

INTERRELIGIOUS DIALOGUE IN THE RELIGIOUS STYLES PERSPECTIVE:
A QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF INSTRUMENTAL CASES

By

Sally Beatrix Swanson

Ralph W. Hood Jr.
Professor of Psychology
(Chair)

David F. Ross
Professor of Psychology
(Committee Member)

Christopher F. Silver
Full-time Lecturer in Learning and Leadership
(Committee Member)

INTERRELIGIOUS DIALOGUE IN THE RELIGIOUS STYLES PERSPECTIVE:
A QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF INSTRUMENTAL CASES

By

Sally Beatrix Swanson

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the University of
Tennessee at Chattanooga in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements of the Degree of
Master of Science: Psychology

The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
Chattanooga, Tennessee

August 2019

Copyright © 2019

By Sally Beatrix Swanson

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Interreligious dialogue (IRD) is considered a sacred religious practice ([PCID], 2017; Merdjanova, 2016) and has become increasingly present in interventions to address conflict resulting from exposure to religious diversity (Cornille, 2013; Patel, 2018). However, few empirical efforts have examined the efficacy and outcomes of IRD. A grounded theory approach (Creswell & Poth, 2017) is well-suited to describe the nuanced role of religion in intergroup processes in major theoretical frameworks. Purposeful sampling (Patton, 2005) of 20 cases were selected from archival data of Faith Development Interviews (Streib & Keller, 2018) collected as part of the *Developmental change in Spirituality* project. Experiences of IRD were explored and analyzed through descriptions of instrumental cases and religious style scores. A thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) is used to identify common themes in IRD and the Religious Styles Perspective (Streib, 2001a). Implications of a theoretical framework for future research and application are discussed.

Keywords: interreligious dialogue, religious styles, religious diversity, qualitative

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people contributed to the culmination of this project to which I have immense gratitude and owe considerable thanks. First, to my advisor and mentor, Ralph W. Hood Jr., for providing the opportunity to work alongside you in the psychology of religion, travel the world, and learn from your immeasurable wisdom. A thank you alone is insufficient to describe my gratitude for your unwavering support, empowerment, and influence. I am grateful for my additional committee members, David F. Ross and Christopher F. Silver, thank you for your guidance and encouragement. Thank you to my new advisor at the University of Maine, Jordan LaBouff, for your contribution to this work and incredible mentorship. Thank you to my mentors Thomas J. Coleman III and Kimberly Rios for your excellent examples and support. Thank you to my collaborators, both those who directly and indirectly contributed to the improvement of this work: Heinz Streib, Barbara Keller, Ramona Bullik, Constantine Klein, Lotte Pummerer, Michael Nielsen, Michael Olson, Robert Arrowood, Aaron Eldridge, and Cameron Mackey. Also deserving of thanks are the following individuals for their example and encouragement: Julie Exline, Alex Uzdavines, Nick Stauner, and the rest of the “expletives” lab, Kevin Ladd, Carissa Sharp, Kaila Rogers, Jacob Strimaitis, Shane Littrell, Jessica Hacker, KC Bagley, Laird Edman, and Kathy Johnson. Thank you to the entire UTC Psychology department. Thank you to Michael Swanson and Victor Pinedo. Finally, thank you to the John Templeton Foundation for the support of this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xii
LIST OF SYMBOLS.....	xiii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. GLOBALISATION.....	4
Exposure to Religious Diversity.....	5
Relevance of Religion in Modern Conflict.....	6
Religious Conflict and Violence.....	8
Religious Violence in the United States Post-9/11.....	10
Religious Identity in Religious Violence.....	11
III. INTERRELIGIOUS DIALOGUE.....	13
The Landscape of Interreligious Dialogue.....	14
What IRD is Not.....	15
Semantics of Interfaith and Interreligious.....	16
Historical Practices.....	17
Cultural Context.....	19
Common Examples.....	21
IRD in Education.....	21
Call for Prayer.....	22
Goals and Motivation.....	23
Religious Duty.....	24
Reactions to Religious Conflict.....	25
Protection of Religious Freedom.....	26

Religious Study	27
Proclamation and Conversion	27
IV. THE EFFICACY OF INTERRELIGIOUS DIALOGUE.....	28
A framework for Understanding Interreligious Dialogue.....	29
Efficacy	30
Current Theories of Criteria for Effective Interreligious Dialogue	31
Conditions for Interreligious Dialogue	32
The Dialogue Decalogue.....	32
Dialogue and Proclamation.....	34
Emergent Themes from Theory	34
Recognizing Differences.....	34
Finding Common Ground	34
Respect for Other Religious Convictions	35
V. CONSIDERATIONS AND CRITICISM.....	37
Considerations Ignored by Current Work on Interreligious Dialogue.....	38
Identity	39
Perspective Taking.....	42
Belief Rigidity.....	43
Religious Belief	44
Religious Maturity	45
Criticisms of Interreligious Dialogue.....	45
Demographic Base in Current Practice	46
Proclamation and Conversion	47
Pluralism	48
Religious Diversity and Threat	50
Secularism.....	52
Conclusion of Criticism	53
VI. RELATED CONTRUCTS AND THEORY IN PSYCHOLOGY.....	55
Efficacy of Group Contact	58
Intergroup Bias.....	60
Intergroup Contact	60
Religion as a Social Identity	61
Social Identity Theory.....	62
Appreciation of the Other	63
VII. THE RELIGIOUS STYLES PERSPECTIVE	65
Fowler	65
Religious Styles Perspective	67
Changes in theory Prior to the Religious Styles Perspective	69

The Religious Styles	72
Subjective.....	73
Instrumental-Reciprocal.....	73
Mutual	73
Individuative-Systemic	74
Dialogical	74
The Faith Development Interview	74
Questions that Elicit Topics on Interreligious Dialogue.....	77
VIII. INTEGRATING INTERRELIGIOUS DIALOGUE IN THE RELIGIOUS STYLES PERSPECTIVE.....	79
Interreligious Dialogue in the Religious Styles Model Aspects	80
Perspective Taking Aspect.....	80
Characterizations of religious style in the Perspective Taking Aspect.....	83
Relation to IRD by Styles	84
Social Horizon Aspect	86
Relation to IRD by Styles	86
Characterizations of religious style in the Social Horizon Aspect	87
Morality Aspect	89
Relation to IRD by Styles	89
Locus of Authority Aspect.....	91
Relation to IRD by Styles	91
Form of World Coherence Aspect	91
Relation to IRD by Styles	91
Characterizations of religious style in the Form of World Coherence Aspect	93
Symbolic Function Aspect.....	94
Relation to IRD by Styles	94
IX. RATIONALE FOR STUDY.....	95
Qualitative Design	97
Research Hypotheses	99
X. METHOD	101
Participants	101
Materials	101
The Faith Development Interview	101
Religious Styles Scores.....	103
Analysis Procedure	103
XI. RESULTS	105
Interpretation.....	106

Instrumental-Reciprocal.....	107
Major themes	109
Mutual	110
Major themes	118
Individuative-Systemic	118
Major themes	125
Dialogical.....	125
Major themes	128
Major Themes Across Religious Styles	128
Analysis of Frequency of Word and Phrases.....	129
 XII. DISCUSSION	 132
Limitations	134
Future Directions	134
REFERENCES	136
APPENDIX	
A. IRD EXEMPT LETTER.....	153
B. FAITH DEVELOPMENT INTERVIEW	156
VITA	158

LIST OF TABLES

11.1 Religious Styles of Participants	106
11.2 Major Themes across Religious Styles	129
11.3 WordStat Word Frequencies	130
11.4 WordStat Phrase Frequencies	131

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 11.1 WordStat Word Cloud.....	130
--------------------------------------	-----

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

FBI, Federal Bureau of Investigation

FDI, Faith Development Interview

IRD, Interreligious Dialogue

PCID, Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue

RSP, Religious Styles Perspective

LIST OF SYMBOLS

N , Number Population Size

n , Number Sample Size

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Forced globalization is the problem of this generation. – Ralph W. Hood Jr., personal communication (2018)

There will be no peace among the nations without peace among the religions. There will be no peace among the religions without *dialogue* among the religions. – Hans Küng, Address at the opening of the Exhibit on the World's Religions at Santa Clara University (2005)

Interreligious Dialogue (IRD) has become an increasingly visible topic in the global religious landscape. The popularity of the topic is attributed, in part, as a response to globalization that provides an increased prospect for individuals to be exposed to diverse religions (Bainbridge, 2003; Patel, 2018). Perhaps, as a result of globalization, the practice of IRD as a sacred religious imperative and opportunity has gained prominence among a variety of religious traditions ([PCID], 2017; Abdool, Potgieter, Van der Walt, & Wolhuter, 2007). Many religions promote dialogue between the religions engaged with religions who differ from their own as a sacred religious duty to encourage both personal development and peacebuilding inherent in religious teachings ([PCID], 2017; Merdjanova, 2016). Theologians, practitioners, and scholars have positioned IRD as a critical practice in the movement to build global peace and combating complex and intractable social conflicts attributed to religion (Knitter, 2013; Merdjanova, 2016; Patel, 2012). Dialogue between the religions is likely to grow as a result of the continued and rapid encounter of diverse religious beliefs and practices in communities that have previously been more homogeneous (Streib & Klein, 2018). Popular efforts endorse the

affinity between religions through practices of IRD as an overwhelmingly positive experience with constructive outcomes however, any effort to engage in religious diversity must recognize the potential threats that may come as a result of increased exposure to issues inherent in globalization.

