

Supplementary Material

to Saroglou & Craninx, *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 2021, 40 (special issue on *Religion*)

Meta-analysis of studies on religiousness and moral foundations:

Complementary information

and

Review of studies on religion and deontology vs. consequentialism:

List of studies and main findings (Table S3)

Method

Studies included

We searched, up until the end of July 2020, for published studies in PsycINFO by using the formula <(relig* or spiritual* or God) and moral* and (foundations or intuitions)> in the Abstract. We also integrated other studies we were aware of. We retained studies with data on religiousness and endorsement of moral foundations (self-reports). We were unable to include: (a) two studies that measured moral foundations as an outcome of experimental manipulation, (b) one study having measured only globally the individualizing and the binding foundations and not distinctly the five foundations, (c) one study, for which we did not receive the correlations (not reported in their paper) we requested from the authors, and (d) four studies including non-Western samples with reliabilities of the moral foundations scales being low and thus correlational analyses being not reported or computed. We also did not include one study with too few (49) participants. Finally, in order not to code multiple effects from the same data, we did not include three studies in which the data overlapped with another publication by the same authors.

Variables and effects coded

In the studies included (in total, 45 studies; see Table S1), we distinguished between effects with measures of (a) religiosity (44 studies), (b) fundamentalism (12 studies), and (c) spirituality (three studies). For religiosity, when more than one religious measure was used in a given study, we coded as the effect the association of the religious construct that was closest to general religiosity, i.e. by order, intrinsic religiosity, religious commitment, self-identification as religious, religious belief, and religious practice/attendance. For fundamentalism, we included measures of religious fundamentalism, religious orthodoxy, and biblical literalism. We did not meta-analyze results with religious quest or existential quest (four studies) since this orientation is often confounded with low religiosity.

The vast majority of studies used the Moral Foundations Questionnaire-30 [6]. Very few others used shorter versions of it or the authors' own items, but the associations in these studies were not different from the majority of studies.

We identified no outlier study; thus, all 45 studies were retained for the analyses. For each study, we coded the bivariate correlations provided in the paper (or sent to us by the corresponding author when in the paper results were summarized at the level of individualizing and binding foundations) between the religious measure and each of the five foundations. For one study providing *t*-tests comparing believers and non-believers, we transformed *t*-tests to *r*. Given the studies' countries, we also categorized the studies as coming from the US, other Western countries (of Christian tradition), or other (only one, i.e. Turkey). We also coded the mean age and the gender ratio (women's percentage) of participants for each study.

Statistical analyses

For the statistical analyses, we used *Meta-Essentials* [58]. For each of the five associations between religiousness and moral foundations, we computed, distinctly for general religiosity, fundamentalism, and spirituality, the mean effect size (*r*) and the respective 95% confidence intervals (CI). We gave equal weight to each study since we (a) did not include the study with too few *N*s, (b) wanted to avoid allowing a study with a too large *N* to enormously impact the findings, and (c) considered that each study provided an equal to the other studies part of information—almost all, in addition, using the same measure of moral foundations. We adopted a random effects model: the size of the associations might vary across studies given recent accumulated evidence on cultural and other contextual variability in the way religiousness relates to morality [10,59].

The associations of moral foundations with fundamentalism and spirituality were based on a limited number of studies. We thus did not carry out additional analyses. For the associations of moral foundations with religiosity, which were based on a large number of studies, we also computed, for each of the five mean effects, the heterogeneity statistics (*Q*, *I*²) and the prediction intervals. We used the trim-and-fill method to address the file drawer issue. We finally computed comparisons of groups of studies to test the cultural differences between the US and the other Western studies and conducted moderation analyses of the role of the sample's mean age and gender ratio (regressions). The publication year was not relevant to be examined as a moderator since all studies were carried out in the last 10 years.

Results

The main results, i.e. distinct by religious orientation mean effect sizes and CIs, are provided in the main article, in Table 1. Additional results are provided below.

Heterogeneity and prediction intervals

For all five meta-analytic effects of the association between religiosity and the five moral foundations, the heterogeneity (*Q*) was high and significant. The five *I*²s were all high (> 85%), indicating that almost all the variance was due to true variance between studies. Inspection of the prediction intervals, which in case of high heterogeneity typically give a large range of possible effects for future findings, indicated that, for the individualizing foundations, the variability referred not only to the size of the mean associations with religiosity, but also to the direction of these mean effects: [-

.08, .26] for care, and [-.23, .19] for fairness. However, the direction was clear for the positive associations between religiosity and loyalty [.04, .47], authority [.07, .52], and purity [.25, .70].

