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Abstract

Much of the research surrounding measures of privilege awareness commonly involve White privilege awareness (Neville, et al., 2000; Pinterits et al., 2009). However, relatively few (i.e., Privilege and Oppression Inventory; Hays, et al., 2007) look at Christian privilege. As such, this study looked to create a more extensive scale that would assess Christian privilege awareness among Christian participants. Using a sample of 391 participants recruited from Facebook, Reddit, SONA and Twitter, an exploratory factor analysis was run on a 29-item scale. The analysis suggested that a final 21 item two factor solution was the best fit for the data after considering factor cross loadings and variance explained. Convergent and concurrent validity are also established. Finally, future directions and limitations are also discussed.
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**Literature Review**

What is privilege? Israel (2012) argues that privilege generally consists of “unearned advantages that are conferred to individuals based on membership or assumed membership in a dominant group” (p. 158). While this may aptly serve as a foundational explication of general privilege, other theorists believe that additional nuance is needed to fully understand the construct. For example, Noam Chomsky defines privilege as a call for those so inculcated to act in a manner that not only indicates an awareness of said privilege, but also questions the implications of such status:

Responsibility I believe accrues through privilege. People like you and me [e.g., White, heterosexual, male] have an unbelievable amount of privilege and therefore we have a huge amount of responsibility. We live in free societies where we are not afraid of the police; we have extraordinary wealth available to us by global standards. If you have those things, then you have the kind of responsibility that a person does not have if he or she is slaving seventy hours a week to put food on the table; a responsibility at the very least to inform yourself about power (Noam Chomsky as cited by Adams, 2003, p. 1)

The need to explicitly prompt those with privilege to question the source of their advantages illustrates a key facet of privilege. That is, two of the common effects of experiencing privilege are (1) obliviousness of its presence (e.g., endorsing “colorblindness” is often framed as a consequence of having racial privilege; Neville, et al, 2000), and (2) a seemingly irrational tendency to deny its existence, even when confronted with otherwise unambiguous evidence demonstrating its presence and effects. Evidence of these outcomes is replete in the literature (Knowles, Lowery, Hogan, & Chow, 2009; Knowles, Lowery, Chow, & Unzueta, 2014; Solomon, Portelli, Daniel, & Campbell, 2005; Boatright-Horowitz, Marraccini & Harps-Logan, 2012; Hossain, 2015; Ancis and Szymanski, 2001). A third effect of experiencing privilege seems to be that individuals have difficulty understanding that privileges granted to them are a consequence of the denial of said privilege among society. Evidence in support of this premise can be gleaned from the work of Knowles and Lowry (2012). These researchers found that those who more strongly endorse the belief that society is a meritocracy (i.e. the idea that an individual’s actions alone predict their circumstances) tended to express low acceptance of the validity of White privilege. Further, Knowles and Lowry, in summary of previous work, suggest this link exists because:

The potential existence of White privilege interferes with dominant-group members’ efforts to maintain a positive self-view. In this research, Whites who experienced a threat to the self were less likely to acknowledge the existence of White privilege than were those who experienced no such threat. While this finding implies that Whites deny inequity because they regard merit as a personal ideal. (p. 204)

Seminal research on privilege has mostly focused upon its racial dimensions with respect to White privilege (Pinterits et al., 2009); however, other dominant group identities including male (McIntosh, 2008), middle class (Liu et al., 2007), and Christian (Schlosser, 2003) are also beginning to be explored in terms of this construct. Despite this growth, the literature on White privilege is often used as an exemplar when researchers attempt to generalize findings about racial privilege to other relevant domains. In the current study, I shall be adopting this approach in my discussion of Christian privilege. Consequently, it seems important to summarize some of the key findings related to White privilege research so that I might use this research as a foundation from which to hypothesize about the construct of Christian privilege.

**A Prototypical Example of Social Advantage: White Privilege**

What is *White* *privilege*? White privilege can best be defined as a “set of unearned assets” (McIntosh, 2008, p. 239) given to White individuals as a function of their membership in a White racial group. To fully understand White privilege, however, it is first necessary to understand the broader concept of race, particularly as it has been defined in the United States. Smedley (1998) argues the current conceptualization of race is a new phenomenon when she states the following:

What was absent from these different forms of human identity is what we today would perceive as classifications into “racial” groups, that is, the organization of all peoples into a limited number of unequal or ranked categories theoretically based on differences in their biophysical traits. There are no “racial” designations in the literature of the ancients and few references even to such human features as skin color. (p. 693)

Further, Smedley argues that it was not until the 18th century that different cultural groups were arranged hierarchically in society due to putative biological differences. This view was not successfully challenged in the New World until the passage of the 13th Amendment in 1865, which legally emancipated enslaved Africans in the United States (U.S Const. amend. XIII). However, this legal status did not deter the US government from explicitly privileging Whiteness in its laws. Two glaring examples include the Supreme Court cases of Takao Ozawa v. United States (1922) and United States v. Bhagat Singh (1923).

Takao Ozawa was a Japanese immigrant who believed he should be entitled to US citizenship as a result of his work ethic, his willingness to embrace mainstream US culture (i.e., speaking English, converting to Christianity, etc.), and his love for his adopted country (Race-The Power of an Illusion, 2003). Unfortunately, to become a citizen at that time required that Ozawa be considered either racially Black or White (Race: The Power of an Illusion, 2003). Thus, Ozawa sued to be considered White. His case, *Takao Ozawa v. United States* (1922), illuminated how the US judicial system served to reify the boundaries of race to ensure greater social privileges to one race over all others. Despite Ozawa’s compelling argument that he had fulfilled the necessary requirements to be granted citizenship, the Court ruled the following:

The appellant, in the case now under consideration, however, is clearly of a race which is not Caucasian and therefore belongs entirely outside the zone on the negative side. A large number of the federal and state courts have so decided, and we find no reported case definitely to the contrary. These decisions are sustained by numerous scientific authorities, which we do not deem it necessary to review. We think these decisions are right and so hold. (*Takao Ozawa v. United States*, 1922, para. 22)

This ruling essentially stated that Ozawa was not eligible for citizenship due to his “scientific” designation as Asian and not White.

A second example occurred only a year later in the case of the *United States v. Thind* (1923). Thind, who was originally born in India, argued that he was eligible for citizenship because the science of the time asserted that Indians were of the Caucasian race (i.e., White). However, the court contradicted its previous stance in the case of Ozawa, and instead wrote that despite the fact that Thind was *scientifically* Caucasian, this was not sufficient to grant him status as a White person. Rather, the court asserted that in the case of *United States v. Thind* (1923), Thind must also match the self-evident physical description that the writers of the law had in mind:

But in this country, during the last half century especially, the word by common usage has acquired a popular meaning, not clearly defined to be sure, but sufficiently so to enable us to say that its popular as distinguished from its scientific application is of appreciably narrower scope. It is in the popular sense of the word, therefore, that we employ is as an aid to the construction of the statute, for it would be obviously illogical to convert words of common speech used in a statute into words of scientific terminology when neither the latter nor the science for whose purposes they were coined was within the contemplation of the framers of the statute or of the people for whom it was framed. The words of the statute are to be interpreted in accordance with the understanding of the common man from whose vocabulary they were taken. (*United States v. Thind,* 1923, para. 7)

As a consequence of these decisions, the Supreme Court again reinforced the racial hierarchy of the United States. Such institutional affirmations of the supremacy of Whiteness throughout the history of the US is what serves as the foundation for the iterations of White privilege that are still with us today.

While at first glance the legislative hypocrisy shown by the Supreme Court in *Takao Ozawa v. United States* (1922) compared to *United States v. Thind* (1923) might in some regards be difficult to fathom, such dissimulation is understandable through the lens of *critical race theory*. This theory asserts that racism is such a commonplace part of US culture that it is likely “almost unrecognizable” (Taylor, 1998, p. 122) to the average White American, being so “ordinary and natural to such a degree that the oppression [that results from it] no longer seems like oppression to the perpetrators” (p. 122). This theory provides a context to better understand how, in the face of the long and impeccably documented history of racism that exists in the United States, there is still a tendency on the part of many White Americans to deny that being White comes certain privileges.

**The Denial of Privilege**

Ancis and Szymanski (2001) have demonstrated that denial is one cognitive mechanism used to attempt to obfuscate the existence of White privilege. In their qualitative study of counseling students in a Social and Cultural Issues in Counseling course, students were asked to read Peggy McIntosh’s essay on her experiences having White privilege, and then subsequently describe their reactions to the essay. The results indicated that denial of privilege was a theme among the counseling students. However, there are multiple other cognitive strategies that allow those with privilege to ignore, or explain away, the existence of their privileged status (Knowles, et al., 2014). One partial manifestation of this denial occurs when Whites “defend against the threats of privilege by distancing their own self-concepts from the offending social identity” (p. 601). According to Knowles et al., this means that while a White person may accept the idea that White privilege exists, they may simultaneously assert that such privilege does not apply to their personal accomplishments.

This obliviousness to the outcomes that result from privilege may be due to the fact that for those uninitiated into an awareness of the racial hierarchy that exists in the US, the systemic processes of privilege are rendered invisible when contrasted with more individualistic and starkly explicit examples of racism (i.e., these individuals see racism as somehow separate from White privilege). Support for this contention can be gleaned from the work of Lowery, Knowles, and Unzueta (2007). These researchers found that the self-image of White respondents was only significantly threatened when social inequality was framed in terms of White privilege rather than Black disadvantage.

In other words, it is not simply the case that Whites perceive a resource differential (Whites > Blacks) and articulate it, equivalently, as either White advantage or Black disadvantage. Rather, our findings make clear that Black disadvantage is psychologically separable from White advantage, and thus that individuals do not automatically translate discrimination against competitors into in-group advantage. (p. 1246)

This phenomenon is further illuminated by the work of Pfeifer and Schneider (1974). These researchers conducted a factor analysis of a racial climate survey completed by students at a university. The results of their analyses indicated that Black and White university students evoked different response patterns, yielding distinct factor structures for each group. Specifically, while the responses of White students supported a five-factor model that included one that represented the construct of individual racism; this was not the case for the Black sample. For the latter group, six factors were uncovered, with two of these factors representing both individual and institutional racism, respectively. Taken together, these results suggest that White respondents don’t see institutional racism in the same way that Black respondents do. If we generalize from these findings, a real-world example of this dynamic playing out might consist of the following example: While many Black New Yorkers opposed the implementation of the controversial “Stop and Frisk” program in the city, many White New Yorkers supported this action (Goldenberg, 2012). Research indicates that programs like Stop and Frisk are racially biased (U.S. Department of Justice, 2018; Gelman et al, 2007). Thus, if this program was named more honestly (i.e., policy makers called it “Stop and Frisk Black men in NYC more than White men”), the program would likely have been widely condemned as racist. However, because race was never explicitly mentioned as an essential component of the implementation of the Stop and Frisk program, it allowed the police a veneer of impartiality and legitimacy, despite repeated protests by people of color that the program was racially biased.