If practices of IRD wish to be used as an intervention to global conflicts, dialogue must engage with issues of problem-solving and discourse (Swidler, 2016) to answer important questions that arise from conflicts between religions. Some of these questions have substantial consequence to public policy and global relations. For example, common questions that are increasingly at the center of debate include: “Can this religion worship here?,” “Can this religion build a sacred space here?,” and “Can members of this religion wear religious garb?” The answers that result from these questions often provoke critical dichotomous decisions that may affect the religious freedoms of religious adherents. By examining the resulting discourse from important considerations for religious freedom and other important motives and goals of religions in contact, we can empirically and systematically explore the impact and efficacy of IRD practices.

A responsible first step in understanding any phenomena of IRD, particularly given the weight attributed to the results of successful practice, is to examine the existent theories that aim to understand IRD and the efficacy of IRD outcomes. Current theories range across disciplines; however, there is no systematic integration of theory that builds upon existent theory and ideas or attempts to discern any distinct element of IRD in a landscape of practices that involves a variety of motives and goals across various levels of dialogue. A range of considerations and criticisms of IRD practices should be acknowledged in tandem with an integration of IRD constructs to areas of inquiry that are well-grounded in established theoretical framework and well-suited to

provide a basic understanding of IRD. In this inquiry of IRD, practices and perceptions of IRD efficacy from case study narratives are integrated with the Religious Styles Perspective (Streib, 2001a). An understanding through this theoretical lens helps answer criticisms of IRD and build toward a theoretical foundation for future empirical research and understanding of the impact and efficacy of IRD practices.

CHAPTER II

GLOBALISATION

In an increasingly globalized world, interreligious conflict is at a high. Religious leaders, policy makers, and government leaders around the globe have responded to the inherent challenges of religious globalization with substantial efforts to encourage peace, cooperation, and protection of religious freedoms by promoting IRD to reduce conflict (Cornille, 2013; Patel, 2018). Globalization allows for an increased awareness of other religious beliefs creating an increasingly saturated religious marketplace with competing sacred ideas (Bainbridge, 2003) and a uniquely modern landscape of religion (Berger, 2014; Scheitle & Finke, 2012). Dialogue between the religions is likely to be pronounced as a result of the continued and rapid encounter of alien religious beliefs and practices introduced to previously analogous communities (Streib & Klein, 2018). Any effort to engage relations between religions must acquiesce that conflicts arising from globalization are improbable to abate creating a clear need for interventions to combat complex conflicts as a result. Changes in religious demographics, as a result of globalization in the United States, effectively describes a new religious landscape (Eck, 2002; Scheitle & Finke, 2012). Globalization changes the shape of identity by impacting international identities in reaction to constructs like xenophobia (Ariely, 2017). Historically, the religions have easily ignored each other, if desired, or, at worst, have led violent intractable conflicts (Moyaert, 2013).

Exposure to Religious Diversity

Forced globalization means increased exposure to religious diversity. When describing religious diversity, this refers both to religious out-group members and religious members who have alien or novel religious beliefs (Streib & Klein, 2018). History provides ample evidence of religious belief or affiliation leading to tension and violence more often than documented peaceful co-existence. Some scholars suggest the result of globalization fuels religious violence and global conflicts (Moghaddam, 2008). Religion tends to be associated with prejudice against other people with different religious affiliations (Streib & Klein, 2014). The polarity of religion is often noted to lead both to violence and peace (Beck, 2010). Allport (1954) famously described the paradoxical role of religion to both “make” and “unmake” prejudice. Religion influences millions of adherents and the critical role that religion plays in shaping cultural, social, and political factors cannot be overlooked (Paul, 1965; Timmerman & Segaert, 2007). Some scholar suggest that more evil is done in the name of religion than anything else (S. Harris, 2005) with some focusing on the negative outcome of religious like prejudice, intergroup conflict, and war (Durrant & Poppelwell, 2017). Some cite religion to be the greatest influence in the world (Prothero, 2007). Religion is one of the most controversial subjects, likely in part due to the recognition of the catastrophic outcomes that can result from disagreements over incompatible sacred and sensitive subjects. Religion is unique in part due to the comprehensive nature of its explanatory power (Hood Jr., Hill, & Williamson, 2005). Some evidence shows support for prosocial behavior and aggressive behavior tied to religion that relate to distinct out-group targets (Blogowska, Lambert, & Saroglou, 2013). Increased diversity in the United States does not necessarily lead to a more tolerant landscape (Craig & Richeson, 2014; Merino, 2010).

In the 21st century, the effects of globalization are described as a “diversity paradox” where increased exposure to diverse ideological identities, like religion, can lead to consequences of threat or viable opportunities for positive contact (Craig, Rucker, & Richeson, 2018; Rattan & Ambady, 2013). A more saturated religious marketplace may have consequences for religion and views of religious freedom and perceived choice (Finke, 1997; Finke & Stark, 1998; Hurd, 2017). Some attend to the pro-social consequences of religion (Batson, 1976), which has resulted in much debate.

Relevance of Religion in Modern Conflict

Interreligious dialogue is inescapably tied to conversations about religious freedom because many argue that interreligious dialogue is a consequence of the protection of religious freedoms. There are no shortages of examples of the religions in conflict. In fact, many in opposition to religion claim that religion, by nature, creates violence and conflict (Cornille, 2013). Approaches to dialogue aim to use interreligious perspectives to confront religion’s inexplicable tie to religiously sanctioned violence and terrorism (Al-Khattar, 2003).

History provides ample evidence for the encounter of other religious beliefs leading to tension and violence. Since WWI, there have been dozens of genocides. In the 1930s, approximately 20 million people were killed during Stalin’s Great Terror followed by the genocide of Jews, Gypsies, Jehovah’s Witnesses, and other groups deemed enemies of the German state in Nazi Germany that totaled over 10 million deaths. In the 1970s, 1.7 million Cambodians were killed by Khmer Rouge. In the 1980s, 50,000 Kurds were killed in the ethnic cleansing of Anfal in Iraq. In the 1990s, over 300,000 Muslims were killed in Bosnia and in Rwanda over 1 million Tutsis and Hutus were killed (Cornille, 2008; Merdjanova, 2016).

Historically, outcomes of the religions in contact have focused on the resulting animosity and the little concerted effort required to exemplify the catastrophic outcomes of the religions in conflict (Cornille, 2008).

Investigations of contact between religions have highlighted the history of catastrophic outcomes of religions in conflict (Cornille, 2008; Patel, 2012). While religion is rarely the sole reason for conflict, conflicts are often attributed to religious beliefs and those beliefs are used with some frequency to justify intergroup violence (Cornille, 2013). Recent data on global hate crimes, persecutions, and deaths that are attributed to religious beliefs suggest the severity of the conflict related to religion (Center, 2018; Justice, 2017). While religion is inextricably tied to helping behavior, altruism, and pro-sociality (Galen, 2012; Myers, 2012; Saroglou, 2012), the focus is primarily on the results of the bad of religion which describes a polarized view of the outcomes of religion (Beck, 2010; Marty, 1997). James asked whether religion was a help or a hindrance, asking if the good brought by religion outweighed its associated harm (James, 1950). Allport (1954) famously noted the dichotomous outcome of religion to make or unmake prejudice. The narrative of the result of religion to bring about good or bad is of one of the most frequently asked questions about religion.

As a result, one interest of social psychologists has been the predictive nature of religion to lead to helping or discrimination (Nielsen, Hatton, & Donahue, 2013, p. 313). Far more research has documented religious prejudice than examples of its reduction (Nielsen et al., 2013, p. 320). As well, religious ideology simultaneously sanctions and condemns support of the social welfare (Malka, Soto, Cohen, & Miller, 2011). The result of religious persecution and the threat of revoking religious rights and freedoms in the United States has gained attention as a result of

the global religious landscape (Grim & Finke, 2010; Hurd, 2017; Sullivan, Hurd, Mahmood, & Danchin, 2015).

The history of religious violence and conflict is somewhat ignored in the West, but the consequences of strife are as relevant as ever. In fact, religious violence appears to be most noticed by the West when individuals who affiliated with a religious group commit acts of violence that affect a Western audience. However, the intersection between religions and conflict is not infrequent. Religion is still a critically important factor in the contemporary world.