Differences between religious dimensions

The differences between religiosity, fundamentalism, and spirituality in their associations with the five moral foundations can be observed in terms of different mean effect sizes. Some of them can be more reliably concluded by comparing the CIs. In certain cases, the highest end of the CI of one effect was not included in the CI of the other effect—and thus was lower than the low end of the CI of that other effect. Indeed, spirituality's positive associations with care and fairness were clearly higher than the associations of these two foundations not only with fundamentalism, but also with religiosity. There was, on the contrary, substantial overlap in the CIs between religiosity, fundamentalism, and spirituality in their associations with the binding values.

Cultural differences

The visually observable differences in the mean effect sizes of religiosity's associations with the binding foundations between the US studies and the studies from other Western countries of Christian tradition (Table 1) turned out to be significant for all three binding foundations (Table S2). The differences regarding authority and purity, as related to religiosity, are robust: the higher end of the CI for the other Western studies is not included in the CI of the respective US studies (Table 1). However, the two sets of studies did not differ with regard to religiosity's associations with care and fairness. Furthermore, in Turkey, i.e. the only country of Muslim tradition, religiosity's associations with loyalty and authority, the two clearly collectivistic foundations, were higher in size compared to the same associations coming from data from the US and the other Western countries (clearly distinct CIs), but prudence is needed since only one study is compared here with the others.

Mean age and gender ratio as moderators

The mean age of the sample showed some variation: it ranged across studies from 19-yrs to 58-yrs. The last value was an outlier; we thus did not retain that study and the range of mean age ended at 52, with a mean of 32.05 and *SD* of 8.91. Computing the moderation analyses (Table S2) showed that there was no moderating effect of mean sample age on the associations of religiosity with any of the five foundations. The gender (women) ratio also showed variability ranging from 38% to 83%, with a mean of 60.24% (*SD* = 11.38). Computing the moderation analyses (Table S2) revealed that the more a sample was predominantly female, the stronger the association of religiosity with care became. On the contrary, the less the sample was predominantly female (or the more it was predominantly male), the stronger the associations of religiosity with loyalty and authority became.

File drawer issue

Applying the trim-and-fill method identified no “missing” studies for four out of the five associations of religiosity with the moral foundations. Only for authority did the procedure suggest that two studies be trimmed off, but the adjusted mean effect size, after fictitious replacement of these studies, remained identical, i.e. .31. In principle, the above suggests no publication bias. It may also be that this method is not powerful enough to detect publication bias when high heterogeneity exists across studies. Nevertheless, given the particularly strong association of religiosity with the binding

foundations, and especially purity, across all studies, it is reasonable to consider that it is unlikely that many unpublished studies with null findings exist.

Discussion

The main results are summarized and commented in the main text. We provide below additional considerations.

Religion and fairness

The somehow surprising null, instead of positive, mean association of general religiosity with the moral foundation of fairness can be understood in two complementary ways. First, this null association may parallel Schwartz's universalism, which is unrelated to religiosity but may be negatively or positively related to it, depending on the cultural and the specific religious context [4]. Indeed, we found that rigid religion, i.e. fundamentalism, implies low endorsement of universal justice, whereas flexible faith, i.e. spirituality, implies the opposite. This kind of dualism is less present in care: in almost all contexts, religion implies some prosocial tendencies, which however may either be very weak or more pronounced. Second, overall, religion implies an implicit or explicit moral, social, and ontological order between the various kinds of beings, including ingroups and outgroups, men and women, and humans and animals [60,61,62]. Thus, the ideal of total equality between all people may not be welcomed with enthusiasm within a religious context: across the world, there is empirical evidence in favor of some discomfort of religiosity with democratic ideals [10].

Moderators: culture, gender, and age

The differences found between the US studies and the other Western studies, mostly carried out in more secular contexts than the US, with religiosity being more strongly related to loyalty, authority, and purity in the US, are in line with, consolidate, and extend previous research. This research suggests more conservative and traditionalist features in US religiosity compared to other Western contexts [63]. As it can be seen in Figure 2 of the main article, religiosity in the other Western countries behaves similarly to spirituality in the US (less conservative than religiosity), regarding the associations with the binding foundations.

