Outcome-Wide Perfectionism

Ken Rice   Don E. Davis   Geoffrey Troughton   Chris G. Sibley   Joseph Bulbulia

2023-05-12

Abstract

Perfectly counterfactual

List of Figures

List of Tables

Introduction

Here we go... (Sibley 2012)

Method

Questions related to religion are as follows

Belief in God

Using one item from Eurobarometer (2005), we asked participants "Do you believe in a God" (1 = Yes, 0 = No) (Eurobarometer 2005).

Belief in Sprituality

Using one item from Eurobarometer (2005), we asked participants "Do you believe in some form of spirit or lifeforce? (1 = Yes, 0 = No) (Eurobarometer 2005).

Religion Affiliation

Participants were asked to indicate their religion identification ("Do you identify with a religion and/or spiritual group?") on a binary response (1 = Yes, 0 = No). We then asked "What religion or spiritual group?" These questions are used in the New Zealand Census.

Religious Identification

If participants answered *yes* to "Do you identify with a religion and/or spiritual group? we asked"How important is your religion to how you see yourself?" (1 = Not important, 7 = Very important). Those participants who were not religious were imputed a score of "1".

Frequency of Church Attendance

If participants answered *yes* to "Do you identify with a religion and/or spiritual group?" we measured their frequency of church attendance using one item from Sibley (2012): "how many times did you attend a church or place of worship in the last month?". Those participants who were not religious were imputed a score of "0".

Spiritual Identification

Spiritual identification was measured using one item ("I identify as a spiritual person.") from Postmes, Haslam, and Jans (2013). Participants indicated their agreement with this item (1 = Strongly Disagree to 7 = Strongly Agree).

Frequency of Prayer

If participants answered *yes* to "Do you identify with a religion and/or spiritual group?" we measured their frequency of prayer by asking "how many times did you pray in the last week?" Those participants who were not religious were imputed a score of "0" (S. Bulbulia J. A. 2015) .

Frequency of Scripture Reading

If participants answered *yes* to "Do you identify with a religion and/or spiritual group?" we measured their frequency of scripture reading by asking "how many times did you read religious scripture in the last week?" Those participants who were not religious were imputed a score of "0" (J. Bulbulia et al. 2016).

Perceived Discrimination – Religion

"I feel that I am often discriminated against because of my religious/spiritual beliefs." (1 = Strongly Disagree to 7 = Strongly Agree). (Developed for the NZAVS, Time 7 - time 14)

Descriptive statistics

Analytic approach

We next leveraged longitudinal data to investigate whether changing from transiting from a Christian denomination to a Christian NFD affiliation affect people's religious behaviors. That is, we used the longitudinal features of NZAVS data collection to evalutate the causal question of whether becoming a Christian NFD makes somebody less religious.(Eurobarometer 2005)

Selection criteria.

1. We selected people who participated in both the NZAVS 2016 and 2017 waves.
2. Christian at baseline, not NFD.
3. Christian at baseline + 1, either NFD or not NFD.
4. Outcomes are all the variables in the NZAVS that measure religion and spirituality.
5. Missing data multiply imputed (to adjust for sampling bias).
6. Control for baseline confounders
7. Estimation by Inverse probability weighting and G-computation.
8. Recover the **Average Treatment Effect in the Treated**.

Sample

Table 1: Sample Statistics (baseline = 2018)

	Time 10 (baseline)
	(N=10787)
Male	
Male	4003 (37 %)
Not_male	6784 (63 %)

	Time 10 (baseline)
Cohort	
Gen_Silent: b.< 1946	714 (7 %)
Gen Boomers: b. >= 1946 & b.< 1965	5229 (48 %)
GenX: born >=1961 & b.< 1981	3311 (31 %)
GenY: born >=1981 & b.< 1996	1421 (13 %)
GenZ: born >= 1996	112 (1 %)
NZ-European	
No	2018 (19 %)
Yes	8730 (81 %)
Missing	39 (0.4%)
Education	
Mean (SD)	5.63 (± 2.66)
Missing	37 (0.3%)
Employed	
No	2714 (25 %)
Yes	8064 (75 %)
Missing	9 (0.1%)
NZDep2018	
Mean (SD)	4.70 (± 2.73)
Missing	117 (1.1%)
NZSEI13	
Mean (SD)	54.9 (± 16.0)
Missing	56 (0.5%)
Rural_GCH2018	
1	6632 (61 %)
2	2092 (19 %)
3	1254 (12 %)
4	567 (5 %)
5	126 (1 %)
Missing	116 (1.1%)
Born NZ	
Mean (SD)	0.800 (± 0.400)
Missing	18 (0.2%)
Parent	
No	2574 (24 %)
Yes	8212 (76 %)
Missing	1 (0.0%)
Partner	
No	2576 (24 %)
Yes	7903 (73 %)
Missing	308 (2.9%)
Politically_Liberal	
Mean (SD)	3.57 (± 1.38)
Missing	497 (4.6%)
Left_Wing	
Mean (SD)	3.71 (± 1.31)
Missing	537 (5.0%)
Religious_Identification	
Mean (SD)	1.72 (± 2.58)

	Time 10 (baseline)
Missing	68 (0.6%)

Description of Changes in Attitudes in Sample Pre-Post Attacks (one year)

The sample consists of 10,878 participants who responded the NZAVS 2016/17 Time 8 survey and who again responded to the NZAVS 2018/19 Time 10 survey.