Some pundits may argue that such instances of obliviousness concerning how the racial hierarchy works in the US results from simple ignorance on the part of those with privilege. Unfortunately, denial of privilege is not necessarily a product of ignorance. A study by Brooks-Immel and Murray (2008) suggests that even well-educated individuals (e.g., university faculty) are not immune to some of the effects of White privilege. That is, even among this intellectual elite (i.e., people who are often trained to be discerning consumers of information), the prevalence of color-blind attitudes (i.e. the idea that “race should not and does not matter”) in modern US society seems to persist within even this ostensibly well-educated sector of society (Neville, et al., 2000, p. 60). This suggests that even high levels of educational achievement do not necessarily serve as a buffer against seeing White privilege and holding color-blind attitudes

Denial of White privilege has been found to positively correlate with other negative reactions when one learns about White privilege. In fact, researchers have begun to uncover additional reactions that appear to compromise the process of learning about privilege. For example, White’s may be prone to experiencing feelings of anger and guilt when the concept of White privilege is presented to them (Ancis & Szymanski, 2001). Part of this reactions is thought to be due to a desire on the part of those with privilege to continue to assert that the advantages and privileges they enjoy in life are somehow earned or deserved (Knowles, et al., 2014):

Thus, after confronting a threat to their personal merit, White participants sought to restore self-regard by denying a different source of meritocratic threat—White privilege (cf. Campbell & Sedikides, 1999). In a second study, meritocratic threat triggered the denial of privilege only among individuals scoring high on a measure of White identification, further suggesting that denial serves a self-protective function (Lowery et al., 2007). The results of these studies remained robust after controlling for levels of anti-Black prejudice, indicating that self-image concerns are sufficient to trigger the denial of White privilege independent of feelings about the outgroup. (p. 599)

Unsurprisingly, the emotionality and defensiveness exhibited by White people confronted by their racial privilege poses a significant impediment to the process by which some White individuals become more aware of the seriousness of racial privilege. As such, researchers concerned with more fully understanding this dynamic in society have worked to empirically measure the construct of White privilege and its effects. Current measures to assess this construct will be discussed in the following section.

**Initial Attempts to Assess White Privilege and Color-Blind Racial Ideology.**

It appears that much of the work in this area has utilized self-report instruments to assess color-blind racial ideology and, by extension, White privilege.Many of these measures attempt to look at either *color evasion* or *power evasion* broadly speaking with respect to Color-Blind Racial ideology (Awad & Jackson, 2016). Color evasion is “the strategy of ignoring race as a means to emphasize similarity and reject racial superiority” (p. 142). Meanwhile power evasion is “willful denial of power relationships designed to ignore racism and discrimination.” (p. 142). For example, one of the most cited measures to assess the power evasion aspect of color-blind racial ideology, as well as attitudes about and denial of White privilege, is the Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS; Awad & Jackson, 2016; Neville, et al, 2000; McDonald, Chang, Dispenza & O'Hara, 2019; Davis, 2019). The CoBRAS is a measure of the “cognitive dimensions of color-blind racial attitudes” (Neville, et al, 2000, p. 61). CoBRAS scores have been found to be positively associated with endorsing sentiments that indicate a fear of non-Whites (Spanierman & Heppner, 2004), and negatively correlated with both pro-diversity values (Spanierman et al, 2008), and support for affirmative action (Awad et al., 2005). This scale has been helpful in bringing people’s perceptions of color-blind racial ideology and White privilege awareness to the forefront of the social sciences. Taken together, this research indicates that low levels of privilege awareness appear to be associated with both endorsing more negative evaluations of marginalized out-groups, as well as displaying indifference to ensuring that out-group members are treated equally within society.

Another more recently developed scale is the White Privilege Attitudes Scale by Pinterits, Poteat, and Spanierman (2009). This scale attempts to measure “the multidimensional nature of White privilege attitudes, reflecting affective, cognitive, and behavioral dimensions” (p. 417). More generally, this scale assesses the degree to which White individuals acknowledge that their race grants them advantages over other racial groups. Research has shown that the WPAS subscale of White Privilege Remorse, in which higher scores indicate greater remorse for having White privilege, appears to be negatively correlated with political conservatism and anti-Black bias (Roussos & Dovidio, 2018); while also suggesting that more exposure to non-White peoples improves White respondents’ desire to confront White privilege (Mindrup et al., 2011). The use of this scale has yielded a body of research that has furthered our understanding of White privilege by including elements about how individuals think about the potential fear and consequences they may encounter should they speak out about privilege.

Taken together, the CoBRAS and WPAS give researchers a better understanding of the elements that make up White privilege awareness in addition to the attitudes and behaviors associated with various levels of such awareness. From here, researchers can proactively approach the multiple facets uncovered using these scales to better investigate ways to combat the denial and skepticism that frequently surrounds the existence of White privilege. Due to the wide usage of these scales, the WPAS and CoBRAS will be used as templates from which I shall derive the preliminary structure and items of a scale to assess Christian privilege.

**White Privilege: A Blueprint for Understanding Christian Privilege**

The research on White privilege reveals that privileged groups get their privilege from being able to structure society in a way that most benefits them (Liu, 2017). Additionally, we see that there are cognitive strategies that members of privileged groups engage in to provide plausible deniability concerning any benefits that either White people generally, or individually, derive from this system in society (Knowles, et al., 2014). With the preceding evidence as my foundation, I extrapolate the following assumptions: (1) Christian privilege exists in the US, and

(2) how Christian privilege manifests amongst Christians will be analogous to the dynamics that have been observed with the study of White privilege. Consequently, just as scales have been developed to measure the facets of White privilege, I believe that such scales can serve as an apt template for the creation of a scale to measure Christian privilege. This is especially true given the link some scholars believe exists between Christianity and its ability to uphold White privilege and, by extension, White supremacy.

**Christianity: What Can We Say About the Faithful?**

Christianity is defined as “the religion derived from Jesus Christ, based on the Bible as sacred scripture, and professed by Eastern, Roman Catholic, and Protestant bodies” according to Merriam Webster’s Online (2018) dictionary. However, the expression of that belief system, both behaviorally and attitudinally, among Christians differs as a function of how individual denominations and people interpret the Bible. As a result, having any monolithic notion of what a Christian does and thinks outside of the somewhat general definition given by Merriam Webster is difficult. Despite this variability, however, some generalizations can be made about these groups.

**Common Christian Group Characteristics and Social Views.** While Christianity includes a broad range of groups who may differ significantly in their practice of this religion, research by the Pew Research Center (n.d.) has uncovered some general trends and characteristics that seem to apply broadly across many denominations of self-identified Christians in the United States. For example:

1. Females are more likely to be Christian compared to males

2. Christians in the US are predominately White

3. A large majority do not have a college degree

4. Most say their faith is of very high importance to them

5. A majority say morality is situational vs absolute

6. Christians are roughly equally affiliated with both American political parties

Thus, some commonalities and generalizations can be made about Christians, even if we must simultaneously acknowledge that differences are also present.

**Can One’s Christian Identity/Attitudes be Measured?** Scholars have attempted to create scales to assess religiosity in a multidimensional fashion (Batson & Schoenrade, 1991; Gorsuch & MacPherson, 1989). Two of the most widely used options for assessing religiosity broadly are (1) the Quest scale (Batson & Schoenrade, 1991) and (2) the Intrinsic/Extrinsic (I/E) Religiosity scale (Gorsuch & MacPherson, 1989). While the QUEST scale was designed to measure how willing one is to question one’s religious beliefs, the Intrinsic and Extrinsic Religiosity Scale was designed to measure what the motivates people to be religious.

Apropos of the current study, earlier research utilizing these constructs has shown that extrinsic religiosity is positively correlated with racism, anti-Semitism, and dogmatism (Donahue, 1985). Additionally, the QUEST religious orientation scale, in which higher scores indicate more willingness to question one’s beliefs, appears to negatively correlate with right wing authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, prejudice, and anti LGBT attitudes (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992).

However, when it comes to a scale to look at Christian privilege, my review of the literature yielded only one measure that attempts to assess this construct – i.e., there is an 8-item subscale developed by Hays, et al. (2007) in their Privilege and Oppression Inventory (POI). Unfortunately, this scale has limitations. For instance, the scale for validation was given only to counseling graduate students. This suggests that the overall generalizability and utility of the scale outside of a counseling setting is unknown. To address this, Hayes et al. (2007) suggest administering the scale to a more diverse sample in addition to potentially adding more items to various scales in order to fully capture the constructs being measured (i.e., White, Christian, Straight and Male privilege). To my knowledge, no such scale utilizing a more diverse sample or using additional items with respect to Christian privilege exists.

**Christianity as a Proxy for White Privilege/Racial Prejudice**

What does the history of Christianity in the US tell us about the phenomenon of White privilege in this country? As a rule, most people see these two categories of identities as separate and distinct from one another. However, recently, some scholars have suggested that adopting this view is a mistake. Sutton (2010), for example, has suggested that these two constructs are fundamentally imbued with systematic inequalities that “mutually constitute and reinforce each other” (p. 10). This dovetails with Faber’s (2012) view that both Christian and White privileges “intertwine” (p. 63) and contain the same fundamental processes that allow the beneficiaries of said privileges to deny its existence.

How do we unpack the interrelations between these privileged identities? We can start by looking at their commonalities. If we accept that a core tenet of most Christian faiths is the idea that those who follow God’s plan will be rewarded, and those who do not shall receive punishment; the analogous characteristics of Christian privilege and White privilege begins to more explicitly coalesce.

We start to see this picture emerge when we look at what research tells us about how Whites evangelicals (i.e., White Christians who believe that it is their duty to spread the message of Jesus and salvation to non-Christians) perceive Black vs. White racial inequality in society. White evangelical respondents tended to blame Black disadvantage on individual and characterological variables rather than external institutional ones (Edgell & Tranby, 2007). Within White evangelical circles, some scholars have posited that the cultural values surrounding “free will individualism ….[and] anti-structuralism” (Emerson et al., 1999, p. 400) may make it more difficult for many White evangelicals to understand racial differences as a function of systemic inequality.

Why might this be so? One of the justifications for chattel slavery in the colonies was the idea that Black Africans were a cursed people because they were the descendants of Ham (Lee, 2003). The core cultural values of free will and anti-structuralism, in addition to historical Christian justifications for various forms of oppression, may help to explain why Todd (2010) suggests that the United States history of oppression is tightly linked to Christianity. Edgell and Tranby offer additional support for Todd (2010) when they consider the following conditional statement including a summarized quote from Martin Luther King Jr.: “If it is true that 11 o’clock on Sunday morning is ‘the most segregated hour in America,’ then racial isolation characterizes the religious experience of most churchgoers” (Edgell & Tranby, p. 267). To further quote Edgell and Tranby (2007), “religion and race interact to form a strong White sub-culture that fosters attitudes about social and political issues” (p. 267) that tend to reinforce the status quo at the expense of societal changes that might allow for a more truly egalitarian society.

But evidence for a link between Christianity and racial bias is not just anecdotal. When we consider what empirical research has revealed about this association, we know that there are numerous studies that have revealed a consistent link between aspects of Christianity and anti-Black bias. For example, a study by Johnson et al. (2010) found that participants primed with Christian words showed stronger anti-Black attitudes than those who were primed with more neutral words. This effect was found even after accounting for participants’ religiosity. Further, a study by Howard and Sommers (2017a) revealed that even after controlling for participants’ pre-manipulation self-ratings of religiosity, White respondents endorsed more negative attitudes concerning Black people after being subliminally primed with a White Jesus compared to a Black Jesus, or some non-race/religion based images (e.g., oranges). Ironically, we see an inverse reaction when the same manipulation was used on a sample of African American respondents (Howard & Sommers, 2017b). Specifically, Howard and Sommers found that when Black participants were exposed to an image of a White Jesus, they subsequently evinced more positive feelings toward White people compared to such ratings given when Black participants were exposed to non-religious White men, objects, or non-human religious objects. Taken together, these studies suggest that there is something about Christianity that appears to elicit pro-White or anti-Black feelings and attitudes

Given the numerous links in the literature concerning the association of Christianity with racial bias (i.e., anti-Black or pro-White sentiments), these findings lend support to the contention that there seems to be something in the construct of Christianity that is intertwined with feelings of racial bias. That is, if both White privilege and certain aspects of Christianity are associated with anti-Black/pro-White sentiments in a similar fashion, then maybe this commonality offers additional justification for using White privilege as a rough analog to arrive at a better understanding of the construct of Christian privilege. Perhaps this finding helps to explain why both Christianity and White privilege predict anti-Black sentiments.

**Christian Identity and Religious Privilege: A Sacred Taboo**

**Christian Intolerance of Non-Christians.** Research by Cook, Cottrell, and Webster (2015) has shown that Christians perceive atheists to be a greater threat to their values than a general population of college students while also suggesting that Christians are more likely to openly discriminate against an atheist compared to a control group. College students were used as a baseline because it was thought that in-group preference would lead to participants feeling less threatened by an in group of other college students. Additionally, research further shows that Christians favor their in-group with higher levels of Christian religiosity being associated with more negative views of atheists (Johnson et al., 2012).