The moderating role of the gender ratio on all five religiosity-moral foundations associations is highly informative of how gender differences are expressed in religion and to satisfy one's own needs. The results are in line with traditional research on the psychology of religion suggesting that women's religiosity is more relational and men's religiosity more order-oriented [64]. Finally, there was no evidence for a moderating role of age, possibly suggesting that the overall links between religiosity and the moral foundations are similarly present across ages, at least from young adulthood to the age of 50-yrs.

Limitations

Results regarding fundamentalism and spirituality should be interpreted with caution and be considered only as preliminary information. They, especially the results regarding spirituality, are based on a limited number of studies that were almost all conducted in the same country (US). Moreover, in three out of the 10 mean associations (2 religious orientations \times five foundations), i.e. care with fundamentalism, and authority and loyalty with spirituality, the CIs included zero, suggesting instability

of these effects possibly due to important moderators having to do with the specific form of spirituality (less or more connected to traditional religion) and fundamentalism (less or more prosocial) across contexts.

On the contrary, results regarding religiosity should be seen with some confidence. They came from a large number of studies, parallel in several aspects the associations of religiosity with values, and as being rather consistent--with differences being in the size of effects rather than the directions of the associations--between the US, European countries of Christian tradition, and Turkey, a country of Muslim tradition. Nevertheless, all studies came from countries of monotheistic traditions and thus generalizability to other religious cultural contexts is not guaranteed. This is especially the case given non-negligible reliability issues of the measure of the moral foundations as found in a recent large cross-cultural study [65].

Nevertheless, the similarities and consistencies across studies and cultures in the way religiousness across orientations--certainly religiosity, most importantly fundamentalism, and, even if more weakly, spirituality--is associated with the endorsement of loyalty, authority, and purity (the three mentioned here by ascending order) are astonishing. Furthermore, these similarities concern, for religiosity and fundamentalism, a considerable prioritization of these values compared to those that are oriented to interpersonal others.

References

58. Suurmond R, van Rhee H, Hak T: **Introduction, comparison and validation of *Meta-Essentials*: a free and simple tool for meta-analysis**. *Res Synth Methods* 2017, **8**:537-553.
59. Cohen AB, Rozin P: **Religion and the morality of mentality**. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 2001, **81**: 697-710.
60. Brandt MJ, Reyna C: **The chain of being: a hierarchy of morality**. *Perspect Psychol Sci* 2011, **6**:428-446.
61. Demoulin S, Saroglou V, Van Pachterbeke M: **Infra-humanizing others, supra-humanizing gods: the emotional hierarchy**. *Soc Cognition* 2008, **26**:235-247.
62. Perry SL, Burge RP: **How religion predicts pet ownership in the United States**. *J Sci Stud Relig* 2020, **59**:190-201.
63. Pew Research Center: **The American-Western European values gap** 2011, Nov 17.
<https://www.pewresearch.org>
64. Beit-Hallahmi B: **Religion and Religiosity**. Routledge; 2015.
65. Iurino K, Saucier G: **Testing measurement invariance of the Moral Foundations Questionnaire across 27 countries**. *Assessment* 2020, **27**:365-372.