Table 2: Average warmth ratings before and one-year after attacks

	Pre Attacks(Time 10)	Post Attacks(Time 11)
	(N=10787)	(N=10787)
Warm Muslims		
Mean (SD)	4.09 (1.46)	4.35 (1.41)
Median [Min, Max]	4.00 [1.00, 7.00]	4.00 [1.00, 7.00]
Missing	286 (2.7%)	1672 (15.5%)
Warm Asians		
Mean (SD)	4.54 (1.27)	4.64 (1.23)
Median [Min, Max]	4.00 [1.00, 7.00]	4.00 [1.00, 7.00]
Missing	265 (2.5%)	1647 (15.3%)
Warm Chinese		
Mean (SD)	4.39 (1.34)	4.47 (1.32)
Median [Min, Max]	4.00 [1.00, 7.00]	4.00 [1.00, 7.00]
Missing	280 (2.6%)	1673 (15.5%)
Warm Immigrants		
Mean (SD)	4.54 (1.23)	4.64 (1.23)
Median [Min, Max]	4.00 [1.00, 7.00]	4.00 [1.00, 7.00]
Missing	282 (2.6%)	1674 (15.5%)
Warm Indians		
Mean (SD)	4.31 (1.36)	4.42 (1.34)
Median [Min, Max]	4.00 [1.00, 7.00]	4.00 [1.00, 7.00]
Missing	277 (2.6%)	1669 (15.5%)
Warm Refugees		
Mean (SD)	4.68 (1.34)	4.80 (1.31)
Median [Min, Max]	5.00 [1.00, 7.00]	5.00 [1.00, 7.00]
Missing	283 (2.6%)	1654 (15.3%)
Warm Pacific		
Mean (SD)	4.78 (1.24)	4.87 (1.20)
Median [Min, Max]	5.00 [1.00, 7.00]	5.00 [1.00, 7.00]
Missing	265 (2.5%)	1654 (15.3%)
Warm Maori		
Mean (SD)	5.00 (1.27)	5.03 (1.26)
Median [Min, Max]	5.00 [1.00, 7.00]	5.00 [1.00, 7.00]
Missing	270 (2.5%)	1660 (15.4%)
Warm NZ Euro		
Mean (SD)	5.57 (1.23)	5.58 (1.24)
Median [Min, Max]	6.00 [1.00, 7.00]	6.00 [1.00, 7.00]
Missing	282 (2.6%)	1659 (15.4%)
Warm Elderly		

	Pre Attacks(Time 10)	Post Attacks(Time 11)
Mean (SD)	5.52 (1.16)	5.51 (1.15)
Median [Min, Max]	6.00 [1.00, 7.00]	6.00 [1.00, 7.00]
Missing	258 (2.4%)	1648 (15.3%)
Warm Overweight		
Mean (SD)	4.21 (1.37)	4.22 (1.38)
Median [Min, Max]	4.00 [1.00, 7.00]	4.00 [1.00, 7.00]
Missing	274 (2.5%)	1660 (15.4%)
Warm Mental-illness		
Mean (SD)	4.60 (1.29)	4.64 (1.28)
Median [Min, Max]	4.00 [1.00, 7.00]	4.00 [1.00, 7.00]
Missing	288 (2.7%)	1671 (15.5%)

Table 3: Personality ratings at baseline. In addition to demographic indicators we also used personality ratings to multiply impute missing values

	Time 10 (baseline)
	(N=10787)
AGREEABLENESS	
Mean (SD)	5.36 (± 0.968)
Missing	36 (0.3%)
CONSCIENTIOUSNESS	
Mean (SD)	5.15 (± 1.01)
Missing	33 (0.3%)
EXTRAVERSION	
Mean (SD)	3.85 (± 1.16)
Missing	33 (0.3%)
HONESTY_HUMILITY	
Mean (SD)	5.51 (± 1.16)
Missing	33 (0.3%)
NEUROTICISM	
Mean (SD)	3.38 (± 1.15)
Missing	36 (0.3%)
OPENNESS	
Mean (SD)	4.95 (± 1.12)
Missing	33 (0.3%)

Selection Bias

Although the timing of the attacks was random with respect to NAVS data collection, non-response and panel attrition may potentially bias inferences. A simple version of this threat is indicated in **?@fig-dag**. .... We used both demographic indicators (see Table 1) and personality indicators (see Table 3) when multiply imputing missing responses.

Propensity scores

We first identified covariates for which balance is required, following VanderWeeles modified disjunctive cause criterion (VanderWeele 2019; VanderWeele, Mathur, and Chen 2020)

Clarify (Greifer et al. 2023) and the original King citation (King, Tomz, and Wittenberg 2000) following (Rainey 2023).