However, these types of negative beliefs do not exist solely between Christians and non-Christians per se. Christians have a long history of holding negative opinion towards women as well. Many of the early Christian scholars and their writings depict a worldview that embraces the notion that God made women to be subordinate to men (Martos & Hegy, 1998). This hierarchical worldview is still present to this day with respect to marriage and ministry. Men (especially Christian men) are still generally expected to be the heads of their households and the Church (Martos & Hegy, 1998). This historical bias is supported by research that has shown a positive association between how literally someone interprets the Bible and their endorsement of benevolent sexism (Burn & Busso, 2005) – i.e., the “subjectively favorable, chivalrous ideology that offers protection and affection to women who embrace conventional roles” (Glick & Fiske, 2001, p.109).

In addition to negative attitudes about women, Christianity is also commonly associated with bias toward LGBT individuals. A study by Trevino et al (2012), suggests that messages containing anti LGB attitudes are fairly widespread and that exposure to these messages is associated with greater LGB prejudice. Other research has suggested that there is a link between religious fundamentalism and anti LBTQ prejudice (Sanabria, 2012).

**Mechanisms of Christian Privilege.** For social privilege to exist, specific institutional mechanisms must also be present to propagate and maintain this privilege (Liu, 2017). Liu posits that it is our government, particularly our legislative branch (i.e., the branch that writes the laws of the society), that serves this purpose in the US. While Liu was primarily referencing White privilege in his discussion of this dynamic, I hope to generalize from this work in order to apply these suppositions to better understand how the construct of Christian privilege works in the United States.

How are these constructs similar? Well, to answer this question, we need only consider who is most likely to be elected to a public office in the US. To this end, Christian privilege is most evident in the United States by the fact that it appears that there is an association between a political candidate’s religious beliefs and their ability to garner public support. In other words, candidates with atheist religious views would likely struggle to gain as much voter support as a Christian candidate (Lipka, 2014). Additional evidence in support of this can be gleaned from the fact that while only 70 percent of the US population identifies as Christian, 85 percent of the US Congress identifies as Christian (Pew Research Center, 2015; Washington Times, 2017). Additionally, 43 of the 45 Presidents in United States history have been Christian (Masci, 2017). Of the two who were not religiously affiliated, Thomas Jefferson “lost his faith in orthodox Christianity at an early age but continued to believe in an impersonal God as the creator of the universe” (Masci, 2017, para. 8). Additionally, the second religiously unaffiliated president, Abraham Lincoln, “…was raised in a religious household and spoke frequently about God (particularly as president), but never joined a church” (Masci, 2017, para. 9). Masci (2017) asserts that the historical accuracy of Lincoln being a Christian is still hotly debated among history scholars. This trend to appoint Christian candidates to high positions in the US government is also evident in Supreme Court appointees – i.e., only nine Justices have ever endorsed a religious view that was something other than some denomination of Christianity (PBS NewsHour, 2018). Of those nine Justices, eight of them identified as Jewish, and one was not a member of a church. Despite the high number of Christian candidates available for such government positions, this rate of representation in the higher echelons of government is out of proportion to the number of Christians represented in the general population.

**Legislative Examples of Privilege.** Christian privilege manifests in the US not just in terms of the proportion of its leaders who are Christian, but also in the laws and policies that this country adopts. For example, Balingit (2018) found that several states have begun to allow the phrase, ‘In God We Trust,” to be displayed on taxpayer funded property. In Florida and Louisiana, such legislation has mandated that public schools display this motto (Solochek, 2018; Mahoney, 2018; Associated Press, 2018). While some might argue that the use of this national maxim is not an example of our government’s endorsement of Christianity over other religions, others have challenged this interpretation by pointing out that no one is thinking of Allah, Vishnu, or Thor when such dictums are evoked (CBS News, 2018). Additionally, we could rebut those who argue in support of the use of this aphorism by reminding pundits that some religions do not have a deity to worship, and some people do not believe in God(s) at all (Pew, 2015). How is this phrase neutral in the lives of people from the latter groups?

The privileged status for Christianity is not merely instantiated both by the adoption of pro-Christian laws in many states; it is also demonstrated by the fact that many legal challenges to such pro-Christian laws have been upheld by the courts. For example, in Illinois, a lawsuit that alleged that the use of the maxim, “In God We Trust,” by government agencies is a violation of the First Amendment was denied on the basis that the motto was not an “endorsement,” but rather a “historical reminder of the nation’s heritage” (CBS News, 2018, p. 1). This conflation of national heritage with Christianity is a form of Christian privilege.

Despite the First Amendment’s explicit prohibition against the State supporting any single religious group over others, the longstanding deference given to Christian priorities through the continued usage of slogans referencing a Christian God or patently Christian imperatives in government documents, monuments, and ceremonies reveals the degree to which Christianity is privileged above other religions by the US government. No other religious belief system is given this same degree of respect and societal influence within our government. The best examples of this bias can be gleaned from the passage of “religious freedom” bills in some states (Johnson & Steinmetz, 2015). Broadly speaking, these bills “[prohibit] laws from burdening religious freedom unless the government had a compelling interest and had used the least restrictive means” (Miller, 2018, p. 1). This means that if a person can cite a deeply held religious objection to a particular law that they believe unnecessarily hinders their ability to practice their religion, they can ignore the law and not be prosecuted for violating it. This reasoning has been used by both individuals and various business and healthcare institutions to claim religious or moral objection to providing wedding and adoption services to members of LGBTQA communities (even in localities that have explicit laws preventing discrimination against these groups; Allison, 2020; Edelman, 2018; LeBlanc, 2019), as well as medical prescriptions for birth control and abortion access (Guttmacher Institute, 2019; National Women’s Law Center, 2017) in communities where utilizing such items and procedures are legal. However, this privilege does not just extend to allowing individuals to legally ignore state and federal laws.

Research by Van Camp, et al. (2016) reveals another example of Christian privilege with respect to job application assessments. Their research had participants read and evaluate job applications for prospective job fit and personality. The hypothetical applications varied with respect to religious beliefs (i.e. Christian, Muslim or atheist) and race (i.e. White or Black). Their results indicated that Christian job applications were rated more favorably than non-Christian applicants. Interestingly, these authors found that some participants were willing to explicitly state that the job applicant’s religious views were a factor in their assessment of the applicant. Further, research by Swan et al. (2014) also supported this trend. When they investigated how hypothetical individuals of varying religious affiliations were evaluated, their results indicated that Christian participants indicated more positive feelings for individuals described as Christian compared to individuals described as atheistic.

Finally, as has been found with research on White privilege, Blumenfeld and Jaekel (2012) found that the tendency for those with privilege to deny this status appears to also occur for some Christians. Specifically, these researchers found that Christian preschool teachers in their sample denied the fact that Christians enjoy a privileged status in the United States.

**How Might We Measure Christian Privilege?**

Efforts to articulate the constituent sentiments of Christian privilege have begun in the work of Schlosser (2003). Schlosser describes a set of core attitudes that represent this privilege, as illustrated by the following statements (pp. 48 – 49):

1. “I do not need to educate my children to be aware of religious persecution for their daily physical and emotional protection”
2. “I can be sure if I need legal or medical help, my religion will not work against me”
3. “I do not need to worry about the ramifications of disclosing my religious identity to others”
4. “I can, if I wish to identify myself, safely identify as Christian without fear of repercussions or prejudice because of my religious identity”
5. “I can be fairly sure that some hate group does not exist whose goal is to eradicate my religious group from the planet.”

These sentiments merely give voice to the reality that Christians in the US do not face systemic discrimination at the hands of the government or as a consequence of historical disenfranchisement.

Members of other, non-Christian religions do not enjoy the aforementioned privilege in the US. A quick glance at the Southern Poverty Law Center’s (SPLC) Hate Map shows over 1000 hate groups currently active in the United States (SPLC, 2018). Many of these groups show animus towards people of Muslim and Jewish faiths. This suggests that the United States is, by default, more friendly to Christian perspectives than other religious orientations.

**Present Study**

With the present study, I hope to create a scale that will assesses individuals’ attitudes about the idea that Christians experience a privileged status in comparison to non-Christians in the United States. This measure will be based upon the previous scale development and theoretical work of various scholars who have explored the construct of White privilege (Neville et al, 2000; Pinterits, et al., 2009; McIntosh, 2015). However, I shall apply their findings in the service of the development of an analogous scale to assess the construct of Christian privilege. To operationalize the items of my scale, I shall draw upon the list of privileges developed by Schlosser (2003) while also including adapted, analogous items found in the White privilege literature.

Further, this scale will be different from the Christian privilege subscale seen in the Privilege and Oppression Inventory (POI) in both content and volume. While the POI contains a relatively short number of items (i.e., 8), the proposed scale will consist of 29 items. Additionally, while the broad content of the POI Christian privilege subscale is solid (i.e., “Christians hold a lot of power because this country is based on their views”, “Society is biased positively towards Christians”, and “To be Christian is to have religious advantage in this country”; Hays, et al., 2007, p. 73), it is not enough just to understand broadly that Christian privilege exists. It is also necessary to be able to situationally identify the manifestations of said privilege. In this area, the proposed scale content wise will attempt to address this by containing items that look at specific situational manifestations of Christian privilege.

Finally, the development of such a scale is important and the reasons for this importance is best understood if we first consider the consequences of White privilege. It is documented that instances of police violence (Edwards et al., 2019), legal inequality (United States Sentencing Committee, 2017), and medical negligence (Hoffman et al., 2016) disproportionately negatively affect people of color compared to their White counterparts. As such, programs must be implemented to bridge this gap. In this pursuit, scales looking to measure the degree of White privilege awareness within the law enforcement, legal and medical communities can be a useful measurement tool to assess the efficacy of such diversity programs meant to mitigate the negative consequences brought on by a lack of privilege awareness. Moving to Christian privilege therefore, it is not a stretch to infer that such discrimination occurs as a result of Christian privilege as well. We already see such privilege-based assumptions exist in job application searches where Christians are seen as better candidates based on their religious beliefs (Van Camp, et al., 2016). Further, it is unlikely such discrimination as a result of privilege stops there. Therefore, scales will need to be created and developed that can appropriately assess the efficacy of diversity programs geared towards bridging the differential outcomes and treatment that exists between Christians and non-Christians across and within multiple institutions and situations. This proposed scale can be a first step toward the creation of such a scale.

**Methods**

**Participants**

Participants will consist of self-identified Christian adults recruited from psychology courses at Eastern Michigan University (via SONA, an online research participant management program) and through the use of social media platforms including Facebook, Twitter, Reddit and Amazon Mechanical Turk. Christians are sufficient for this study because we are specifically interested in understanding how aware self-identified Christians are of their Christian privilege. Given that the hypothesized Christian privilege scale contains an initial 29 items, a minimum of 300 high quality participants will be recruited for this study given the general guidelines to have a minimum of 10 responses per scale item.

**Procedure**

Upon signing up for the present study, participants will be asked to read a consent form and provide electronic consent before moving into the actual study materials. Participants will complete a series of demographic questions before completing the main instruments of this study (see Appendix A through F). These measures will consist of the proposed scale items as well as various measures that will be used to determine discriminate and convergent validity. Following completion of the various scale items, participants will be given a debriefing form. Lastly, participants will be asked to indicate whether or not they wish to receive research credit for participation in the study that they may use for course credit pending their individual instructor’s approval (i.e., SONA recruited participants) or entered into a drawing to win one of four $25.00 Amazon gift cards (i.e., social media recruited participants).