Religious Conflict and Violence

Religious affiliation and belief are often used, and even lent themselves, to the task of justifying violence or discrimination toward other religious groups and individuals (Cornille, 2013; Ginges, Hansen, & Norenzayan, 2009). Violence believed to be sanctioned by God results in increased aggression among believers (Bushman, Ridge, Das, Key, & Busath, 2007).

Individuals and groups are regularly targeted on the basis of religious belief and affiliation.

Recent data on global hate crimes, persecution, and death attributed to various facets of holding religious identity support the notion of a thriving catastrophe (Center, 2018; Justice, 2017).

Global restrictions on religion, social hostilities toward religions, and upticks in nationalist activities are on the rise with harassment of religious groups at its highest since 2007 (Center, 2018). While the most common report of religious conflict is typically viewed as isolated hate crimes or acts of terrorism, religious conflict and war resulted in the displacement of 31.4 million people in 2014, which increased by over 4 million people from the previous year (Center, 2014).

Violence and discrimination against religious groups by government and varying religious out-groups has reached new heights in all regions of the world except the U.S. and Americas (Center,

2014). Hostility and attacks on minority faiths have increased, especially in the Middle East and North Africa (Center, 2013). Hostility can range from the vandalization of religious property to violent assaults that result in death. The level of restrictions of religion is recorded as “very high” in 39% of countries where 5.5 billion, or 77% of the world’s population, reside (Center, 2013). These lead to religious conflict and open doors to persecution (Grim & Finke, 2010). In 2013, 158 countries (80%,) had no formal ban on religion, while 21 countries (10%) formally ban religion due to issues that are not cited as security bans, 6 countries (3%) ban religion explicitly for security reasons, and the remained 13 countries (6%) have bans on religion for a combination of both security and non-security reasons (Center, 2018). At 39% of harassment incidents and hostility, an all-time high of harassment against Jews was recorded in 2013 compared to 26% in 2007 (Center, 2018).

Where there is distinctive geographical separation between groups that does not allow for diversity, the perception of polarizing religious differences increases. Examples of modern real-world religious violence are notable in Nigeria, Sri Lanka, The Balkans, Papua New Guinea, and at the Israel/Gaza border. In conflict resolution in Kenya, religious radicalization is determinants of religious radicalization (Rink & Sharma, 2018). In Nigeria, conflicts have been sustained by the Islamic Radical group, Boko Haram. Violence is in part due to competition for land, water, and resources from Libya and there is an increasing conflict between the Nigerian president and the influx of gunmen in Nigeria. A conflict between crop farmers and herdsman is ongoing and such violence is stoked in both ethnic and religious division. Violence is worsening between predominantly Christian farmers and predominantly Muslim herders who are competing for space and are separated by geographic regions with the Muslims in the north and Christian in the

south. In this region, an attack occurred at a Catholic church that left 19 dead (Mbachu & Ibukun, 2018).

Religious Violence in the United States Post-9/11

In the United States post 9/11, revived prejudice against Islam with the perception of Islam as a religion that promotes violence and that Muslims are inherently militant and irrational. Islam has become an integral part of the American religious landscape, but American Muslims are often perceived as extremist groups (Haddad & Harb, 2014). Anti-Muslim hate crimes are the highest they have been since 9/11. Religiously motivated hate crimes were up 23% and hate crimes against Muslims were up 67% in 2015 (Kishi, 2015).

In the United States, the most recent hate crime statistics indicate 21% of all reported hate crimes are an offense motivated or prompted by religious bias and the second highest motivation being race and ethnicity. Religiously biased hate crimes were most prevalent against Jews (54%) and Muslims (25%). All other affiliations make up less than 5% of reported biases related to hate crimes (Justice, 2017; Kishi, 2015). Recently, executive orders banning refugees and immigrants from seven predominantly Muslim countries were met with protests at major airports across the U.S. The Public Religion Research Institute (2015) found that relatively few Americans regularly interact with Muslims, 36% saying they have never had a conversation and 30% saying they have occasional interactions with someone who is a Muslim. Only 8% reported daily interactions with Muslims. Americans who have had a conversation with Muslims, at least occasionally in the past year, express much more positive views of Muslims than those who report less regular interaction (Cooper, 2017; Cox & Jones, 2015).

Before 9/11, interreligious dialogue efforts were dismissed as feel-good affairs, which have shifted to an increase in interest toward interventions that increase cooperation (Swidler & Mojzes, 2000; Takim, 2004). Americans, particularly those under 30, are expressing more warm attitudes towards religious groups (Center, 2017). As a result, a cultural shift of peacemaking has emerged, particularly in younger generations. IRD is framed by generational differences (Patel & Brodeur, 2006). Eboo Patel, the leader of interfaith youth core (IFYC), describes a generation of interreligious dialogue (Patel, 2016).

Religious Identity in Religious Violence

The United States also highlights an interesting phenomenon about religious identity where Americans evaluate the various religious affiliations of individuals who have committed acts of violence. In a 2015 report by The Public Religion Research Institute (PRRI), 75% of Americans denounced the Christian identity of individuals who committed acts of violence in the name of Christianity. When considering self-identified Muslims who committed acts of violence in the name of Islam, only 50% of Americans denounced the individual's religious identity. When asked if individuals who committed acts of violence were really their respective religious affiliation, Americans reported 19% of Christians who committed the acts were "really Christian" and 39% of Muslims who committed the acts were "really Muslim" (Cox & Jones, 2015). These findings highlight the important nuance in context-specific perceptions of religious identity and affiliation. The role of religious identity and related beliefs are woven into attitudes and stereotypes about religious others. This relationship can lead to a continuation of religiously fueled bias if stereotypes about religious identities remain unconsidered in interreligious group relations.

Groups organized by ideology, like religion, engaged in collective action that can lead to conflict (Cohrs, 2012). Violence frequently involves a small group that believes that sacred values of the group are threatened by a larger group (Ginges, Atran, Sachdeva, & Medin, 2011). Ideological groups determine what issues might be worth fighting for (Cohrs, 2012). In some circumstances, group ideology can contribute to conflict (Cohrs, 2012). Exposure to religiously sanctioned violence increases levels of aggression among the religious (Bushman et al., 2007). With religious conflict still at the forefront of global relations, it is evident that attention should be brought to understanding the conflict between groups in religious contexts and why so many efforts have been created with the aim of improving the relations that are the cause of disturbance.

CHAPTER III

INTERRELIGIOUS DIALOGUE

Practices of what may be considered IRD proliferate. These range in practice from academic discourse, to constructions of dialogue (Abdool et al., 2007). Some dialogue rests on the goal of understanding others across religious differences. Interreligious Dialogue is increasingly relevant in a world of forced globalization. IRD is a necessary component for peace simply because religion is often attributed to the cause of conflict (Cornille, 2013). Accordingly, religious leaders, policy makers, and government leaders around the globe have responded to the inherent challenges of religious globalization with a substantial effort to promote IRD as an intervention to encourage peace, cooperation, and protection of religious freedoms (Cheetham, Pratt, & Thomas, 2013). IRD aims to address complex situations but is most popularly promoted and relevant where religious identity is tied to another identity in which there is conflict. In complex intergroup relations, it may be easier to erroneously identify people's political affiliation and intentions based on their religious affiliations. In this pursuit of peace, hundreds of groups and initiatives committed to IRD have emerged around the globe with aims not only to promote tolerance but also to develop interreligious understanding that allows diverse believers to cooperate and better serve the world and their common prosocial goals (Merdjanova, 2016; Patel & Brodeur, 2006). Opportunities are the potential for peaceful co-existence (Cornille, 2013). This is supported by many religious groups who suggest IRD is the route to global peace.

Dialogue among the religions is suggested as a vital first step of peacebuilding in complex religious conflicts (Merdjanova & Brodeur, 2009; Orton, 2007). Part of the problem in exploring Interreligious Dialogue is that it is often unclear what people are referring to. Diverse forms of IRD compliment and reinforce each other as well as overlap. Furthermore, IRD can be oriented toward particular groups, such as youth dialogue, gender, and occupation (like between theologians, clergymen, lay people, or scholars of religion). Due to the complexity and the infinite variants of IRD, there are potentially infinite outcomes of such practices. IRD acts as a counterbalance to religious violence and conflict. Interfaith cooperation is the active engagement of religious diversity toward a constructive end (Eck, 2002).

Dialogue on a global basis is now a possibility and is viewed as a necessity. Leonard Swidler, founder of the Dialogue Institute, preaches that humanity is faced with an important dichotomous choice: “Dialogue or Death!” (Swidler, 2016). However, interventions including incompatible sacred beliefs and ideological systems pose a challenge for international policy and negotiations (Argo & Ginges, 2015).

The Landscape of Interreligious Dialogue

The KAICIID International Dialogue Center has identified over 500 international organizations promoting IRD (KAICIID, 2018). Within the US alone there are hundreds of such groups. More than a decade ago, an ethnographic report of interfaith and interreligious groups by the Harvard Pluralism Project of 20 major metro areas in the United States indicated there were approximately 20 groups in each city that explicitly welcomed IRD or had a mission to create tolerance between differing religious groups (Eck, 2006). IRD can center around religion or it can be secularized. IRD practice greatly vary in practices, motivation, and goals. IRD ranges in

participants (laypeople, religious leaders, policy makers, theologians), structure (local, community-based, national, international), and a variety of themes (Moyaert, 2013).