We also used the WeightIt Package in R (Greifer 2023b).

We first assessed covariate balance using the cobalt package (Greifer 2023a)

We compared for methods for balancing covariates on the exposure: (1) covariate balancing propensity scores, which utilises the CBPS package (Fong, Ratkovic, and Imai 2022); (2) entropy balancing (Greifer 2023b), (3) Bayesian additive regression trees (Dorie 2022), and (4) energy balancing (Greifer 2023b).

Discussion

Points to consider:

- Muslim acceptance post attacks is evident whether the pre-attack acceptance trend is bounded at its highest or lowest confidence interval.
- Prototypical minority acceptance is also evident whether the pre-attack acceptance trend is bounded at its highest or lowest confidence interval.
- The magnitude of prototypical minority acceptance is about half that of the Muslim acceptance post-attack benefit.
- At the lower bound of the pre-attack acceptance trajectory, all groups experience a lift in post-attack acceptance. This scenario suggests the potential for a "Jacinda Effect".
- However, the complex interplay of social events at that time in New Zealand History remains unclear – and cannot be disentangled from observed data....
- At the upper bound of the pre-attack acceptance trajectory, only prototypical minority groups saw a lift in acceptance over and above expectations from the pre-attack trajectory.
- Notably, although the confidence intervals for prototypical minorities were reliably above zero on this "best-case" pre-attack trajectory, the confidence intervals between prototypical and non-prototypical minority groups overlapped. We can therefore infer only somewhat weak overall support for prototyping in the attack responses.
- This study reveals the potential for psychological science to reframe how popolar understandings of minority groups. In New Zealand Pacific peoples tend to be grouped with Māori peoples. However, the pattern of response to Pacific peoples following the Christchurch attacks is more closely aligned with the prototypical minority group response.
- Moreover, the declining acceptance of elderly people and for New Zealand Europeans over time merits further attention. Overall acceptance of these populations remains the highest of all groups. The pattern does not necessarily imply increasing prejudice: it may rather reflect declining affective responses to the familar. Whether and how people naturally become less "warm" to others as we age is another matter for future investigations.
- Overall this study reveals both the power and the limitations of longitudinal data to address questions of fundamental interest across the social sciences.
-

Acknowledgments

References

Bulbulia, Joseph, Geoffrey Troughton, Lara M. Greaves, Taciano L. Milfont, and Chris G. Sibley. 2016. "To Burn or to Save? The Opposing Functions of Reading Scripture on Environmental Intentions." *Religion, Brain & Behavior* 6 (4): 278–89. https://doi.org/10.1080/2153599X.2015.1026926.

Bulbulia, Shaver, J. A. 2015. "Religion and Parental Cooperation: An Empirical Test of Slone's Sexual Signaling Model." In *The Attraction of Religion: A Sexual Selectionist Account*, edited by & Van Slyke J. Slone D., 29–62. Bloomsbury Press.

Dorie, Vincent. 2022. "Dbarts: Discrete Bayesian Additive Regression Trees Sampler." https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=dbarts.

Eurobarometer, Special. 2005. "Social Values, Science and Technology." *Eurobarometer Special Report* 225.

Fong, Christian, Marc Ratkovic, and Kosuke Imai. 2022. "CBPS: Covariate Balancing Propensity Score." https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=CBPS.

Greifer, Noah. 2023a. *Cobalt: Covariate Balance Tables and Plots*.

———. 2023b. *WeightIt: Weighting for Covariate Balance in Observational Studies*.

Greifer, Noah, Steven Worthington, Stefano Iacus, and Gary King. 2023. *Clarify: Simulation-Based Inference for Regression Models*. https://iqss.github.io/clarify/.

King, Gary, Michael Tomz, and Jason Wittenberg. 2000. "Making the Most of Statistical Analyses: Improving Interpretation and Presentation." *American Journal of Political Science*, 347361.

Postmes, Tom, S. Alexander Haslam, and Lise Jans. 2013. "A Single-Item Measure of Social Identification: Reliability, Validity, and Utility." *The British Journal of Social Psychology* 52 (4): 597–617. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12006.

Rainey, Carlisle. 2023. "A Careful Consideration of CLARIFY: Simulation-Induced Bias in Point Estimates of Quantities of Interest." *Political Science Research and Methods*, 110. https://doi.org/10.1017/psrm.2023.8.

Sibley, & Bulbulia, C. G. 2012. "Healing Those Who Need Healing: How Religious Practice Affects Social Belonging." *Journal for the Cognitive Science of Religion* 1: 29–45.

VanderWeele, Tyler J. 2019. "Principles of Confounder Selection." *European Journal of Epidemiology* 34 (3): 211219.

VanderWeele, Tyler J, Maya B Mathur, and Ying Chen. 2020. "Outcome-Wide Longitudinal Designs for Causal Inference: A New Template for Empirical Studies." *Statistical Science* 35 (3): 437466.