**Measures**

**Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS).** The CoBRAS is a 20-item scale that looks to measure the “cognitive dimension of color-blind racial attitudes” (Neville et al., 2000, p. 61). This scale consists of three factors: Racial Privilege, Institutional Discrimination, and Blatant Racial Issues (Neville, et al, 2000). The Racial Privilege factor consists of 7 items and assesses “blindness of the existence of White privilege (e.g., ‘White people in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin’).” (Neville, et al, 2000, p. 63). The Racial Privilege factor has a Cronbach’s alpha of α = .83. The Institutional Discrimination factor consists of 7 items and assesses “awareness of the implications of institutional forms of racial discrimination and exclusion (e.g., ‘Social policies, such as affirmative action, discriminate unfairly against white people’).” (Neville, et al, 2000, p. 63). The Institutional Discrimination factor has a Cronbach’s alpha of α = .81. The last factor, Blatant Racial Issues, consists of 6 items and assesses “unawareness to general, pervasive racial discrimination (e.g., ‘Social problems in the U.S. are rare, isolated situations’).” (Neville, et al, 2000, p. 63). The Blatant Racial Issues factor has a Cronbach’s alpha of α = .76.

Individual items within each factor are rated on a 6-point Likert scale with higher scores indicating higher levels of awareness of racial privilege, institutional discrimination and blatant racial issues. The scale can be assessed either by looking at individual subscales or through a total score composite. The overall scale has been found to have a relatively high internal consistency (α = .91). For a complete list of questions please refer to Appendix A and for a more in-depth analysis of the CoBRAs scale, see Neville, et al. (2000).

**Social Dominance Orientation (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth & Malle, 1994).** The Social Dominance Orientation scale is a 14-item scale that assesses “the extent to which one desires that one's in-group dominate and be superior to outgroups.” (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth & Malle, 1994, p. 742). Initial work on the scale conceptualized the scale to include one singular factor measuring the extent people felt that “some people are inherently superior or inferior to others and [their] approval of unequal group relationships” (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth & Malle, 1994, p. 745). However, other scholars, based on their own factor analysis, have suggested that the SDO scale actually consists of two factors looking at “support for group-based dominance” and “opposition to equality” (Jost & Thompson, 2000, p. 217). Examples of individual items include: “Some groups of people are simply not the equals of others” and “If people were treated more equally, we would have fewer problems in this country” (p. 760).

Individual items are rated on a 7-point Likert scale with higher scores indicating more positive feelings towards each item and lower scores indicating more negative feelings towards each item. The overall scale has been found to have an adequate internal consistency score (α = .83; Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth & Malle, 1994). Test-retest reliability has also been shown to be high (*r* = .81, *p* < .01; Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth & Malle, 1994). For a full list of items please refer to Appendix B and for a more in-depth analysis of the Social Dominance Orientation scale, please refer to Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth and Malle (1994) as well as Jost and Thompson (2000).

**Religious Fundamentalism Scale (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992)**.The Religious Fundamentalism scale is a 12-item scale that looks to measure:

the belief that there is one set of religious teachings that clearly contains the fundamental, basic, intrinsic, essential, inerrant truth about humanity and deity; that this essential truth is fundamentally opposed by forces of evil which must be vigorously fought; that this truth must be followed today according to the fundamental, unchangeable practices of the past; and that those who believe and follow these fundamental teachings have a special relationship with the deity. (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992, p. 118)

The scale consists of one singular factor measuring the extent people either agreed or disagree with various statements related to the above conceptualization of religious fundamentalism (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 2004). Examples of individual items include: “God has given humanity a complete, unfailing guide to happiness and salvation, which must be totally followed.” and “When you get right down to it, there are basically only two kinds of people in the world: the Righteous, who will be rewarded by God; and the rest, who will not.” (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, p. 52).

Individual items are rated on a 9-point Likert scale with higher scores indicating higher and levels of agreement with each individual item and lower scores indicating higher levels of disagreement with each individual item. The overall scale has been found to have a high degree of internal consistency α = .91 (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 2004). For a full list of items please refer to Appendix C and for a more in-depth analysis of the Religious Fundamentalism scale, please refer to Altemeyer and Hunsberger (2004).

**Global Just World Belief (Lipkus, 1991).** The Global Just World Belief scale is a 7 item scale that looks to measure “the general belief that people get what they deserve and deserve what they get.” (Lipkus, 1991, p. 1172). The scale consists of one singular factor that looks to measure the extent to which people either agree or disagree with statements related to the conceptualization of a just world. Examples of individual items include: “I feel that people get what they are entitled to have.” and “I basically feel that the world is a fair place.” (p. 1173).

Individual items are rated on a 6-point Likert scale with higher scores indicating higher levels of agreement with each individual item and lower scores indicating higher levels of disagreement with each individual item. The internal reliability of the items has been shown to be adequate (α = .827; Lipkus, 1991). For a full list of items please refer to Appendix D and for a more in-depth analysis of the Global Just World Belief scale, please refer to Lipkus (1991).

**Sanctification of Social Justice Scale (Todd et al. 2014).** The Sanctification of Social Justice Scale is a 5-item scale that looks to “assesses how strongly individuals connect working for social justice to an expression of God’s will and what it means to be Christian.” (Todd et al., 2014, p. 253). The scale consists of one singular factor that looks to measure the extent to which people agree or disagree with statements related to the conceptualization of the scale. Examples of individual items include: “My Christian beliefs encourage me to work for social justice.” and “God wants Christians to work for social justice.” (p. 249). Individual items are rated on a 6-point Likert scale with higher scores indicating higher levels of agreement with each individual item and lower scores indicating higher levels of disagreement with each individual item. Exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis by Todd et al. (2014) were α = .79 and α = .82 respectively. For a full list of items please refer to Appendix E for a more in-depth analysis of the Sanctification of Social Justice scale, please refer to Todd et al (2014).

**Privilege and Oppression Inventory (Hayes, 2007).** The Privilege and Oppression Inventory is a 39-item scale that looks to measure “counselors’ awareness of privilege and oppression along dimensions of race, sexual orientation, religion, and gender” (Hays, et al., 2007, p. 66). The scale consists of four factors that measure the extent of an individual’s awareness of Christian privilege, White privilege, Heterosexual privilege, and sexism awareness. Examples of individual items include: “Christian holidays are given more prominence in society than non-Christian holidays.”, “Being White and having advantage go hand in hand”, “Many gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals fear for their safety”, and “I am aware that men typically make more money than women do.” (Hays, et. al., 2007, p. 72-74). Individual items are rated on a 6-point Likert scale with higher scores indicating higher levels of agreement with each individual item and lower scores indicating higher levels of disagreement with each individual item. Confirmatory factor analysis by Hays, et al. (2007) suggested an overall scale Cronbach’s alpha of α = .95. The individual subscale Cronbach alpha’s for White privilege awareness, Christian privilege awareness, Heterosexism privilege awareness and sexism awareness were α = .92, α = .86, α = .81, and α = .79 respectively. For a full list of items please refer to Appendix F for a more in-depth analysis of the Privilege and Oppression Inventory, please refer to Hays, et al. (2007).

**Proposed Scale (Christian Privilege Awareness Scale).** The Christian Privilege Awareness scale is a 29-item scale measuring an individual’s awareness of Christian privilege. Questions were based on or adapted from conceptually similar scale items contained in the WPAS (Pinterits, et al., 2009), CoBRAS (Neville, et al., 2000) and the work of Schlosser (2003). 15 of the items are forward scored and 14 items reverse scored. The scale is scored on a 11-point Likert scale, based on the recommendation of Wu and Leung (2017), from 0 (*very strongly disagree*)to 10 (*very strongly agree*) with higher scores indicating greater Christian privilege awareness and lower scores indicating lower Christian privilege awareness. For a full list of scale items, please refer to Appendix G.

**Results**

**Participants**

Participants (*N* = 389) were recruited from SONA (*n* = 10), Facebook (*n* = 59), Twitter (*n* = 1), and Reddit (*n* = 319), and consisted of Christian participants between the ages of 18 and 77 (*M* = 26.16, *SD* = 8.6). All participants were adults and from the United States. Of those 389 participants, 248 identified as male, 122 identified as female, 4 identified as trans-males, 2 identified as trans-females, 6 identified as non-binary/trans/queer, 3 indicated they preferred to not answer, 3 selected Other, and 1 participant did not respond to the question. The religious ideology of the sample consisted of Evangelical Christians (*n* = 71), Protestant Christians (*n* = 166), Catholics (*n* = 62), and "Other" Christians (*n* = 90). The educational attainment of the sample consisted of participants who did not complete high school (*n* =6), completed high school (n = 43), had some college (*n* = 106), or attained one of the following degrees: associate’s (*n* = 29), bachelors’ (*n* = 133), master's (*n* = 49), doctoral (*n* = 9), or either a J.D. or M.D (*n* = 14). The racial makeup of the sample consisted of White individuals (*n* = 287), Blacks/African American individuals (*n* = 14), Hispanics/Latino individuals (*n* = 28), Other individuals (*n* = 17), and many who were of various multi-racial identities (*n* = 43).

**Exploratory Factor Analysis Assumptions**

The bivariate correlation, homogeneity, multicollinearity, adequate sample size, and normality assumptions were analyzed. The bivariate correlation, homogeneity (Bartlett test *p* < .001), sample size (KMO = .94), and multicollinearity assumptions were met. However, the normality assumption was violated as evidenced by the Shapiro Wilk test, *p* < .001 meaning that individual items, within the proposed scale, were not normally distributed. However, low skew (-.42) and kurtosis (-.22) values suggest this is not a concern.

**Initial Item Omission Process**

Per the suggestions of Fields, Mills and Field (2012), the correlation matrix of the original proposed 28 item Christian Privilege Awareness Scale was analyzed to look for individual items with multiple correlations either above *r* = .80 or below *r* = .30. Given these criteria, one item (i.e., “Religious minorities are treated better than Christians in the United States?”) was removed due to several item correlations above *r* = .80. An additional three items (i.e., “I can reasonably expect my Christian beliefs to be respected by the people around me”, “I can easily find Christian music on a local radio station”, “A declaration of my Christian faith does not come with personal consequences”) were removed due to being correlated less than *r* = .30 with at least half of the total items. This brought the proposed scale down to 24 total items.

**Factor Solution**

A factor analysis was performed on the shortened (now only 24-items) preliminary Christian privilege awareness scale. A parallel analysis suggested a four-factor solution, solutions of three, four and five factors were analyzed with both orthogonal and oblique rotations to assess potential factor loading error and subsequent fit. Additional preliminary analyses indicated that two items consistently cross loaded in both the orthogonal and oblique rotations. These items were removed, and the analysis was re-calculated.

A second parallel analysis suggested a four-factor solution for the 22 remaining items. Thus, solutions of three, four and five factors were analyzed with both orthogonal and oblique rotations. The results of these analyses suggested that a three-factor oblique solution was the best solution due to the relative variance explained in addition to the lack of cross loadings. However, the third factor contained only one item. At the suggestion of Costello et al (2005), this free-standing item was removed leaving a potential two factor solution. A final parallel analysis suggested a three-factor solution for the remaining 21 items, so solutions of two, three and four factors were analyzed with both orthogonal and oblique rotations. After taking into account variance explained (40%) and cross loadings (zero), a two-factor oblique solution was selected as being the best solution for the reduced 21 item scale.

The first factor appears to get at the theme of ***Christian exceptionalism*** related to Christian privilege with items such as the following:

1. “If someone’s Christian values dictate that they not hire a gay/lesbian person for a job, then that choice should be respected by the rest of society.”
2. “Religious minorities do not have the same benefits as Christians.”
3. “It is acceptable to only have Christian faith symbols on government property (i.e. courthouses).”

The second factor appears to get at the theme of an awareness of ***freedom from discrimination***, related to Christian privilege with items such as the following:

1. “I do not have to worry about losing relationships because of my Christian faith”
2. “I do not have to worry about losing my job because of my Christian faith”.
3. “It is easy to find places of worship to practice my Christian faith.”

**Reliability**

The 21-item overall scale Christian Privilege Awareness Scale showed a high internal consistency (α = .91; CI: .90-.92) with the 16-item ***Christian exceptionalism*** and 5-item ***freedom from discrimination*** subscales having high (α = .92; CI: .90-.93) and acceptable (α = .74; CI: .69-.78) internal consistencies, respectively.