For this research, I am most interested in the types of dialogue that have the goal of changing attitudes toward other religious groups or individuals. Approaches to dialogue aim to use interreligious perspectives to confront religion's inexplicable tie to religiously sanctioned violence and terrorism (Al-Khattar, 2003; Pratt, 2016). An exchange between representatives of a variety of religious beliefs that aim to address issues of mutual concern.

What IRD is Not

The primary interest in the current study is in the dialogue between physical individuals or groups who represent the belief systems that they affiliate with, not isolated exposure of religious texts and ideologies. Therefore, a Christian studying the Qur'an represents the intermingling of ideas which may be in dialogue, but in the view of this author, IRD is best viewed by the interactions between a Christian and Muslim. Solely studying the beliefs of others isolated from considerations about group membership and individuals in the group presents a likely important aspect of motivation and outcomes of IRD, but is better understood as a separate construct, likely religious studies, theology, or philosophy. This is the impact of the ideas of differing religions, which certainly have interesting outcomes. However, the view of IRD is the dialogue between religious groups rather than the ideologies they represent. Dialogue is not intended to represent debate (Swidler, 2014).

Semantics of Interfaith and Interreligious

Interreligious dialogue practices can also be called interfaith practices and sometimes are referred to as pluralism (Eck, 2002), ecumenicalism, inter-culturalism (Flunger & Ziebertz, 2010; Timmerman & Segaert, 2007), or syncretism (Cheetham et al., 2013). There are many attempts to conceptualize what IRD is, but, for our purpose, we believe IRD is the interaction between groups or individuals who represented different religions (either by affiliation, belief, or other element of religious identity).

A useful distinction should be made between the semantics of interreligious dialogue and interfaith dialogue. These terms are often used interchangeably and a stance on their distinction has yet to be adapted or popularized. Some work has even broadened the types of activities, which may be quickly labeled as IRD, as inter-worldview dialogue (Brodeur, 2019) or as inter-ideological dialogue (Swidler, 1983, 2014). Pluralism, the preferred terminology of Diane Eck, founder and director of the Harvard Pluralism Project, similarly describes an encounter of religious differences based on dialogue (Eck, 2006, 2007).

However, the most popular terms “religious” or “faith” that are used to describe a phenomenon range of religious intergroup relations may relate to different connotations of religious expression or experience. An adoption of one descriptor of a practice or groups may indicate to those outside of the group or those unaware of the core aims of the group that a certain type of effort or practice is being claimed. In the context of the research described by this work, I prefer to use the term interreligious dialogue. Religion best encompasses a group where faith seems to represent more of the beliefs held by members of the group. Because the current study has a focus on the efficacy group processes and broadly aims to discuss efficacy of group relations, rather than a primary focus on individual development and a dialogue between

ideologies, interreligious seems the more appropriate term to describe phenomena broadly described as IRD. While ideologies and beliefs are irrevocably a critical element of dialogue between religions, IRD seems to suggest a larger process that encompasses the types of activities that may be more narrowly described by interfaith dialogue.

The misunderstanding of the meaning of terms remains an obstacle to dialogue (Paul, 1965). IRD is also not to be confused with intra-religious or intra-faith dialogue. These activities are best described as dialogue within one religious tradition where an umbrella term or group label is acknowledged to be shared or in common. A communication between individuals who hold the same views is suggested to be a better description of reinforcement rather than dialogue (Swidler, 2014).

Historical Practices

IRD can range from meetings between political leaders as a sign of solidarity and friendships, a place for discussion and debate, collaboration of members of religious groups to support a common project, to interreligious prayer and spiritual exchanges (Swidler, 2013). This is particularly problematic in the application of IRD as an intervention with a lofty goal to increase positive communications between religious groups. Given the range of approaches and techniques currently practiced and the wide variety of geographic, political, and social contexts in which they take place, it is increasingly important to develop methodologies to evaluate what work (Adams, Rawls, Audi, & Wolterstorff, 2013). It is also important to note that scale of IRD varies greatly. Some IRD can be described as individuals meeting over something small and others may be leaders who aim to change policy where people's lives hang in the balance.

The Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue (PCID) formed by Pope Paul VI in 1965 decrees three reasons to for the creation of the now foundational religious text in interreligious dialogue, the *Nostra Aetate*: (1) to promote collaboration founded on a mutual understanding and respect between Catholics and other religious traditions, (2) to encourage the study of other religions, and (3) to promote a formation of individuals who share a dedication to dialogue. The document also notes four types of dialogue: Dialogue of Life, Dialogue of Action, Dialogue of Theological Exchange, and Dialogue of Religious Experience. Dialogue of Life is concerned with the sharing of common human afflictions. Dialogue of Action is a collaborative effort to support the development and freedom of people. Dialogue of Theological exchange is the sharing of religious study. Dialogue of Religious Experience is the sharing of experiential action attributed to religion. The type of dialogue that most relates to the focus of this research is the Dialogue of Action. While other types of dialogue likely cannot be distinguished from a distinct Dialogue of Action and are woven together in interconnected applications, Dialogue of Action reflects the desire of religious groups and leaders to use IRD as an intervention to promote peace among religious groups.

Leonard Swidler (2014) founder and president of the Dialogue Institute, proposes that IRD should be understood as distinct operations in four areas: Dialogue of the Head, Hands, Heart, and Holy, which somewhat parallel the types of dialogues defined by the PCID (1965). Dialogue of the Hands relates to what Swidler describes as practical dialogue where there is collaboration to help humanity. Dialogue of the Heart is an attempt to experience religious expressions from the other's perspective. Dialogue of the Head relates to utilizing dialogue to seek understanding and truth. Swidler relates this area to cognitive components of dialogue. Dialogue of the Holy describes the wholeness of experiences where there is harmony in

ideology. The majority of IRD efforts are interventions to create lasting peace and what we focus on as a foundation for understanding IRD best relates to Swidler's Dialogue of the Head.

Additional typologies that consider Dialogue of Life, practical Dialogue of Action, theological dialogue, spiritual dialogue, and diplomatic dialogue have been conceptualized in an attempt to exemplify the variety of motives and needs to be addressed from diverse practices of IRD (Moyaert, 2013).

Cultural Context

There are many contexts that change the dynamic of interreligious dialogue. In societies where religions are free to practice whatever faith they choose, the stressors that may be placed on dialogue may be different than those societies where there is no legal free market of religion. Despite considerable increased practice of IRD for a variety of motives, the dearth of research current in the scientific study of IRD has a continued reliance on the understanding of practices from a Western perspective that fails to understand IRD as a culturally diverse, integrative, global phenomena. Additionally, current practices of IRD fail to employ appropriate contextually valid methods and theoretical perspectives informed by scholars around the globe. Even without considering important global contexts, the extent to which these practices have evidential, beneficial, or effective outcomes is unclear. A range of beliefs held by a range of religions poses a challenge for international negotiations where even the best intentions to respect sacred beliefs of all religions is thwarted by discrepancies between religions and incompatibility of what is held sacred (Argo & Ginges, 2015; Patel, 2018).

After 9/11, IRD entered the spotlight as a potentially viable solution to religious violence and extremism (Brodeur, 2005). Due to cultural changes in perceptions of need for dialogue,

IRD has been pushed to the forefront of hopeful interventions for peace (Cornille & Corigliano, 2012; Pratt, 2016). Previously, in the US, IRD was viewed as a primarily feel-good affair with any primary goal of IRD to be personal development or transformation (Brodeur, 2005). The perception of IRD shifted as public responses to IRD were viewed as an intervention to global and highly publicized religious violence that unavoidably impacted the West. Within the US alone there are hundreds of groups engaging in or promoting IRD. more than a decade ago, an ethnographic report of interfaith and interreligious groups by the Harvard Pluralism Project of 20 major metro areas cities in the United States indicated there were approximately 20 groups in each city that explicitly welcomed IRD or had a mission to create tolerance between differing religious groups (Eck, 2006). Awareness of the rising number of groups focused on IRD in workplaces, communities, and educational systems in the United States continues to develop (Patel, 2018). However, a limited focus has been directed toward a similar understanding of the efforts of IRD practices around the globe, particularly in those areas where religious conflict is most rampant.

Although some research has begun to investigate IRD in the United States (Patel, 2018), a limited focus has been directed toward a similar understanding of the efforts of IRD practices around the globe, particularly among non-western cultures and religions and in the contexts where interreligious conflict is most severe. Given the goals of IRD to promote understanding and reduce religious conflict in an increasingly globalized world, it is imperative that any scientific understanding of IRD be situated in a truly global program of research.

