). America's liberalization in attitudes toward homosexuality, 1973 to 1998. *American Sociological Review*, *66*(5), 762.

Madge, N., Hemming, P.J., & Kevin, S. (2014). *Youth on religion: the development, negotiation and impact of faith and non-faith identity*. London ; New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Maher, M. J. (2013). Homophobic bullying in Catholic high schools: Five US studies in heterosexism, authority, masculinity, and religion. In Z. Gross, L. Davies, & A.-K. Diab (Eds.), *Gender, Religion and Education in a Chaotic Postmodern World* (pp. 271–284). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. Mandel, L., & Shakeshaft, C. (2000). Heterosexism in middle schools. Research on men and masculinities series, *11*, 75–104.

Marsh, H.W., Lüdtke, O., Nagengast, B., Trautwein, U., Morin, A.J.S., Abduljabbar, A.S., & Köller, O. (2012). Classroom climate and contextual effects: Conceptual and methodological issues in the evaluation of group-level effects. *Educational Psychologist*, *47*(2), 106–124.

Mayo, J.B. (2017). Sexuality and queer theory in the social studies. In M.M. Manfra & C.M. Bolick (Eds.), *The Wiley Handbook of Social Studies Research* (pp. 254–269). USA: New Jersey, Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell.

Moon, D. (2002). Religious views of homosexuality. In D. Richardson & S. Seidman (Eds.), *Handbook of Lesbian and Gay Studies* (pp. 313–328). London: SAGE.

Muldoon, O.T., Schmid, K., & Downes, C. (2009). Political violence and psychological well-being: The role of social identity. *Applied Psychology*, *58*(1), 129–145.

Muldoon, O.T., Trew, K., Todd, J., Rougier, N., & McLaughlin, K. (2007). Religious and national identity after the Belfast Good Friday agreement. *Political Psychology*, *28*(1), 89–103.

Mullin, B.-A., & Hogg, M.A. (1998). Dimensions of subjective uncertainty in social identification and minimal intergroup discrimination. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *37*(3), 345–365.

OECD. (2016). *Pisa 2015 results in focus*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Ohlander, J., Batalova, J., & Treas, J. (2005). Explaining educational influences on attitudes toward homosexual relations. *Social Science Research*, *34*(4), 781–799.

Park, C.L. (2007). Religiousness/spirituality and health: a meaning systems perspective. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, *30*(4), 319–328.

Phalet, K., Fleischmann, F., & Stojčić, S. (2012). Ways of 'being Muslim': Religious identities of second-generation Turks. In Crul M., Schneider J., & Lelie F. (Eds.), *The European Second Generation Compared: Does the Integration Context Matter?* (pp. 341-374). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Poteat, V.P. (2007). Peer group socialization of homophobic attitudes and behavior during adolescence. *Child Development*, *78*(6), 1830–1842.

Poteat, V P., DiGiovanni, C.D., & Scheer, J.R. (2013). Predicting homophobic behavior among heterosexual youth: domain general and sexual orientation-specific factors at the individual and contextual level. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *42*(3), 351–362.

Preacher, K.J., & Selig, J.P. (2012). Advantages of Monte Carlo confidence intervals for indirect effects. *Communication Methods and Measures*, *6*(2), 77–98.Roggemans, L., Spruyt, B., Van Droogenbroeck, F., & Keppens, G. (2015). Religion and negative attitudes towards homosexuals: An analysis of urban young people and their attitudes towards homosexuality. *Young*, *23*(3), 254–276.

Rey, A. M., & Gibson, P. R. (1997). Beyond High School. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services*, *7*(4), 65–84.

Russell, S.T., Toomey, R.B., Crockett, J., & Laub, C. (2010). LGBT politics, youth activism, and civic engagement. In L.R. Sherrod, J. Torney-Purta, & C. Flanagan (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Civic Engagement in Youth* (pp. 471–494). Hoboken, New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell.

Ryu, E. (2015). The role of centering for interaction of level 1 variables in multilevel structural equation models. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, *22*(4), 617–630.

Selig, J. P., & Preacher, K. J. (2008). Monte Carlo method for assessing mediation: An interactive tool for creating confidence intervals for indirect effects [Computer software].

Scheerens, J. (2011). Indicators on informal learning for active citizenship at school. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, *23*(3), 201–222.

Schmidt, S.J. (2010). Queering social Studies: The role of social studies in normalizing citizens and sexuality in the common good. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *38*(3), 314–335.

Schwartz, E.C. (2011). *With us or against us: using religiosity and sociodemographic variables to predict homophobic beliefs.* Doctoral Dissertation. Indiana: Indiana State University.

Stapleton, L.M., Yang, J.S., & Hancock, G.R. (2016). Construct meaning in multilevel settings. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, *41*(5), 481–520.

StataCorp. 2015. *Stata Statistical Software: Release 14*. College Station, TX: StataCorp LP.Steger, M.F., Bundick, M.J., & Yeager, D. (2011). Meaning in Life. In R.J.R. Levesque (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Adolescence* (pp. 1666–1677). New York: Springer.

Stulhofer, A., & Rimac, I. (2009). Determinants of homonegativity in Europe. *Journal of Sex Research*, *46*(1), 24–32.

Swidler, A. (Ed.). (1993). *Homosexuality and World Religions* (1st edition). Valley Forge, Pa: Trinity Pr Intl.

Timmerman, C., Vanderwaeren, E., & Crul, M. (2003). The Second Generation in Belgium. *International Migration Review*, *37*(4), 1065–1090.

Turner, J.C. (1991). *Social influence.* Buckingham: Thomson Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.

Turner, J.C., Hogg, M.A., Oakes, P.J., Reicher, S.D., & Wetherell, M.S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory.* Oxford, Blackwell.

Van Droogenbroeck, F., Spruyt, B., Siongers, J., & Keppens, G. (2016). Religious quest orientation and anti-gay sentiment: Nuancing the relationship between religiosity and negative attitudes toward homosexuality among young Muslims and Christians in Flanders. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *55*(4), 787–799.

Weinberg, G. (1972). *Society and the healthy homosexual*. New York: St. Martin's.

Whitley, B.E. (2009). Religiosity and attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: A meta-analysis. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, *19*(1), 21–38.

Whitley, B.E., & Lee, S.E. (2000). The relationship of authoritarianism and related constructs to attitudes toward homosexuality. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *30*(1), 144–170.

Wilkinson, W.W. (2004). Religiosity, authoritarianism, and homophobia: A multidimensional approach. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, *14*(1), 55–67.

Wright Jr, L.W., Adams, H.E., & Bernat, J. (1999). Development and validation of the homophobia scale. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, *21*(4), 337–347.

Ysseldyk, R., Matheson, K., & Anisman, H. (2010). Religiosity as identity: toward an understanding of religion from a social identity perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Review: An Official Journal of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Inc*, *14*(1), 60–71.