**Validity**

To assess the concurrent validity of the Christian Privilege Awareness Scale, the total score of this measure (as well as its individual subscales) was correlated with the following scales: Privilege and Oppression Inventory Christian Privilege subscale (Hays, 2007) , Privilege and Oppression Inventory White Privilege subscale (Hays, 2007), Social Dominance Orientation (Pratto et al., 1994), Color Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (Neville et al., 2000), Religious Fundamentalism Scale (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992), Global Just World Beliefs Scale (Lipkus, 1991), and the Sanctification for Social Justice Scale (Todd, et al., 2014). For correlations, see Table 2.

Given the Christian Privilege Awareness Scale’s positive correlations with the Privilege and Oppression Inventory White Privilege subscale (*r* = .78) and CoBRAS scale (*r* = .81), as well as the proposed scale’s negative correlations with the Social Dominance Orientation (*r* = -.70), Religious Fundamentalism scale (*r* = -.62), and Global Just World Belief scale (*r* = -.43). These correlations suggest that individuals who score highly on the proposed scale (i.e., more Christian privilege awareness), also show higher level of White privilege awareness (i.e., Privilege and Oppression Inventory White Privilege subscale), a relative lack of colorblind attitudes (i.e., CoBRAS), a relative lack of belief in the idea of natural social hierarchies (i.e., Social Dominance Orientation), low religious fundamentalism (i.e., Religious Fundamentalism Scale), and a lack of belief that the world is a just place (i.e., Global Just World Belief). The initial scale appears to have appropriate degree of concurrent validity. Additionally, the proposed scale’s positive correlations with the Privilege and Oppression Inventory Christian Privilege subscale (*r* = .84) and the Sanctification for Social Justice scale (*r* = .59) suggests that the initial scale also shows an appropriate degree of convergent validity.

**Discussion**

While there are many scales that look at a variety of privilege related constructs (e.g., racism, sexism, and White privilege), there is still much to be understood broadly speaking about how these various constructs influence and shape human thoughts, attitudes and behaviors. This is not only particularly true within the realm of Christian privilege but also an imperative gap to fill. Christianity within the United States is pervasive in its influence. Christianity influences public policy regarding women’s reproductive rights (i.e., abortion rights) and LGBTQA+ rights (i.e., marriage equality and anti-discrimination laws). It has found its way into schools in the form of teaching creationism or intelligent design in science classrooms. Christianity has even been used to justify the accessibility of medication (i.e., birth control) and medical care. In light of this religious influence, it is important to explicitly be able to understand the values and attitudes that result in these societal outcomes. Two explicit elements of that understanding include understanding not only those attitudes and beliefs but also the awareness of the influence that Christianity has in the United States.

The initial results of this study suggest the existence of two subscales which both show preliminary evidence of measuring two facets of the construct of Christian privilege among Christians. While both subscales are positively correlated with each other and, broadly speaking, appear to assess the construct of Christian privilege awareness, these constructs are distinct enough to warrant separate descriptions.

**Christian Exceptionalism Subscale**

The first factor consists of 16-items and appears to measure a construct we have labeled Christian exceptionalism. It taps themes associated with the idea that Christians enjoy implicit and explicit advantages in society (e.g., “Christian doctors should not lose their jobs due to an unwillingness to provide services that violate their religious beliefs” and “It is acceptable to only have Christian faith symbols on government property [e.g., courthouses]”). Because the nature of a privilege is predicated upon the denial of the same to others, it is not surprising that the current analyses revealed that items whose face validity appears to tap themes that highlight the advantages that come with being Christian tended to group together.

**Freedom From Discrimination Subscale**

The second factor included 5-items that appear to measure a theme related to the idea that one of the privileges that comes with being a Christian in the US is that one is generally *free from experiencing discrimination* as a function of endorsing this faith. Constituent items in this scale included statements that explicitly expressed this sentiment (e.g., “I do not have to worry about losing relationships because of my Christian faith” and “I do not have to worry about losing my job because of my Christian faith”).

**Convergent Validity**

With respect to convergent validity, the Christian Exceptionalism subscale was shown to be positively associated with previous attempts at measuring Christian privilege (i.e., the Christian Privilege subscale of the Privilege and Oppression Inventory). This suggests that the proposed scale does appear to be measuring a similar construct to the one proposed by Hayes et al. (2007).

The Freedom from Discrimination subscale scale was also shown to be positively associated with the Privilege and Oppression Inventory’s Christian Privilege subscale. This suggests that the subscale does appear to be measuring a similar construct to the one proposed by Hayes et al. (2007) despite the additional items having been added.

**Concurrent Validity**

The proposed Christian Exceptionalism and Freedom from Discrimination subscales both demonstrate concurrent validity with the White privilege measure (i.e., the Privilege and Oppression Inventory’s White Privilege Awareness subscale), and negative correlations with color-blind racial attitudes (i.e., Color Blind Racial Attitudes Scale), social dominance orientation, and religious fundamentalism. Conceptually, the strong positive relationship between the proposed scale and measures of White privilege also makes sense. While it is true that Christian and White privilege are distinct (and separate) manifestations of privilege broadly speaking, it is also reasonable to suggest that they share overlapping mechanistic underpinnings (i.e., societal and legal support). As such, we might speculate that those who are able to see certain manifestations of privilege (e.g., White privilege) should also be able to recognize newer forms of privilege such as Christian privilege. To illustrate this point, research suggests those who are aware of White privilege are also more likely to be aware of other forms of privilege – e.g., heterosexual privilege (Case & Stewart, 2010; Hayes, 2007). A corollary of this finding would be that those who are aware of privilege are also more able to perceive subtle and gross forms of discrimination compared to those who do not see privilege, while those lower in privilege awareness may be less likely to perceive various forms of discrimination.

Further, conceptually, the moderate to strong negative relationships between the two subscales (i.e., Christian exceptionalism and freedom from discrimination) and measures of color-blind racial attitudes, social dominance orientation, and religious fundamentalism. With regards to the relationship between the subscales and color-blind racial attitudes, research on various forms of privilege have suggested that higher levels of color-blind racial attitudes correlate to lower levels of privilege awareness across multiple domains (i.e., white privilege, class privilege, Christian privilege, heterosexual privilege, and male privilege; Garrett-Walker et al., 2018). Additionally, the relationship between the two Christian privilege subscales and social dominance orientation research has suggested a general negative relationship between social dominance orientation and measures of privilege awareness (Lantz et al., 2018). With regards to the relationship between the subscale and religious fundamentalism, research has suggested that religious fundamentalism has a generally negative relationship with other forms of privilege awareness (e.g., White privilege; Todd et al., 2015).

Lastly, the Christian exceptionalism (but not the Freedom from Discrimination) subscale is negatively correlated with the global just world beliefs scale. The Freedom from Discrimination subscale shows no correlation with global just world beliefs. The relationship between the Christian exceptionalism subscale and the global just world beliefs scale conceptually makes sense. It could be argued that the idea of seeing a group as being exceptional (i.e., more privileged) could also overlap with ideas around people (and by extension groups) getting what they deserve.

**Interpretations**

However, this high degree of correlation between both the Christian Exceptionalism and the Freedom from Discrimination subscales with the White Privilege Awareness subscale of the Privilege and Oppression Inventory suggests at least the possibility that Christian privilege and White privilege are so interconnected that they are, in a sense, the same construct. This would be consistent with the hypothesizing of Faber (2012) who posits that Christian and White privilege are connected. This high intercorrelation is present despite the fact that neither the White privilege nor Christian privilege mention religion or race, respectively. From a content perspective, they have a differing face and content validity. As such, this suggests that more work is necessary to fully differentiate measures of White privilege awareness from those of Christian privilege awareness. One potential way of doing this could be to look at how Black and White Christians answer measures of Christian and White privilege. One would expect that if Christian privilege and White privilege are the same construct, there should be no difference between how Black and White Christians answer measures looking at both White and Christian privilege. However, even if White and Christian privilege ARE the same construct, this in itself would be interesting with the potential to open up entirely new lines of research moving the posited interconnectedness of White Supremacy and Christianity from a historical perspective to a more empirical endeavor. One such empirical question might be to see why White and Black participants answer similarly on both White and Christian privilege (if they are in fact the same construct) when it would be expected that Black participants answer differently from White participants on White privilege measures would be one such research question. Further this could suggest, albeit controversially, that Christianity within the United States is an inherently racist from a systematic perspective. Societally, this would suggest that so long as the United States grants privilege to the Christian faith, they must also simultaneously uphold principles of White supremacy. This has far reaching implications beyond the scope and intention of this paper.

The apparent shared relationship between both subscales for all of the other scales suggests that the two subscales are measuring a similar construct. However, the fact that global just world beliefs is negatively correlated with the Christian exceptionalism subscale, but not correlated with the freedom from discrimination subscale suggests that the Freedom from Discrimination subscale is tapping an additional construct with respect Christian privilege awareness that is not being tapped by Christian exceptionalism. While this finding deserves further study, one could argue the non-existence relationship between the freedom from discrimination subscale and global just world beliefs suggests that being able to see yourself as a potential target of discriminatory behavior, compared to not being able to see yourself as a target of discriminatory behavior, is independent of privilege awareness. It could be the case for example that someone can understand that they are not discriminated against while also not realizing that they may not deserve what they have in all instances (both positive and negative instances). To this end, future iterations of this scale could add items such as “It should be okay for a Christian organization to deny employment to someone because they aren’t Christian” or “It should not be legal in this country for Muslims to choose **not** to hire someone just because they are Christian” to attempt to flesh out the distinction between understanding that one is discriminated against and understanding that while one may not be discriminated against personally, this does not mean others are not.

**Practical Uses**

Research has shown privilege awareness is not only meaningful in contexts such as counseling, but also that education geared toward this aim works and various disciplines have sought to provide and encourage such education. Research into psychology diversity courses show that courses geared toward helping others to better understand the differential treatment groups receive as a function of race help students to better become aware of their own privileged status while also reducing prejudice (Case, 2007). One prominent approach to understanding differential treatment across disciplines (e.g., counseling and medicine) is the idea of intersectionality (Chan, et al., 2018; Wilson, 2019).

1. **Define intersectionality and explain the theory**
2. **Give examples (i.e., counseling and medicine; below)**

Some fields, such as counseling psychology (Chan, et al., 2018) and medicine (Wilson, 2019), have moved to taking an intersectional approach to better understand the complex nature of oppression and discrimination across various social contexts. This means assessing how holding different identities can have varying outcomes because of the intersectionality of holding multiple identities (Chan et al., 2018). For example, the experiences of a Black atheist man may be different than those of a Black Christian man. While both hold marginalized racial identities, the Christian Black man holds a privileged religious identity that his atheist counterpart lacks. An intersectional approach allows for people to hold both privileged and oppressed identities simultaneously. The competing clash of privileged and marginalized identities functions to produce differing outcomes on a daily basis for each individual as a result of holding both privileged and marginalized identities.

As such, to fully understand clients in medical and mental health contexts, it becomes necessary for medical and mental health practitioners to be educated in the experiences of people who hold a range of both privileged and oppressed identities. However, the benefits to understanding privilege go beyond just medical and mental health contexts.

Research has suggested that not only is awareness of White privilege among Christians positively correlated with a willingness to partake in social justice (Todd, et al., 2015), it is also in White individual’s best interests to eliminate racial privilege as those most aware of racial privilege are more likely to have poorer mental health (Fujishiro, 2009). This suggests that even systems of oppression that benefit one race over the other, can have negative health outcomes for those for whom the system is designed to benefit. One could reasonably extend such logic to Christian privilege as well. However, by adding an awareness of Christian privilege to the societal consciousness, it is possible for people at the individual and systematic levels to recognize actions and policies that discriminate against those who are not in the majority.

While tools exist to help aid medical doctors and mental health professionals to understand privilege and oppression with respect to identities involving race and gender, relatively few tools exist to aid these professionals in understanding the privilege and oppression that can result from holding Christian and non-Christian identities. The two subscales identified within this Christian privilege awareness scale adds tools that will allow educators to foster such an awareness of this religious identity dimension by providing yet another lens of analysis for future therapists and doctors to examine the world around not only them, but also the world of their clients as well.