Common Examples

IRD commonly presents itself in meetings between religious leaders, often as a sign of solidarity, in discussion and debate, in collaborations between members of religious groups to support a project, and in interreligious prayer or spiritual exchanges (Cornille, 2013). IRD is also cited as a reaction to violence where a single individual, who may affiliate with a religious group, is perceived as a representative of an entire religious group, such as Boko Haram, ISIS, or ISIL. IRD is frequently used as an intervention to protect and keep safe other members of the religious group who are unaffiliated with individuals that promote violence and commit acts of terror (Swidler, 2013).

IRD in Education

Religious diversity issues ought to be engaged more positively and cooperatively in strategic ways, often by creating plans to have courses, curriculums, workshops, and programs to hold these practices and encouraged interreligious dialogue (Patel & Brodeur, 2006). The Interfaith Youth Core, a non-profit founded in 2002 by Eboo Patel, aims to create opportunity for interreligious dialogue among students on college campuses (Core, 2018) and remains a trailblazer for educational programs on religious diversity. Various handbooks have emerged as a result of experience of leaders in the Interfaith Youth Core to guide practices of dialogue among the religions in student affairs and on university campuses (Patel, 2016). Similarly, a focus on the challenge of diversity on identity and group contact on college campuses and received limited attention (Sidanius, Levin, van Laar, & Sears, 2010).

Some proponents of IRD suggest engagement with religious others in school curriculum is an unavoidable civic duty (Abdool et al., 2007). For example, academic affairs often look at a

range of diversity matters, but often religious diversity is left out of the conversation. We see a parallel exclusion in the empirical research of religious diversity in current psychology. The dearth of research on intergroup contact and violence on religion is meager in comparison to the rate of other diversity matters and identities that are considered in current conversations and interventions.

Streib (2001c) deals with issues of interreligious negotiations, which we can understand as an application and element of a broad conceptualization of IRD in European students. (Streib, 2001b) echoes the lack of attention toward inter-religious issues in religious education. This chapter reflects on the neglected question of how students perceive and deal with religious diversity.

Call for Prayer

In real-world approaches, after the attack the Catholic Church in Nigeria, religious leaders called for united prayer as the best way to stop conflict (Mbachu & Ibukun, 2018). This call to action not only demonstrates a need for IRD to bring people together, but also is an interesting call for prayer as a valuable commodity and spiritual resource to be utilized to solve a conflict by appeal to God and works that are sanctioned by spiritual warfare rather than efforts to combat religious violence by secular means. Research on resource scarcity may aid to an understanding of this method of participation in IRD, which is particularly interesting as it relates to unique religious aspects. What perceived spiritual resources exist? What other benefits are there to the inclusion of religious others in shared rituals that rely upon the faith of others to be effective like some group prayer is perceived to be? The implications of the motives of individuals who engage in IRD, citing the need for IRD by following religious principles to

come together in prayer. The desire for interfaith prayer illuminates interesting, but unclear perceptions about the sources of the efficacy of IRD. Continued research on the call to prayer should look at the distinction of the symbolic meaning of group prayer and the literal collection of spiritual resources of group prayer.

Goals and Motivation

Many people may come to the same conclusion of turning their focus toward interreligious dialogue, but the routes for getting to that conclusion, the understanding of the impact of that conclusion, and what they hope to accomplish with conclusions that vary infinitely (Eck, 2007). This lack of a cohesive story for individuals involved in IRD practices is important in understanding their purposes for coming together and the ultimate aims of the dialogue in impacting the effectiveness and outcomes of dialogue. To look at a theory of motivation on religious behavior, contextual cues that regulate contingent motivation must be included (Kirkpatrick, 2013, p. 131). Additionally, the use of God to understand religious motivated goals (Emmons & Schnitker, 2013, p. 256) and belief in God leads to stronger goal commitments (Landau, Khenfer, Keefer, Swanson, & Kay, 2018) should be considered.

Streib (2001c) says this is embedded in a “theoretical, philosophical-phenomenological framework.” This research focused on the primary aims of what specific parts of experiences are most important to students and what skills and competencies are required of students to engage with religious diversity presented through religious education. In the cases, an 11th grade German class describes a discussion over the question “does God exist?” and describes a conversation between a Muslim, Turkish immigrant; an atheist; and a Protestant immigrant from Poland, which describes some argument between the three students. Purposeful action prompted

by religion provide a source of meaning to goals and an understanding of religion as a meaning-making system that cannot ignore goal centrality in the generation of meaning (Emmons, 1999; Emmons & Schnitker, 2013; Hood Jr. & Belzen, 2013, p. 256). Religion sanctifies personal goals (Pargament & Mahoney, 2005) and leads to effective goal-direct behavior (Schnitker & Emmons, 2013).

Many IRD practices fail to explicitly articulate the goals of the programs that are likely to lead to any results, personal development, decreased violence, or otherwise. A distinction must be made about IRD as a phenomenon for which religious leaders are promoting as a real avenue for promoting peace and whether the route of investing in IRD to achieve goals as large as world peace and resulting in beneficial outcomes in places where there is intractable conflict is realistic or attainable is beyond the scope of this project. However, if effort is concerted toward the practice and promotion of IRD, it is worth understanding broadly, and importantly addressing and understanding the places in which IRD facilitation can produce outcomes that are effective in moving toward the goals of the groups who are invested in this practice.

Religious Duty

Many individuals and religious groups view learning about religious others as a religious duty (Seul, 1999). This is supported by claims made by theologians. Scholars in theology have widely promoted interreligious dialogue as not only a solution to such conflicts but also as a religious duty ([PCID], 2017). For example, there are many religiously oriented groups dedicated to increasing and promoting interreligious dialogue, such as the Monastic Interreligious Dialogue group, Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue, and The World Council of Churches. The Dalai Lama has written extensive texts on the value of interreligious dialogue as a universal

responsibility (Lama, 1976). The roots of interreligious dialogue were found in the ecumenical, or interfaith, movement, with the goal being to find an ecumenical commonality within an assortment of religious groups (Swidler, 2013).

IRD is an imperative and sacred religious experience (Abdool et al., 2007). Many belief systems not only taught dialogue between the religions as a sacred religious duty, but also as a place that enriches personal development and supports peacebuilding inherent in religious teachings (Merdjanova, 2016). Theologians and scholars have positioned IRD as a critical practice in the peace movement to combat social conflict between religions and attributed to religion (Merdjanova, 2016). As a result, there may be some overlap in group motives to support the peacebuilding aspects of religion and the pro-social outcomes related to religion that may be relevant to understanding overlapping motives in IRD. Personal transformation is remarked by some to be the greatest impact of interreligious practices (Brodeur, 2005).

Reactions to Religious Conflict

There is considerable weight put on IRD as a strategy to promote global peace. The aim for these groups, who wish to advocate for tolerance should be to figure out processes that have evidence of working and, more importantly, what works in what contexts. Interventions should not be one-size-fits-all and should consider the variety of religious experiences and nuances that impact the types of conflict that are involved in the complex webs that the groups aim to improve. IRD acts as a counterbalance to religious violence and conflict. The international interreligious dialogue movement holds a crucial role in promoting tolerance, yet international organizations remain economically unstable (Brodeur, 2005; Patel, 2018)

Protection of Religious Freedom

The protection of religious freedoms has been a popular motive to promote the need for IRD in the United States (Sullivan et al., 2015). Some perspectives examine the results of religious persecution and taking away of religious rights and freedoms in the United States (Grim & Finke, 2010) while others highlight the challenges of global restrictions of religious freedom (Hurd, 2017). Similarly, a restriction to religious freedoms are the increasingly common violence and deaths occurring at religious spaces and places of worship. For example, in the last few years many there have been highly publicized, salient reminders of religious violence in places of worship: the catholic church in Nigeria that killed 19; the shooting at the Tree of Life Synagogue in Pittsburgh, PA on November 4, 2018; the shooting at the mosque in Christchurch, New Zealand on March 15, 2019 that left 50 dead; and Catholic Churches bombed on Easter in Sri Lanka left over 300 dead in April 22, 2019. In reaction, religious leaders and members of religious groups are coming together in solidarity to ensure all who wish to practice religion may do so safely.

Considering recent increases in religious violence, religious groups are increasingly showing support for each other against violence (Religious News Service, 2019). In a 2016 report by the FBI, hate crimes in public places are highlighted the need to protect religious spaces. When hate crimes are reported as being due to a religious bias, crimes were reported at the following locations: 20% in or near residences/homes, 15% in religious spaces, 12% at schools/college, and less than 10% in other locations. This is also the lowest percentage happening at homes in comparison to other hate crimes which primarily happen at homes, suggesting an increased danger for religious hate crimes at religious centers (U.S. Department of Justice, 2017).

Religious Study

An additional opportunity is the promise for spiritual growth (Cornille, 2013). It is important to note that many practices of what people may consider IRD are simply the encounter of religious content or ideas that differ from one's own through engagement with religious study that does not require any interaction with an individual or group. Religious or spiritual growth does not require dialogue, but some interaction with other faith is believed essential for some to achieve growth. The *Nostra Aetate* (Paul, 1965) was formed in part to encourage the study of other religions through interreligious dialogue. Education about the beliefs of others is a necessary part of the effective dialogue (Paul, 1965).