Supplementary Material Table S1

Studies on religiousness and moral foundations included in the meta-analysis

	Study	Country	<i>N</i>	Religious Indicator	MF Measure
[12]	Bulbulia et al. (2013)	N. Zealand	1188	Intrinsic religiosity	MFQ-30
[13]	Clark et al. (2020), Study 1	USA	284	Relig. attendance	MFQ-30
	Study 3	USA	461	Intrinsic religiosity	MFQ-30
[14]	Davis et al. (2016), Study 2	USA	490	Rel. commitment	MFQ-2009
[15]	Deak & Saroglou (2015)	Belgium	230	Religiousness	MFQ-20
[16]	Deak & Saroglou (2016)	Belgium	177	Religiousness	MFQ-30
[17]	Deak & Saroglou (2017)	Belgium	213	Religiousness	MFQ-20
[18]	Di Battista et al. (2018)	Italy	248	Religious believer	Own items
[19]	Franks & Scherr (2015), Study 1	USA	144	Religiosity	MFQ-30
	Study 3	USA	200	Religiosity	MFQ-30
[20]	Greenway et al. (2019)	USA	313	Traditional God Fundamentalism ^a	MFQ-30
[21]	Harnish et al. (2018)	USA	132	Fundamentalism ^a	MFQ-30
[22]	Hodge et al. (2019), Study 2	USA	202	Relig. commitment	MFQ-30
[23]	Johnson et al. (2016)	USA	450	Relig. commitment Biblical literalism ^a Outreaching faith ^b	MFQ-30
[24]	Kang et al. (2016, Study 1)	USA	577	Religiosity	MFQ-30
[7]	Koleva et al. (2012), Study 1	USA	10222	Relig. attendance	MFQ-30
	Study 2	USA	14517	Relig. attendance	MFQ-30
[25]	Krull (2016), Study 1	USA	616	Intrinsic religiosity Fundamentalism ^a	Own items
	Study 2	USA	773	Intrinsic religiosity Fundamentalism ^a	Own items
[26]	Labouff et al. (2017), Study 1	USA	134	Religiosity	MFQ-30
	Study 2	USA	1870	Religiosity	MFQ-30
[27]	Meagher (2019)	USA	578	Relig. attendance Fundamentalism ^a	MFQ-30
[28]	Métayer & Pahlavan (2014)	France	538	Religious believer	MFQ-30
[29]	Minton et al. (2019), Study 2	USA	197	Religiosity	MFQ-30
	Study 3	USA	391	Religiosity	MFQ-30
[30]	Mooijman et al. (2018), Study 4	USA	313	Religiosity	MFQ-30
[31]	Niemi & Young (2016), Study 1	USA	228	Religiosity	MFQ-30
	Study 2	USA	254	Religiosity	MFQ-30
	Study 3	USA	343	Religiosity	MFQ-30
[32]	Nilsson et al. (2016), Study 2a	Sweden	126	Being religious	MFQ-2009
	Study 2b	Sweden	200	Being religious	MFQ-2009

[33]	Nilsson et al. (2020)	Sweden	985	Religious practice Spirituality ^b	MFQ-2009
[34]	Njus & Okerstrom (2016)	USA	306	Proximity w. God	MFQ-30
[35]	Piazza & Landy (2013), Study 2	USA	211	Being religious	MFQ-30
[36]	Reynolds et al. (2020), Study 1	USA	139	Intrinsic religiosity	MFQ-30
	Study 3	USA	183	Theism	MFQ-30
[37]	Rutjens et al. (2018), Study 1	Netherlands	173	Belief in God Relig. orthodoxy ^a	MFQ-15
	Study 3	Netherlands	167	Belief in God Relig. orthodoxy ^a	MFQ-15
[38]	Rosik et al. (2013)	USA	183	Intrinsic religiosity	MFQ-30
[39]	Simpson et al. (2016, Study 1a)	USA	293	Belief in God Biblical literalism ^a	MFQ-30
[40]	Yalçındağ et al. (2019, Study 2)	Turkey	493	Being religious	MFQ-30
[41]	Yi & Tsang (2020), Study 1	USA	420	Intrinsic religiosity Fundamentalism ^a Spirituality ^c	MFQ-30
	Study 2	USA	268	Intrinsic religiosity Fundamentalism ^a	MFQ-30
	Study 3	USA	270	Intrinsic religiosity Fundamentalism ^a	MFQ-30
	Study 4	USA	455	Theism	MFQ-30

Notes. ^a = measures categorized as indicators of fundamentalism. ^b = measures of spirituality. All other religious measures were considered as indicators of general religiosity.

Supplementary Material Table S2

Moderators of the associations between religiosity and moral foundations

Moderator and statistic used	Care	Fairness	Loyalty	Authority	Purity
US vs. Other Western: $Q(1)$	1.67	2.29	5.74*	31.83***	39.30***
Sample's Mean Age: b	-0.22	0.06	0.08	0.07	-0.06
Gender (Women) Ratio: b	0.30*	0.22	-0.37**	-0.34**	-0.15