In fields such as counseling and medical practice, this overarching awareness is an aspect of what is known as multicultural competence (citation). Research in counseling for example suggests there is a positive relationship between a client’s perceptions of the multicultural competence of their counselor, and the client’s satisfaction and general views of said counselor (Tao et al., 2015). These findings suggest that not only is privilege awareness important from a therapeutic competency perspective, it is also impactful on client outcomes.

Taken together, this research is preliminary in nature. However, this research does provide an initial promising start to instrument development to assess Christian privilege awareness within a Christian population. This work builds on the work of Schlosser (2003) and Hayes, et al. (2007) by providing a second instrument to evaluate the awareness of Christian privilege generally, while also focusing such assessment upon Christian participants more specifically. Additionally, this work serves to further research into Christian privilege by providing another instrument, outside of the Privilege and Oppression Inventory (Hayes, et al., 2007), to assess the construct much in the same way that White privilege awareness and attitudes are measured by various instruments (e.g., Color-Blind Racial Attitudes Scale, White Privilege Attitudes Scale, etc.).

To this end, these subscales could eventually be used in various contexts (i.e., counseling and medical classrooms, hospitals, mental health clinics, etc.) to assess how aware of their own privilege Christian counseling and medical students are. This in turn could allow professionals to become more multiculturally competent. It is the author’s hope that these subscales will be used in the above ways for the purposes of furthering the educational training of medical and counseling students (among others) toward the promotion of multicultural competence.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

**Limitations**

While this research provides initial promising results for measuring Christian privilege awareness, it is not without its limitations. For instance, the sample used for this study was obtained using a combination of SONA, Reddit, and Facebook with an incentive to win one of four $25 Amazon gift cards in a raffle. As such, the sample is largely a convenience sample. Also, this scale looks to assess Christian privilege awareness within *Christian* populations. Because this scale was developed to be used with only Christian respondents, more research will need to be conducted to explore whether or not some modification of this measure might also be valid for other religious groups.

**Future Directions and Conclusion**

Given the preliminary nature of the study, future research should include additional confirmatory studies to further support the identified factor structure of this nascent measure, as well as exploring how more well-established theories of Christian identification (Quest; Batson & Schoenrade, 1991) may be associated with these attitudes. For example, future research may wish to investigate the degree to which high quest oriented Christian individuals recognize their Christian privileges compared to Christians with lower quest orientations. Further, investigating relationships between intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity as they relate to scores on the Christian privilege awareness scale may also be useful.

Additionally, further research will need to examine the discriminate validity of the proposed measure given the initially high correlations between it and the White privilege scales included in this study.

Researchers would be wise to see to what extent, if any, Black and White Christians respond differentially to measures of White and Christian privilege. Studies should look to see whether Christian privilege awareness can be manipulated and appropriately detected by the proposed measure. Such studies are necessary to explore deeper questions such as whether or not being aware that one has Christian privilege is associated with levels of empathy, as was found in a study by Kraus, Cote, and Kelter, 2010) when they examined the effects of economic privilege (or the lack thereof) and its influence on respondents’ empathy. Essentially, these researchers found that people with more financial privilege tended to evince less empathy compared to those with less privilege. This finding offers one potential explanation for why some Christians seem to support legislation that would make it legal to deny certain groups in society the same privileges (e.g., freedom from discrimination due to their Christian identities) that they themselves enjoy.

It is also important to ensure that the measure is appropriate and sensitive enough to detect changes in an individual’s awareness of their own Christian privilege as well as to test the degree to which White vs. Christian privilege can be distinguished. This research is necessary before this scale should be used an applied setting (e.g., medical, legal, law enforcement, etc.).

1. **Promise of the scale**
2. **What does it show?**
3. **What should future research do?**
4. **Lasting impression sentence (i.e.,** However, this first attempt does provide an encouraging first step into the development of a broader in scope scale to assess Christian privilege awareness amongst Christians)
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|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 1. | | | | |
| *Factor Loadings of the Christian Privilege Awareness Scale with M and SD for Individual Item*s | | | | |
|  | Factors | |  |  |
| Items | Exceptionalism  (α = .91) | Freedom from Discrimination  (α = .73) | M | SD |
| 1. If someone’s Christian values dictate that they not hire a gay/lesbian person for a job, then that choice should be respected by the rest of society. | .79 | -.07 | 7.42 | 3.53 |
| 2. Religious minorities do not have the same benefits as Christians? | .76 | .01 | 6.95 | 3.01 |
| 3. Christian doctors should not lose their jobs due to an unwillingness to provide services that violate their religious beliefs. | .73 | -.07 | 5.11 | 3.60 |
| 4. It is acceptable to only have Christian faith symbols on government property (i.e. courthouses). | .73 | -.01 | 7.73 | 3.01 |
| 5. Discrimination towards religious minorities does not happen frequently? | .72 | -.09 | 8.19 | 2.59 |
| 6. Christians have certain advantages in the US due to their religious affiliation? | .69 | .13 | 6.69 | 2.84 |
| 7. Religious minorities should adapt to the Christian culture of the United States? | .67 | .03 | 8.21 | 2.79 |
| 8. It is important for political leaders to be inclusive towards minority faiths? | .66 | .06 | 8.66 | 2.51 |
| 9. The separation of religion from politics unfairly discriminates against Christians? | .65 | .06 | 8.72 | 2.59 |
| 10. Discrimination towards Christians happens frequently in the United States? | .62 | .13 | 6.82 | 2.86 |
| 11. It is easier to be a Christian in the United States compared to a member of other faiths? | .61 | .24 | 8.34 | 2.52 |
| 12. Doctors should be able to refuse service to patients if the doctor’s Christian values conflict with a patient’s lifestyle. | .60 | -.01 | 8.18 | 3.41 |
| 13. Everyone who works hard, regardless of religious affiliation can obtain wealth? | .57 | -.23 | 4.87 | 3.59 |
| 14. Freedom of religion does not mean freedom from religion. | .50 | -.08 | 5.85 | 3.19 |
| 15. Our society promotes a Christian culture? | .46 | .19 | 5.79 | 3.10 |
| 16. Only Christian teachers should be allowed to share their Christian values with their students. | .41 | -.04 | 8.72 | 2.45 |
| 17. I do not have to worry about losing relationships because of my Christian faith. | -.05 | .70 | 6.94 | 2.99 |
| 18. I do not have to worry about losing my job because of my Christian faith. | .12 | .67 | 9.14 | 2.50 |
| 19. I do not have to worry about being denied services because of my Christian faith. | .17 | .61 | 9.05 | 2.25 |
| 20. I can be certain that my Christian views will be accepted by in-laws? | -.08 | .55 | 7.98 | 2.83 |
| 21. It is easy to find places of worship to practice my Christian faith. | -.04 | .44 | 9.50 | 2.19 |
| Percent of Variance Explained | .32 | .10 | α = .91 | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 2. Discriminate Validity  *Means, standard deviations, and correlations between key variables.*   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Variable | *M* | *SD* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | 1. Christian Privilege Awareness Scale | 7.58 | 1.73 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | 2. CPAS: Christian Exceptionalism | 7.29 | 1.99 | .97\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  | [.97, .98] |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | 3. CPAS: Freedom From Discrimination | 8.52 | 1.80 | .60\*\* | .40\*\* |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  | [.53, .66] | [.32, .48] |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | 4. POI: White | 4.01 | 1.39 | .78\*\* | .79\*\* | .35\*\* |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  | [.74, .82] | [.75, .83] | [.26, .44] |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | 5. COBRAS | 4.20 | 1.17 | .81\*\* | .83\*\* | .35\*\* | .91\*\* |  |  |  | |  |  |  | [.77, .84] | [.79, .86] | [.26, .43] | [.89, .93] |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | 6. SDO | 2.34 | 1.11 | -.70\*\* | -.71\*\* | -.30\*\* | -.69\*\* | -.77\*\* |  |  | |  |  |  | [-.74, -.64] | [-.76, -.66] | [-.39, -.21] | [-.74, -.63] | [-.81, -.73] |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | 7. RF | 5.51 | 1.99 | -.62\*\* | -.65\*\* | -.23\*\* | -.44\*\* | -.44\*\* | .30\*\* |  | |  |  |  | [-.68, -.56] | [-.70, -.58] | [-.32, -.13] | [-.51, -.35] | [-.52, -.36] | [.20, .39] |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | 8. GJWB | 2.82 | 0.94 | -.43\*\* | -.48\*\* | -.06 | -.44\*\* | -.53\*\* | .51\*\* | .23\*\* | |  |  |  | [-.51, -.35] | [-.55, -.39] | [-.16, .04] | [-.52, -.36] | [-.60, -.45] | [.43, .58] | [.14, .32] | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |   *Note.* *M* and *SD* are used to represent mean and standard deviation, respectively. Insert abbreviations here. Values in square brackets indicate the 95% confidence interval for each correlation.  \* *p* < .05. \*\* *p* < .01. |  |  |  |

Table 3. Convergent Validity

*Means, standard deviations, and correlations with confidence intervals*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | *M* | *SD* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Christian Privilege Awareness Scale (CPAS) | 7.58 | 1.73 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. CPAS: Christian Exceptionalism | 7.29 | 1.99 | .97\*\* |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | [.97, .98] |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. CPAS: Freedom From Discrimination | 8.52 | 1.80 | .60\*\* | .40\*\* |  |  |
|  |  |  | [.53, .66] | [.32, .48] |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. POI: Christian | 4.18 | 1.09 | .84\*\* | .81\*\* | .52\*\* |  |
|  |  |  | [.81, .87] | [.78, .85] | [.44, .59] |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Sanctification of Social Justice Scale (SSJS) | 5.05 | 1.62 | .59\*\* | .61\*\* | .26\*\* | .57\*\* |
|  |  |  | [.53, .66] | [.54, .67] | [.17, .35] | [.50, .63] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix A. Color Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS) Items |
| 1. Everyone who works hard, no matter what race they are, has an equal chance to become rich. |
| 2. Race plays a major role in the type of social services (such as type of health care or day care) that people receive in the U.S. (R) |
| 3. It is important that people begin to think of themselves as American and not African American, Mexican American or Italian American. |
| 4. Due to racial discrimination, programs such as affirmative action are necessary to  help create equality. (R) |
| 5. Racism is a major problem in the U.S. (R) |
| 6. Race is very important in determining who is successful and who is not. (R) |
| 7. Racism may have been a problem in the past, it is not an important problem today. |
| 8. Racial and ethnic minorities do not have the same opportunities as white people in the U.S.(R) |
| 9. White people in the U.S. are discriminated against because of the color of their skin. |
| 10. Talking about racial issues causes unnecessary tension. |
| 11. It is important for political leaders to talk about racism to help work through or solve society's problems. (R) |
| 12. White people in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin. (R) |
| 13. Immigrants should try to fit into the culture and values of the U.S. |
| 14. English should be the only official language in the U.S. |
| 15. White people are more to blame for racial discrimination than racial and ethnic minorities.(R) |
| Appendix A. Color Blind Racial Attitudes Scale (CoBRAS) Items (continued)  16. Social policies, such as affirmative action, discriminate unfairly against white people. |
| 17. It is important for public schools to teach about the history and contributions of  racial and ethnic minorities. (R) |
| 18. Racial and ethnic minorities in the U.S. have certain advantages because of the color of their skin. |
| 19. Racial problems in the U.S. are rare, isolated situations.  20. Race plays an important role in who gets sent to prison. (R) |