Proclamation and Conversion

Many motives to participation in IRD are the same motives that IRD is criticized for. For example, the many may participate in IRD to proselytize, which is also a criticism attributed to the inefficacy of IRD practices. The resulting skepticism of perceived positive motives to engage in IRD also lend to criticism and in efficacy of the practice (Paul, 1965).

CHAPTER IV

THE EFFICACY OF INTERRELIGIOUS DIALOGUE

While practices of IRD are flourishing in numbers, the efficacy of programs remains relatively stagnant. Despite global growth in formal and informal IRD practices, there is limited systematic research on the topic, and the existing research relies nearly exclusively on understanding practices from a specifically Western perspective that fails to understand IRD as a culturally diverse, integrative, global phenomena and employ appropriate contextually valid methods and theoretical perspectives informed by scholars around the globe. This lack of an evidence-based, globally integrated perspective on IRD leaves well-intentioned organizations, religious and political leaders developing IRD programming in a vacuum, severely limiting its potential to reduce conflict and promote interreligious understanding. Although IRD is widely practiced and referenced by religious and civic groups in the public sphere, little research has been done that explores what people think about IRD and the extent to which IRD has the ability to be a publicly desirable method to look at the conflict between religious groups. By extension, rationality, reason, faith, peace, conflict, and a relationship with God or a universal power are largely ignored in the role of IRD. There is a need to understand what makes effective IRD. Because theology and religious studies focus on interreligious dialogue, we need to use a framework and considers this work when examining interreligious dialogue through the lens of psychology.

A Framework for Understanding Interreligious Dialogue

Although there is a global growth in formal and informal IRD practices, there is limited systematic research on the topic and the existing research relies nearly exclusively on understanding practices from a specifically Western perspective that not only fails to understand IRD as a culturally diverse, integrative, and global phenomena, but also does not employ contextually appropriate valid methods and theoretical perspectives informed by scholars around the globe. This lack of an evidence-based, globally integrated perspective on IRD leaves well-intentioned organizations and religious and political leaders developing IRD programming in a vacuum that severely limits its potential to reduce conflict and promote interreligious understanding. To best approach a framework for IRD, we must disentangle the complex dimensions of IRD. For example, one major disentanglement must consider that IRD can center around religion or it can be secularized leading to possible different outcomes. IRD theories are needed that focus on pragmatic outcomes or finding solutions to real-world problems. Some positive steps in understanding IRD result from the interest of scholars observing IRD from practice, but the same work has largely resulted in speculation about what criterion are necessary for IRD (Cornille, 2008, 2013; Garfinkel, 2004; Orton, 2016; Swidler, 1983). There is some overlap between the various theories, but a dearth of empirical research is committed to the understanding of IRD.

Few studies have approached a empirical understanding of interreligious contact that may be framed as IRD. Two studies serve as exemplars of qualitative approaches to understanding this phenomenon. Streib and Klein (2014) used a sample of German adolescents aged 12 to 25 where religious styles predict interreligious prejudice, or prejudice toward religious others. The sample looked specifically at prejudice toward Muslims and Jews. Religious experiences, beliefs,

and structural schemata of religion may promote interreligious prejudice, while other schemata may prevent hostility and promote xenophilia and xenosophia (Streib & Klein, 2014). An exploratory investigation of qualitative responses described attitudes toward religious others and revealed emergent themes of interactions with those who hold differing religious beliefs (Farrell et al., 2018). No further efforts integrate a psychological framework to empirically understand religious group contact that directly apply to real-world group contact in religious contexts.

Despite the increasing need and interest in resolutions to conflicts spurred by religion (Nielsen, 1998), there is little understanding of prejudice reduction and cooperative behavior that occurs when religions collide that could lead to peacebuilding described by facilitators of IRD. Importantly, theoretical frameworks that attempts to understand IRD remain separated by disciplinary boundaries with no attempt to build upon the work.

Efficacy

A framework and methodology to evaluate interfaith initiatives (Mccallum, 2017). Theories about what makes IRD effective or explain what processes are at play in IRD are examined across theories that remain unconnected. Many practices of IRD are happening at the individual level, which effect perceptions of larger groups that an individual represents.

A major criticism of IRD is the efficacy of the programs. There are plenty examples of IRD activities, but without any evidence of their broad effectiveness or for empirical and narrow effectiveness. Many successes of IRD programs comes down to the extent to which religious leaders or individuals in positions of power can work within communications to prevent escalation.

Many of the interreligious efforts to promote peace are exchanged as theoretical approaches rather than interventions that are documented and able to be evaluated for efficacy. Additionally, instances of successful efforts that resulting from IRD go undocumented and unpublicized beyond the small communities where those efforts are taking place. Despite evidence for movements in the United Nations and beyond in public policy (Swidler, 2016), some prominent scholars of religion argue that there have been no international solutions for modern conflict and resulting violence among world religions (Beck, 2010). Procedures to evaluate the efficacy of IRD practices represent an important step in empirically understanding the efficacy of practices in application (Garfinkel, 2004) but fail to provide clear criteria that consider a myriad of IRD activities.

Real change in religious violence may depend on the role of elite and powerful religious leaders (Sisk, 2011). Good IRD embraces the differences and effective IRD leads to action. There are no approaches or defined measurements that focus specifically on testing efficacy of interreligious dialogue and are publicly available.

Current Theories of Criteria for Effective Interreligious Dialogue

Much thought by a variety of scholars and theologians has been ascertained about what requirement must exist to have an effective dialogue. The following theories, concepts, and materials describe the diverse interpretive and theoretical frameworks that shape the content of a qualitative analysis of IRD. Such procedure is described as a necessary step in qualitative research by Creswell and Poth (2017). The ideas of a variety of scholars and facilitators represent important, yet different, epistemologies that vary in rhetoric to describe important processes that describe elements of IRD. Commonalities and differentiations will be discussed among the most

relevant theories. Philosophical assumptions will also be discussed. In a table, overlap of suggested related constructs in theories on the efficacy are described.

There are many groups that promote dialogue with religious others as a possible solution to a myriad of issues that result from divides defined by religion. Even at the broadest theoretical approaches, there is little agreement among scholars and practitioners about what criteria must exist to observe any beneficial outcomes as a result of practicing IRD. Perhaps more problematic for the future study of IRD is the lack of overlap between the many different criteria posed by a variety of scholars, practitioners, and religious leaders. Some theories are not included which provides less theoretical foundation or impact in the respective discipline (Ten Commandments for Interfaith Dialogue; Leggewie, 2004; Overhauling Interreligious Dialogue for Peacebuilding; Merdjanova, 2016).

Conditions for Interreligious Dialogue

In her popular book, *The Im-possibility of Interreligious Dialogue*, Catherine Cornille (2008) describes many criticisms and hesitations to dialogue. However, despite the condemnation of the potential prospect of dialogue, Cornille offers four conditions that have the potential to lead to dialogue: doctrinal humility, commitment to a particular religious tradition, interconnection, empathy, and hospitality. Conditions for IRD are described as a demanding set of conditions (Cornille, 2013).

The Dialogue Decalogue

Leonard Swidler (1983, 2014), the dialogue decalogue, has a focus on religious dialogues but takes an approach in which he teaches how to have dialogue outside of religion. He calls this

type of learning “deep dialogue.” In his course, a variety of lessons and mechanisms exist to supposedly make the participant aware of how they communicate and dialogue with others, which ultimately, they can transfer to dialogues that focus on religion. Swidler’s persuasion leads to his dichotomous options to “Death or Dialogue” (Swidler, 1991).

Swidler (1983, 2014) asserts ten principals or “commandments” that serve as “ground rules” for interreligious or interideological dialogue that are rooted in interpersonal relationships. Principals are rejected by Swidler as “theoretical rules” and instead are explicitly contributed to Swidler’s own learned experience. *The Dialogue Decalogue*, first published in 1983, provides a sentence to summarize an explanation of each principal that is described by Swidler’s reasoning for each principal. The decalogue uniquely provides examples of probes to apply to the principals in dialogue. For the purposes of succinctly describing all ten principals of Swidler’s *Decalogue*, but at the risk of losing important detail described by Swidler, I have further narrowed each principal to briefly indicate the core of each principal so they may be conceptually compared to other works. These summaries may not be representative of the nuance provided by each principal. The summarized principals for a fruitful dialogue are: (1) Goal of learning and a change in attitude and perception of religious other, (2) dialogue must happen within and between religious communities, (3) honesty and sincerity, (4) beliefs must remain distinct, (5) each participant defines their own identity, (6) no a-priori assumptions about disagreements, (7) participants must be of equal status, (8) mutual trust must exist, (9) Self-critical of own religious traditions, and (10) The ultimate goal of dialogue should be to take the perspective of the other’s religion.