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

Supplementary Material Table S3

Studies on religion and deontological versus consequentialist morality

Studies	<i>N</i> , country	Moral orientation measure	Results
[43] Antonenko et al. (2013)	119, US	5 moral dilemmas: instrumental harm (IH) ^a	Fundamentalism: <i>r</i> w. deontological choices
[44] Arli & Pekerti (2017)	669, Australia 451, Indonesia	Forsyth's Questionnaire: Idealism <i>and</i> Relativism ^c	Intrinsic religiosity: <i>r</i> w. high idealism, not w. relativism, in both samples
[45] Banerjee et al. (2010)	8900, US	Evaluation of permissiveness of 145 counter-normative acts	Religious: more deontology-, rule-based judgments; extended moralism
[46] Barak-Corren & Bazerman (2017), Studies 1 & 2	489, US 330, Israel	Variants of the trolley dilemma ^a	Religious: more deontological, by inaction or indirectness
[47] Baron et al. (2015), Study 4	96, US	15 moral dilemmas of two kinds: instrumental harm + righteous non-care; utilitarianism (scale) ^{a, b, c}	Religiosity: <i>r</i> w. high deontological choices <i>and</i> low utilitarianism
[48] Christensen et al. (2014)	25, Spain	Neural activity during 48 moral dilemmas: instrumental harm ^a	Catholics, not atheists: different brain areas when deontological vs. utilitarian moral dilemmas
[49] Conway & Gawronski (2013), Study 1	112, Canada	10 moral dilemmas: IH; scores for deontology <i>and</i> consequentialism ^a	Religiosity: <i>r</i> w. high deontology, not w. consequentialism
[16] Deak & Saroglou (2016)	177, Belgium	9 moral dilemmas: righteousness vs. care ^b	Religiosity: <i>r</i> w. high non-caring righteousness when outcomes are not severe
[50] Kahane et al. (2018)	86 experts, UK	Positive (universalistic, impartial, care) + negative (instrumental harm) utilitarianism (scale) ^c	Religiosity: <i>r</i> . w. universalistic, impartial care; not w. instrumental harm
[51] Love et al. (2020), Study 6	890, US	Questionnaire: Formalism <i>and</i> Consequentialism ^c	Christians, Muslims, Hindus, Religiosity: high formalism <i>and</i> low consequentialism, comp. to the non-religious and Jews
[52] McPhetres et al. (2018), 3 studies and a meta-analytic summary	Total <i>N</i> = 1207, US	10 moral dilemmas: IH; scores for deontology <i>and</i> consequentialism ^a	Religiosity: high deontology <i>and</i> low utilitarianism; effect reduces if pressure (time, cognition)
[53] Piazza (2012), Study 1	82, UK + 82, US and others	Rule- vs. outcome-based bipolar reasons against 10 moral transgressions ^c	Religiosity, beyond political conservatism, predicted rule-based reasoning
Study 2	133, US	As above ^c	Rel. orthodoxy, beyond sociocognitive rigidity, predicted rule-based reasoning

[35]	Piazza & Landy (2013), Study 1	290, US	14 counter-normative acts: never-permitted, permitted, mandatory ^{a, b}	Religiosity: <i>r</i> w. low utilitarianism (permitted or mandatory, for higher good); not due to inflexible thinking
	Study 2	211, US	11 moral dilemmas: righteousness vs. care ^b	Religiosity: <i>r</i> w. high non-caring righteousness; not due to moral conservatism
[54]	Piazza & Sousa (2014), Study 1	349, US	13 counter-normative acts: never-permitted, permitted, mandatory ^{a, b}	Religiosity: <i>r</i> w. low consequentialism for higher good
	Study 2	147, US	As above, but to prevent worse/more of the same transgression	Religiosity: <i>r</i> w. low consequentialism for preventing the worse
	Study 3	192, US	Permissiveness of two harmless transgressions	Religiosity: <i>r</i> w. low permissiveness
	Saroglou et al. (2010), unpublished, Study 1	64, Belgium	9 moral dilemmas: righteousness vs. care ^b	Authoritarianism among the religious: <i>r</i> . w. high non-caring righteousness
[55]	Szekely et al. (2015)	317, Romania	12 moral dilemmas: instrumental harm ^a	One religious dimension predicted high deontology
[56]	Van Pachterbeke et al. (2011)	152, Belgium	9 moral dilemmas: righteousness vs. care ^b	Relig. priming increased high authoritarians' non-caring righteousness
[57]	Yilmaz & Bahçekapili (2015), Study 1	355, Turkey	Forsyth's Relativism subscale ^c	Religiosity: <i>r</i> w. low moral relativism
	Study 2	97, Turkey	After rel. priming: Moral objectivity & subjectivity: (1) evaluations after six scenarios, (2) scale	Relig. priming increased objectivism and decreased subjectivism
	Study 3	150, Turkey	Activating through text moral subjectivism	Belief in God: lower after activation of subjectivism, comp. to objectivism or neutral

Notes. ^a = Trolley-like moral dilemmas: absolutely not harming/killing one person (deontology) versus doing it to save more people (consequentialism: instrumental harm). ^b = Moral dilemmas: absolutely respecting other than care principles (e.g., honesty, authority) (righteous deontology) versus transgressing them to save/protect others, including proximal people (caring consequentialism). ^c = self-reported measures of moral orientation or reasoning.