Appendix B. Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) Items

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| 1. Some groups of people are simply not the equals of others. |
| 2. Some people are just more worthy than others. |
| 3. This country would be better off if we cared less about how equal all people were. |
| 4. Some people are just more deserving than others. |
| 5. It is not a problem if some people have more of a chance in life than others |
| 6. Some people are just inferior to others. |
| 7. To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on others. |
| 8. Increased economic equality. (R) |
| 9. Increased social equality. (R) |
| 10. Equality. (R) |
| 11. If people were treated more equally, we would have fewer problems in this country. (R) |
| 12. In an ideal world, all nations would be equal. (R) |
| 13. We should try to treat one another as equals as much as possible. All humans should be treated equally. (R) |
| 14. It is important that we treat other countries as equals. (R) |

Appendix C. Religious Fundamentalism Scale Items

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| 1. God has given humanity a complete, unfailing guide to happiness and salvation, which must be totally followed. |
| 2. No single book of religious teachings contains all the intrinsic, fundamental truths about life. |
| 3. The basic cause of evil in this world is Satan, who is still constantly and ferociously fighting against God. |
| 4. It is more important to be a good person than to believe in God and the right religion. |
| 5. There is a particular set of religious teachings in this world that are so true, you can’t go any “deeper” because they are the basic, bedrock message that God has given humanity. |
| 6. When you get right down to it, there are basically only two kinds of people in the world: the Righteous, who will be rewarded by God; and the rest, who will not. |
| 7. Scriptures may contain general truths, but they should NOT be considered completely, literally true from beginning to end. |
| 8. To lead the best, most meaningful life, one must belong to the one, fundamentally true religion. |
| 9. “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. |
| 10. Whenever science and sacred scripture conflict, science is probably right. |
| 11. The fundamentals of God’s religion should never be tampered with or compromised with others’ beliefs. |
| 12. All of the religions in the world have flaws and wrong teachings. There is no perfectly true, right religion. |

Appendix D. Global Just World Beliefs (GJWB) Scale Items

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| l. I feel that people get what they are entitled to have. |
| 2. I feel that a person's efforts are noticed and rewarded. |
| 3. I feel that people earn the rewards and punishments they get. |
| 4. I feel that people who meet with misfortune have brought it on themselves. |
| 5. I feel that people get what they deserve. |
| 6. I feel that rewards and punishments are fairly given. |
| 7. I basically feel that the world is a fair place. |

Appendix E. Sanctification of Social Justice Scale Items

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| 1. Social justice is at the heart of the Christian Gospel. |
| 2. One is not truly Christian unless one works for social justice. |
| 3. My Christian beliefs encourage me to work for social justice. |
| 4. God wants Christians to work for social justice. |
| 5. God wants Christians to confront discrimination so that everyone can be successful. |

Appendix F. Privilege and Oppression Inventory Items

Appendix G. Religious Privilege and Advantage Awareness Scale (RPAAS) Items

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| 1. Christians have certain advantages in the US due to their religious affiliation? |
| 2. Religious minorities do not have the same benefits as Christians? |
| 3. Everyone who works hard, regardless of religious affiliation can obtain wealth? |
| 4. It is easier to be a Christian in the United States compared to a member of other faiths? \*\* |
| 5. I can be certain that my Christian views will be accepted by in-laws? |
| 6. Most Christians are generally seen as more trustworthy and honest than non-Christians. |
| 7. The separation of religion from politics unfairly discriminates against Christians? \* |
| 8. The separation of religion from politics in required to promote equality among differing faiths? \* |
| 9. Religious minorities are treated better than Christians in the United States? \* |
| 10. Religious minorities should adapt to the Christian culture of the United States? \* |
| 11. Freedom of religion does not mean freedom from religion. |
| 12. It is acceptable to only have Christian faith symbols on government property (i.e. courthouses) |
| 13. Christian doctors should not lose their jobs due to an unwillingness to provide services that violate their religious beliefs |
| 14. Only Christian teachers should be allowed to share their Christian values with their students |
| 15. Discrimination towards religious minorities does not happen frequently? \* |
| 16. Discrimination towards Christians happens frequently in the United States? \* |
| 17. It is important for political leaders to be inclusive towards minority faiths? \* |
| 18. Our society promotes a Christian culture? \*\* |

|  |
| --- |
| Appendix F. Religious Privilege and Advantage Awareness Scale (RPAAS) Items (continued) |
|  |
|  |
| 19. I do not have to worry about losing my job because of my Christian faith \*\*\* |
| 20. I do not have to worry about losing relationships because of my Christian faith \*\*\* |
| 21. I do not have to worry about being denied services because of my Christian faith \*\*\* |
| 22. If someone’s Christian values dictate that they not hire a gay/lesbian person for a job, then that choice should be respected by the rest of society. |
| 23. Doctors should be able to refuse service to patients if the doctor’s Christian values conflict with a patient’s lifestyle. |
| I24. Think that ministers who want to posthumously baptize Jewish victims of the Holocaust so that these victims can be allowed into Heaven should be allowed to do this. |
| 25. I can easily find Christian music on a local radio station \*\*\* |
| 26. I can expect to have major holidays of my Christian faith off from work \*\*\* |
| 27. A declaration of my Christian faith does not come with personal consequences \*\*\* |
| 28. It is easy to find places of worship to practice my Christian faith \*\*\* |
| 29. I can reasonably expect my Christian beliefs to be respected by the people around me \*\*\* |
| **Note**: Questions labeled with a \* were adapted from the CoBRAS scale (Neville, Lilly, Duran, Lee & Browne, 1999). Questions labeled with a \*\* were adapted from the WPAS (Pinterits, Poteat & Spanierman, 2009). Lastly, items with a \*\*\* were taken and or inspired by Schlosser (2003). |

Appendix G. DASS

|  |
| --- |
| 1. I found it hard to wind down. |
| 2. I was aware of dryness of my mouth. |
| 3. I couldn’t seem to experience any positive feeling at all. |
| 4. I experienced breathing difficulty (e.g. excessively rapid breathing, breathlessness in the absence of physical exertion). |
| 5. I found it difficult to work up the initiative to do things. |
| 6. I tended to over-react to situations. |
| 7. I experienced trembling (e.g. in the hands). |
| 8. I felt that I was using a lot of nervous energy. |
| 9.I was worried about situations in which I might panic and make a fool of myself. |
| 10. I felt that I had nothing to look forward to. |
| 11. I found myself getting agitated. |
| 12. I found it difficult to relax. |
| 13. I felt down hearted and blue. |
| 14. I was intolerant of anything that kept me from getting on with what I was doing. |
| 15. I felt I was close to panic. |
| 16. I was unable to become enthusiastic about anything. |
| 17. I felt I wasn’t worth much as a person. |
| 18. I felt that I was rather touchy. |
| 19. I was aware of the action of my heart in the absence of physical exertion (e.g. sense of heart rate increase, heart missing a beat). |
| 20. I felt scared without any good reason. |
| 21. I felt that life was meaningless. |

Appendix H. Privilege and Oppression Inventory

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Christians are represented positively in history books. |
| 2. Whites have the power to exclude other groups. |
| 3. Christians hold a lot of power because this country is based on their views. |
| 4. I think gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals exaggerate their hardships. |
| 5. Being White and having an advantage go hand in hand. |
| 6. Gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals experience discrimination. |
| 7. Heterosexuals have access to more resources than gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals. |
| 8. To be Christian is to have religious advantage in this country. |
| 9. The media negatively stereotypes gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals. |
| 10. Gay, lesbian and bisexual individuals do not have the same advantages as heterosexuals. |
| 11. Society is biased positively toward Christians. |
| 12. Christianity is the norm in this society. |
| 13. Government policies favor Whites. |
| 14. Most White high-level executives are promoted based on their race. |
| 15. Gay, lesbian and bisexual individuals lack power in the legal system. |
| 16. Individuals do not receive advantages just because they are White. |
| 17. Women experience discrimination. |
| 18. Women lack power in today’s society compared to men. |
| 19. There are different standards and expectations for men and women in this society. |
| 20. Christianity is valued more in this society than other religions. |
| 21. I am aware that men typically make more money than women do. |
| 22. Christian holidays are given more prominence in society than non-Christian holidays. |
| 23. Openly gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals lack power in today’s society |
| 24. The majority of positive role models in movie are White. |
| 25. Heterosexuals are treated better in society than those who are not heterosexual. |
| 26. White culture characteristics are more valued than those of people of color. |
| 27. The media (e.g., television, radio) favors Whites. |
| 28. Some individuals are devalued in society because of their sexual orientation. |
| 29. There are benefits to being White in this society. |
| 30. May gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals fear for their safety. |
| 31. Advertisers set standards for how women should appear. |
| 32. Whites generally have more resources and opportunities |
| 33. Many movies negatively stereotype people of color. |
| 34. Women are disadvantaged compared to men. |
| 35. Femininity is less valued in this society. |
| 36. Christians have the opportunity of being around other Christians most of the time. |
| 37. I am aware that women are not recognized in their careers as often as men. |
| 38. The lighter your skin color, the less prejudice and discrimination you experience. |
| 39. I believe that being white is an advantage in society. |
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Appendix J. SONA Informed Consent

Project Title: Racial and Religious Ideology: An Examination of Attitudes and Thoughts

Principal Investigator: Brier Gallihugh, B.A. Eastern Michigan University  
Faculty Advisor: Stephen Jefferson, Ph.D., Eastern Michigan University

Thank you for your interest in this study! Your participation is greatly appreciated. To participate you be able to read and respond to prompts fluently in English, be over the age of 18, personally self-identify as a Christian, and be from the United States. Participation in research is voluntary and you may pull out of this study at any time (**including after starting the study**). Please feel free to ask any questions you have about participation in this study.  
   
**Study Purpose**

The purpose of this study is to broadly examine your thoughts about a wide range of societal themes and ideas (i.e., racial, religious, etc.).

**Basic Study Procedure**  
   
You will be recruited to take place in this online study through the SONA program at Eastern Michigan University.  Upon reading this consent form, you will be redirected to the Qualtrics program which will contain the primary study materials and questionnaires. You will be asked to first complete a demographic survey that asks you to report aspects of your identity such as your gender, age, racial group, religious affiliation, etc. as well as your current mental anxiety and depression levels. You will also be asked a series of questions concerning your life situation in light of the COVID-19 (a.k.a., the coronavirus). After completion of the demographic survey, you will be asked to respond to a series of questions measuring your thoughts about various racial and religious themed topics. Lastly, the study will conclude with one final question regarding whether or not you wish to receive credit for your participation. The study will take approximately 25-30 minutes to complete.

**Type of Data Collected**  
   
You may be asked to provide data that you find to be sensitive. All data will be collected anonymously (i.e., we have no way of linking your actual responses with your name). You will be asked your opinion about a number of racial and religious themed questions. You will also be asked some common questions about your identity and current mental status (e.g., age, gender, race, anxiety and depression levels, etc.).

**Risk of Study Participation**  
   
There is no expected risk for participating in this study outside of what a student may face while taking a college examination or listening to a college lecture. However, you may at times potentially experience stress while reading or answering any of the study materials especially any related directly to you. As such, should you feel stress you cannot handle, you are free to withdraw from the study and are encouraged to do so immediately. Should you feel you need professional help, the following is the contact for the Eastern Michigan University Counseling and Psychological Service and if needed, national hotlines:

Eastern Michigan Counseling and Psychological Services

734.487.1118

counseling.services@emich.edu

**National Hotlines**

1) SAMHSA’s National Helpline: (1-800-662-HELP (4357))  
2) Veteran's Crisis Helpline: (TEXT 838-255)  
3) LifeWays 24-Hour Crisis Line: (800-284-8288)  
4) Trevor Project (LGBTQ): (866-488-7386)

**Benefits of Study Participation**  
   
There are no anticipated benefits to you for taking part in this study. Study results may have general benefit to society by increasing our understanding of how people perceive others. Thus, findings from this study will be used as a basis for potential publications, posters, and/or presentations at conferences or symposiums.  
   
**Data Storage Procedures**  
   
Data for this study will be kept on the Qualtrics server. Qualtrics is an account-based program where only researchers will have access your individual responses and data. Qualtrics is GDPR (General Data Protection Regulation) compliant. Upon completion of the data collection, the data set will be downloaded from Qualtrics to a laptop computer that is password protected.