Swidler’s Decalogue uniquely considers skill development integrated into criteria for effective dialogue and relates some theorizing to “deep-dialogue” and “critical thinking” which

are necessary aspects that go beyond existing traits brought to a dialogue. He cites the need of skills like critical thinking that develop the capacity to reconcile differences.

Dialogue and Proclamation

The *Nostra Aetate* (Paul, 1965) makes several important distinctions in the revolutionary text. While not described as distinct or theoretical principals, the text makes several important and nuanced claims. Notably, the documents call for all IRD to happen via “the spirit of dialogue.” Meaning, IRD intends for those in dialogue to be doing so with good intention. Additionally, the church expresses the importance of creating a framework where the religious other is not seen as “lost” or in need of conversion. This work is important in creating a framework that acknowledges the direct conflict of religion to dialogues where the proclamation and dialogue may be in conflict.

Emergent Themes from Theory

Recognizing Differences

In practice of interreligious contact, a difference in religious belief is advocated to be confronted and leaders in IRD have suggested that for interreligious contact to be effective, differences in religious belief must be addressed directly ([PCID], 1991; Swidler, 1983, 2014).

Finding Common Ground.

Many of IRD initiatives focus on a common core element of dialogue. Peace is a shared teaching in religion that is cited by many facilitators of IRD as an important focal point to engage in beneficial dialogue. Finding common ground is noted as common theme, which is

supported by the work of Martin Marty (1997) who suggests that religious globalization is challenged by finding common good. Finding common ground is also effectively established by Eck (2006) in finding commonalities in world religions. One thing we may learn from this place are individual differences in the ability to find commonalities between or similarities within ideologies that are different than their own.

The first step in establishing commonalities in interreligious dialogue is the acknowledgement that, at minimum, religion is shared. If the dialogue is caused because differences in religion are in conflict, this acknowledgement may vary in efficacy if an intervention approach using IRD aims to solve a conflict where issues between individuals in dialogue do not have relevance to the conflicts at hand. This leads to understanding IRD where the focus of IRD is secularized.

Respect for Other Religious Convictions

The Pontifical council stresses the importance to respect and appreciate other's religious expression and, to do so, the council posits that education about the beliefs of others is a necessary part of the effective dialogue ([PCID], 1991; Paul, 1965) (PCID, 1965). The *Nostra Aetate* (Paul, 1965) calls for respecting other's religious traditions and convictions.

We must avoid the pitfalls of others that draw attention to IRD absent of empirical considerations. The current foundation of research suggesting critical elements of IRD fail to employ rigorous, empirically backed methodology or consider empirical evidence in the understanding of human behavior. Each emergent theory of IRD provides unique insight to challenges and important considerations of practicing IRD; however, the failure to integrate the theories is problematic. Additionally, while theories range across disciplines, there is not

systematic integration of any theories that build upon a theory or make any distinctions based on other theoretical stances.

CHAPTER V

CONSIDERATIONS AND CRITICISM

There is a need to understand practical limitations to IRD. Dialogue on its own does not fulfill the desires and conflicts that cause IRD to be a critical intervention in the first place. Religious conflicts represent issues that also involves other social identities and politics, which cannot be solved via IRD or a focus on religious elements that are entangled in more complex socio-political issues. Intervention strategies in IRD need to pay attention to context-specific threats so any intervention can narrow in on strategies to reduce threat in that specific context rather than an “one-size-fits-all” approach. Additionally, these strategies need to confront the largely promoted view of IRD as a Band-Aid or panacea for religious conflict. The focus of issues focused on in IRD practices range in severity and consequence. So, some efforts of IRD may succeed in changing certain beliefs but may fail to make any changes that significantly impact the larger goals of most IRD practices such as reduced conflict and global peace.

Additionally, the efficacy of dialogue remains and issues of being a means to an end of violence. Problematically, dialogue may be in place and be seemingly effective until there is content or situation where participants reach an impasse brought by a conflict of incompatible sacred values (Argo & Ginges, 2015; Hasenclever, 2012). At which point, a superficial dialogue is no longer useful, and the potential of religious diversity could lead to conflict or violence. This is perhaps worsened by the enforcement of stereotypes gained by increased exposure to the religious other. It is also unclear how facilitated efforts of IRD actually shift ideas or behavior or

decrease the polarization of views. To be able to measure any of the effects of IRD, we need to understand the nuance of individuals in these contexts so measurements can align with those things.

Absent from all the theories is a cohesive theoretical framework from which to ground the future study and understanding of IRD. Additionally, the theories that lend the most relevant information to understand the processes existent in IRD practices and the outcomes of them fail to account for any ability or motivation of the participants in dialogue. There is no consistent or data-driven approach to understanding the practice of IRD or supporting beneficial outcomes of IRD.

Additionally, there is little understanding for which elements combine to create effective practices, little consideration for the contexts in which IRD might be most effective, and no empirical assessment of IRD practices. Existing literature speculates on successful mechanisms (Cornille, 2008, 2013; Swidler, 2014), but practitioners largely operate by instinct rather than clearly articulated data-driven guidelines for successful IRD which leads to unorganized and ineffective practices that are unable to achieve the goals intended by well-intentioned practitioners.

Considerations Ignored by Current Work on Interreligious Dialogue

IRD theories are needed that focus on pragmatic outcomes or finding solutions to real-world problems. Ensuring a theory of IRD that has depth by acknowledging the complexity that the language of IRD aims to express. Without these distinctions, we are unable to articulate from theory the psychological mechanisms and characteristics that occur in, or as a result from, religious intergroup contact, relations, or dialogue. An important consideration is the ways which

IRD prompt critical reflection and forced an examination of assumptions and biases held by varying members of dialogue. Additionally, current work on IRD largely ignores goal setting and the sacred values that influence decision making that have been considered in group contact (Sheikh, Ginges, Coman, & Atran, 2012).

Identity

Identity is particularly important in interreligious dialogue because what people consider as their own religious identity shapes dialogue with someone who is different than their defined identity. IRD is contingent on the idea that dialogue is between two defined and different religious identities. Religious belief is a unique social identity that is both widely recognized as a major component of self-identity. This identity contains elements of malleable and developing systems of thought and understanding the world. It is one of the only social identities that is widely recognized as a group identity that encompasses changing beliefs with hierarchical progressions of belief systems. While not all element of religious identity and religious group processes are unique, few other identities are as linked to development and pro-social attitudes (Hood Jr. et al., 2005). Religion is an important social identity and is important in many people's self-concept (Verkuyten, 2007). Religion ought to serve a uniquely powerful function in shaping psychological and social processes (Ysseldyk, Matheson, & Anisman, 2010). Religion is distinguished as a unique identification unmatched by other social groups due to a distinctive worldview described as sacred and a group affiliation that is notably described as eternal and serves a dual function as a social identity, and a belief system (Ysseldyk et al., 2010).

Religious as identity has limited understanding from a social identity perspective (Yitmen & Verkuyten, 2018; Ysseldyk et al., 2010). Looking at religion as an identity from the target's

perspective has aided in examining religious threat in the United States (Pasek & Cook, 2019). In a 2007 study in Germany, perceived importance of the religious identity of Muslims lead to increased implicit attitudes of aggression, support for terrorism, and intrinsic religious orientation of Muslims compared to attitudes toward Christians (Fischer, Greitemeyer, & Kastenmüller, 2007) (Fischer, Greitemeyer, & Kastenmüller, 2007). As a result, there is further support for religious identity playing an important role in interreligious relations (Verkuyten, 2007).

Religious identity is historically measured by religious affiliation. Practically this may be useful but not the most meaningful place to examine religious identity as religious affiliation. It lacks the nuance to look at variance of commitment and practice that variety greatly within a religious tradition that must be attended to when considering a dialogue of equal partners for effective IRD. Identity in religion is closely tied to measures of religious attendance (Brenner, 2011). Stereotypes of religion endorse perceived self-identity of ideological identities in religion (Burris, Branscombe, & Jackson, 2000). Religious identity must consider culture (Cohen & Hill, 2007) particularly in intergroup conflict (Saroglou, 2016). Additionally, globalization has changed what a religious identity means allowing for more complex ideological and religious identities (Coleman & Collins, 2017). Identification of a global citizenship is unrelated to religiosity (Katzarska-Miller, Barnsley, & Reysen, 2014), but present a first step in understanding important questions about global identities like identification with all of humanity (McFarland, Brown, & Webb, 2013) and motives to engage in activities like IRD that are in part advertised as solution to solve global conflicts.

Other considerations for identity should examine the work of identity centrality to moderate the relationships between group-based stressors and well-being (Crane, Louis, Phillips,

Amiot, & Steffens, 2018) and religious identity as an in-group or out-group member affecting social behavior (Różycka-Tran, 2017). Other research examines intergroup conflict related to religion and identity (Seul, 1999), Arab-Christian in the United States as a result of religion and identity (Kayyali, 2018), and religion and identity in Northern Ireland (Mitchell, 2017) that is relevant to understanding religious as an identity in conversation with religious others.