**Alternative Task**  
   
You will receive no compensation for your participation. However, some instructors in psychology do offer course credit for research participation. Researchers have no control over this. If you are unsure if your instructor allows such credit, please ask your instructor. All psychology instructors who offer research credits in their courses are required by University policy to provide a non-research alternative to students in their classes who do not wish to directly participate in research. In order to be granted research credit, at the end of your participation in this anonymous survey, you will need to follow the link provided to a completely separate survey where you will be asked to give your name. This second survey will not in any way be linked to your earlier survey responses and is only collected so that we can give participants research credits by name. If you do not complete this survey, we cannot award you SONA credit.

**Personal Information Confidentiality**  
   
We plan to publish the results of this study. We will not publish any information that can identify you individually. All data for this study will be collected anonymously. The only identifying information you will provide the researcher is separate from the main questionnaires of this study and is only collected to award research credit.

You do not need to provide any identifying information to participate in this study. However, if you wish to receive research credit, once you have anonymously completed the main questionnaires of the study, you will then be asked if you wish to receive course credit for participating in this research. If you answer "Yes" to this question, you will be automatically linked to a completely separate survey that will ask for your name. Because the data from these two surveys are never linked, the only way a researcher will know that you have completed the relevant questionnaires of the anonymous portion of this study is to ask for your name with this completely separate, new survey. Completing this second survey will allow the researchers to know to whom they should grant credit in SONA (i.e., if you do not complete this "exit" survey, you will not receive SONA credit). Your instructors will not know which study you have participated in unless you tell them. Also, the researcher will not know what your specific responses were to any items of the surveys you completed (i.e., they will only know that you participated, but not what you reported in your responses)."

**Data Storage For Future Use**  
   
We will not store any personally identifying information about you. We will store the anonymous data collected for this study on the Qualtrics survey website, as well on a password protected laptop computer. Finally, we will also password protect the data file.

**Cost to Participant**  
   
Participation will not cost you anything.  
   
**Participation Compensation**  
   
You will not be paid to participate in this research study.  
   
You will receive .5 hours of SONA credit if you complete this study. If you do not complete this study, you will not earn research credit for your participation.  
   
**Study Contact Information**  
   
If you have any questions about the research, you can contact the Principal Investigator, Brier Gallihugh, at bgallihu@emich.edu or by phone at (989)-423-6118.  
   
You can also contact Brier Gallihugh’s faculty adviser, Dr. Stephen Jefferson, at sjeffer2@emich.edu or by phone at 734.487.0097.  
   
For questions about your rights as a research subject, contact the Eastern Michigan University Human Subjects Review Committee at human.subjects@emich.edu or by phone at 734-487-3090.  
   
**Voluntary participation**  
   
Participation in this research study is your choice. You may refuse to participate at any time, even after signing this form, without repercussion.

**Statement of Consent**  
   
I have read this consent form. I have had an opportunity to ask questions and am satisfied with the answers I received.

 I give my consent to participate in this research study.

 I do not give my consent to participate in this study.

Appendix K. Social Media Informed Consent

Project Title: Racial and Religious Ideology: An Examination of Attitudes and Thoughts

Principal Investigator: Brier Gallihugh, B.A. Eastern Michigan University  
Faculty Advisor: Stephen Jefferson, Ph.D., Eastern Michigan University

Thank you for your interest in this study! Your participation is greatly appreciated. To participate you be able to read and respond to prompts fluently in English, be over the age of 18, personally self-identify as a Christian and be from the United States. Participation in research is voluntary and you may pull out of this study at any time (**including after starting the study**). Please feel free to ask any questions you have about participation in this study.  
   
**Study Purpose**

The purpose of this study is to broadly examine your thoughts about a wide range of societal themes and ideas (i.e., racial, religious, etc.).

**Basic Study Procedure**  
   
You have been recruited to take part in this online study through the one of potentially various social media platforms (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, Reddit, Amazon Mechanical Turk, etc.).  Upon reading this consent form, you will be redirected to the Qualtrics program which will contain the primary study materials and questionnaires. You will be asked to first complete a demographic survey that asks you to report aspects of your identity such as your gender, age, racial group, religious affiliation, etc. as well as your current mental anxiety and depression levels. You will also be asked a series of questions concerning your life situation in light of the COVID-19 (a.k.a., the coronavirus). After completion of the demographic survey, you will be asked to respond to a series of questions measuring your thoughts about various racial and religious themed topics. Lastly, the study will conclude with one final question regarding whether or not you wish to receive credit for your participation. The study will take approximately 25-30 minutes to complete.

**Type of Data Collected**  
   
You may be asked to provide data that you find to be sensitive. All data will be collected anonymously (i.e., we have no way of linking your actual responses with your name). You will be asked your opinion about a number of racial and religious themed questions. You will also be asked some common questions about your identity and current mental status (e.g., age, gender, race, anxiety and depression levels, etc.).

**Risk of Study Participation**  
   
There is no expected risk for participating in this study outside of what a student may face while taking a college examination or listening to a college lecture. However, you may at times potentially experience stress while reading or answering any of the study materials especially any related directly to you. As such, should you feel stress you cannot handle, you are free to withdraw from the study and are encouraged to do so immediately. Should you feel you need professional help, the following are contacts for various mental health service hotlines.

1) SAMHSA’s National Helpline: (1-800-662-HELP (4357))  
2) Veteran's Crisis Helpline: (TEXT 838-255)  
3) LifeWays 24-Hour Crisis Line: (800-284-8288)  
4) Trevor Project (LGBTQ): (866-488-7386)

**Benefits of Study Participation**  
   
There are no anticipated benefits to you for taking part in this study. Study results may have general benefit to society by increasing our understanding of how people perceive others. Thus, findings from this study will be used as a basis for potential publications, posters, and/or presentations at conferences or symposiums.  
   
**Data Storage Procedures**  
   
Data for this study will be kept on the Qualtrics server. Qualtrics is an account-based program where only researchers will have access your individual responses and data. Qualtrics is GDPR (General Data Protection Regulation) compliant. Upon completion of the data collection, the data set will be downloaded from Qualtrics to a laptop computer that is password protected.

**Alternative Task**  
   
You will receive no guaranteed compensation for your participation. However, participation in this study will enter you into a chance to win *one* of *four* $25.00 Amazon gift cards. At the conclusion of the data collection, four participants will be chosen at random to receive one of the gift cards via email. In order to be entered into the drawing, at the end of your participation in this anonymous survey, you will need to follow the link provided to a completely separate survey where you will be asked to give an email. This second survey will not in any way be linked to your earlier survey responses and is only collected so that we can contact winners. If you do not complete this survey, we cannot enter you into the drawing.

**Personal Information Confidentiality**  
   
We plan to publish the results of this study. We will not publish any information that can identify you individually. All data for this study will be collected anonymously. The only identifying information you will provide the researcher is separate from the main questionnaires of this study and is only collected to award research credit.

You do not need to provide any identifying information to participate in this study. However, if you wish to be entered into the drawing for one of the $25.00 Amazon gift cards, once you have anonymously completed the main questionnaires of the study, you will then be asked if you wish to be entered into the drawing for participating in this research. If you answer "Yes" to this question, you will be automatically linked to a completely separate survey that will ask for a contact email. Because the data from these two surveys are never linked, the only way a researcher will know where to potentially send you an Amazon gift card is if you have completed this completely separate, new survey. Completing this second survey will allow the researchers to randomly choose which four participants will receive one of the $25 Amazon gift cards. Therefore, if you do not complete this "exit" survey, you will not be entered into the drawing. Your instructors will not know which study you have participated in unless you tell them. The researcher will not know what your specific responses were to any items of the surveys you completed (i.e., they will only know that you participated, but not what you reported in your responses)."

**Data Storage For Future Use**  
   
We will not store any personally identifying information about you. We will store the anonymous data collected for this study on the Qualtrics survey website, as well on a password protected laptop computer. Finally, we will also password protect the data file.

**Cost to Participant**  
   
Participation will not cost you anything.  
   
**Participation Compensation**  
   
You will not be paid to participate in this research study. However, completion of this survey (including the second survey at the end), will enter you in a drawing with a chance to win one of four $25.00 Amazon gift cards. If you do not complete this study, you will not be entered into the drawing.

**Study Contact Information**  
   
If you have any questions about the research, you can contact the Principal Investigator, Brier Gallihugh, at bgallihu@emich.edu or by phone at (989)-423-6118.  
   
You can also contact Brier Gallihugh’s faculty adviser, Dr. Stephen Jefferson, at sjeffer2@emich.edu or by phone at 734.487.0097.  
   
For questions about your rights as a research subject, contact the Eastern Michigan University Human Subjects Review Committee at human.subjects@emich.edu or by phone at 734-487-3090.  
   
**Voluntary participation**  
   
Participation in this research study is your choice. You may refuse to participate at any time, even after signing this form, without repercussion.

**Statement of Consent**  
   
I have read this consent form. I have had an opportunity to ask questions and am satisfied with the answers I received.

 I give my consent to participate in this research study.

 I do not give my consent to participate in this study.

Appendix L. Demographic Questions

|  |
| --- |
| 1. What recruitment platform did you hear about this study from? |
| 2. What is your age? |
| 3. What is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received? |
| 4. Are you currently attending college? |
| 5. Are you from the United States? |
| 6. Please indicate your religious affiliation? |
| 7. Please indicate your typical political ideological leanings using the scale provided? |
| 8. Choose one or more races that you consider yourself to be |
| 9. What is your gender? |

Appendix M. COVID-19 Questions

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Given the COVID-19 (coronavirus) pandemic, are you currently classified as an essential worker in your state of residence? |
| 2. Due to COVID-19 (coronavirus), are you currently unable to earn money? |
| 3. Due to COVID-19, have you recently been forced to apply for government assistance (e.g., unemployment, food stamps, etc.)? |
| 4. Due to COVID-19, have you been forced to work at home? |
| 5. Have any of your friends or family been diagnosed with COVID-19? |
| 6. Have you been diagnosed with COVID-19? |
| 7. How personally distressing do you find the COVID-19 pandemic? |
| 8. From a national perspective, how distressing do you find the COVID-19 pandemic? |
| 9.How disruptive has the COVID-19 pandemic been in your everyday life and activities? |
| 10. How worried are you that you or someone you know will contract COVID-19? |
| 11.I believe that my state government is doing the best that can be done to cope with the COVID-19 pandemic? |
| 12. I believe that my federal government is doing the best that can be done to cope with the COVID-19 pandemic? |
| 13. I have not really paid attention to the news about COVID-19? |

Appendix N. Debrief Form

Thank you for participating in this study! This form provides background about our research to help you learn more about why this study was done. Please feel free direct any questions or concerns you may have to the investigators.    
  
Some studies use deception in situations where there is no other way to conduct the experiment without potentially biasing the results. The current study is one that did involve mild deception. The actual purpose of this study was to serve as a preliminary exploration into the development of a scale to assess Christian privilege awareness among a Christian population. As such, telling you the actual purpose of the study may have biased your responses. However, know that all your responses are confidential, and every participant received the same items to answer. Thank you for your participation as your responses will provide valuable information into the development of this scale as well as determine various levels of validity measures to assess the accuracy of the scale under development.

The data from this study will be presented to groups and potentially in research journals. However, all data will be kept secure and personally identifiable information left out. Data will only be analyzed by trained researchers. However, should you feel uncomfortable, know that your participation is still voluntary, and you are free to withdraw from the study at any time. There is no penalty for withdrawing. Lastly, we ask that you please refrain from communication with others about the contents or purpose of this study to others as doing so may also bias our results. Thank you for your time!

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Investigator | Contact Number | Email |
| Brier Gallihugh, B.A. | 989.423.6118 | bgallihu@emich.edu |
| Stephen Jefferson, Ph.D. | 734.487.0097 | sjeffer2@emich.edu |

If you want more information about your rights as a participant or want to report any research-related concerns, please feel free to contact the current researchers (if your concerns relate to this study) or you may contact the Institutional Review Board at (734) 487-3090.