Groups organized by ideology, like religion, engage in collective action that can lead to conflict (Cohrs, 2012). Ideological groups determine what issues might be worth fighting for and in some circumstances, group ideology can contribute to conflict (Cohrs, 2012). Religion is also a source for important cultural identity (Cohen & Hill, 2007). Streib (2001c) notes that religious diversity in this case is not necessarily limited to interactions between religions but could also be a result of interaction within religious orientations and worldview.

Strength of group identification is an important criterion to understand ideological group processes (Roccas & Elster, 2012). It might be worth distinguishing between religious identity and religious affiliation. Conflict related to religion may encompass them both in different ways. Religion is an important social identity. Religion ought to serve a uniquely powerful function in shaping psychological and social processes (Ysseldyk et al., 2010). Authors distinguish religion as a unique identification unmatched by other social groups due to a distinctive worldview described as sacred and a group affiliation that is notably described as eternal. Religion serves a dual function as a social identity and a belief system. Religiosity is important in many people's self-concept (Verkuyten, 2007).

Religious identity of majority religious group members predicts attitudes toward religious minority groups (Abu-Rayya & White, 2010). Work has begun to look at the role of religious identity and intergroup contact in social groups in Turkey as well as the importance of group

affiliation and perceived threat of different social categories based on contextual meaning to predict how much identity influences perceptions in group contact (Bilali, Iqbal, & Çelik, 2018). Complex religious identities may pose a challenge for group contact that aims to facilitate contact between distinctive group identities (Bodenhausen, 2010). While a leading scholar on IRD, Cornille describes issues of identity in that IRD presupposes that one must relate to a singular religion in order to dialogue with another (Cornille, 2013) and ignores parts of religious identity that engage with multiple religious belonging (Cornille, 2010).

Religious identity is linked to differing preference among Christian and Muslim religious affiliations in coping strategies (Fischer, Ai, Aydin, Frey, & Haslam, 2010). This may be an important consideration in how members of differing religious identities may react to threats specific to religious diversity prompted by IRD. Identity and perceived threat predict support for extremist violence (Beller & Kröger, 2018). Psychological theories attempt to understand extremist violence in applied settings (Ginges et al., 2011) that have important connections to religious identities engaging in IRD and religious conflicts.

Perspective Taking

Streib (2001b) supports the proposal of “inter-religious learning” where a perspective change is required of the students. This mirrors the perspective change aspect we discuss below and highlights why perspective taking may be one of the most critical areas to focus on in future research concerning interreligious contact and relations. Streib (2001b) suggests “perspective coordination” and “inter-religious negotiation” as less ambitious solutions than perspective change to encounter interreligious issues that lead to interreligious learning.

Perspective taking may represent a cognitive component of IRD that parallels the cognitive component of perspective taking established in group contact research (Hewstone, Cairns, Voci, Hamberger, & Niens, 2006). Perspective taking is proposed as an important aspect of the efficacy of intergroup contact (Gutenbrunner & Wagner, 2016). However, some research suggests that perspective taking has led to the confirmation of stereotypes (Skorinko & Sinclair, 2013).

Belief Rigidity

Do rigid beliefs prohibit dialogue and perspective taking? How does belief rigidity interact with the proposed criteria for effective contact like having a strong disposition of religious conviction as proposed by the *Nostra Aetate* (Paul, 1965)? Some practices of IRD assume that pluralism and interfaith is necessary for IRD, while other scholars and theologians posit that belief rigidity and understanding is important and necessary for IRD (Paul, 1965; Swidler, 1983). This is problematic because a theoretical stance of accepting pluralism and retaining belief rigidity may exclude the other. Additionally, the types of dialogue that result of each stance are not clearly defined or exemplified by what types of dialogues these ideas may look like, ways practices impact the religious landscape in the United States, or the ways practices impact the tenets and goals of IRD groups as a sacred goal or a goal towards creating peace. This assumption is entirely problematic and exclusionary of fundamentalist groups as well as any individual that wants to understand other religions but feels firm in their beliefs and doesn't want to incorporate the practices or viewpoints of other religions into their own beliefs. On the other hand, the inclusion of other faiths towards a personal understanding of the divine is an integral

and sacred part of many individuals' personal faith. This is a dichotomy that needs further understanding and clarity as we study the effectiveness and types of IRD.

An unconditional commitment to one's own faith in intractable conflict may result in self-sacrificial, religiously motivated actions (Atran, 2016; Atran & Ginges, 2012). The need for closure in religious individuals with rigid beliefs predict the role of ideologically related prejudice (Brandt & Reyna, 2010), but more recent research suggests that people both high and low on measures of religious fundamentalism exhibit prejudice toward out-groups (Brandt & Van Tongeren, 2017).

Religious Belief

The *Nostra Aetate* (Paul, 1965) describes in depth, a thoughtful articulation that describes the dissonances that exist in actions of interreligious dialogue, especially when dealing with proclamation or ecumenicalism in the Catholic tradition. This discusses multiple motives for engagement with IRD and how religious belief may drive motives in different directions. The document provides suggestions for when motives should take precedence within certain contexts or to achieve goals.

Religious belief is an important consideration in understanding the justification for unique outcomes of intergroup processes ,such as the de-legitimization or condemnation of other ideological beliefs (Bar-Tal & Hammack, 2012), social exclusion (Aydin, Krueger, Frey, Kastenmüller, & Fischer, 2014), and religiously sanctioned violence (Bushman et al., 2007). Religion may have a unique role in conflict resolution (Svensson, 2007).

However, most IRD fails to engage religious beliefs. There is no research that illuminates the perceived role of God or a higher power in religious conflicts. If a person holds a belief

system in which God or a higher power is a part, dialogue about the will of God in religious conflict is ignored. Because this is related to belief systems, it is certain to be an impasse in dialogue that cannot be ignored. For example, belief systems may believe that God wishes for other religious groups to ultimately be destroyed. A righteous group must prevail; therefore, religious war is necessary. Dialogue may be engaged in to support a motive, but an individual may believe conflict between religions is necessary or supported by their belief system. This argument supports a position where the utility of IRD is a means to an end in solving a problem. However, when these conflicts of ideology are exposed and must be confronted, perhaps as part of a facilitation of IRD, there are potential problems. Sacred values uniquely effect resolution strategies in violent political conflict (Ginges, Atran, Medin, & Shikaki, 2007).

Religious Maturity

IRD is exalted as an essential feature of peaceful co-existence and promise of spiritual growth (Cornille, 2013). Allport and Ross (1967) noted distinction of religious practices divided by individuals who encompassed mature or immature religion, which is now popularized by measures of intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientations. The dichotomous of religious maturity or style of religion a person characterized impacts prejudice toward religious others (Allport & Ross, 1967) and may represent bias that is unique to religious contexts (Allport, 1966). These considerations of development and maturity must be examined in practices of IRD.

Criticisms of Interreligious Dialogue

The critical variables remain ignored in IRD related which can result in a perceived ineffectiveness of IRD that may bar individuals or groups from engaging in IRD. Despite the

continued popularity of IRD, practices are frequently criticized as only a feel-good affair with short term efficacy and appealing to those without defined religious identities or those with a quest religious orientation (Patel, 2018; Van Tongeren et al., 2016). The approaches to reduce intractable conflict may be useless to effectively achieve a goal of conflict reduction and but may have beneficial outcomes but not the overall goals of interventions for religious violence. Discrepancy of reported goals and the involvement and salience of those goals within IRD practices contributes to the problem of understanding IRD approaches.

There are reasonable motives to avoid intergroup contact or interreligious dialogue. The repeated call for religions to engage in peaceful conversation may signal a reservation or even resistance toward dialogue (Cornille, 2013; Leggewie, 2004). An increasing perception of religious indifference, despite much evidence that religion remains of vital importance, has demonstrated another challenge for IRD: a lack of interest by a majority of participants to engage in any discussions about religions or concepts of interfaith (Catto, 2017).

Demographic Base in Current Practice

The international IRD movement holds a crucial role in promoting tolerance, yet international organizations remain economically unstable (Brodeur, 2005). Additionally problematic is the focus on dialogue as religious engagements that are promoted with the use of faith-based resources and hosted by particular religious groups. People who are willing to engage in IRD do not seem to be the same people who perceive threat from other religious groups. In other words, many of IRD promptings seem to be “preaching to the choir.” In other words, a major issue for facilitations of dialogue is that persons who stand most to gain from dialogue are those who exhibit bias and are least likely to effectively engaged in dialogue.

Additionally, voluntary engagement of IRD and the seeking of IRD experiences is more common.

Established IRD programming is developed by and for religious leaders or leaders in global politics, which results in interventions that lack empirical scrutiny and critical consideration of the objective long-term outcomes of IRD practices and interventions. This hampers the ability of well-intentioned groups to offer valuable insight to others who wish to incorporate IRD into their own identity specific practices.

As well, many of IRD groups are engaging individuals or religious groups who may differ in some beliefs but are not in conflict and are open and ecumenical. Although this may describe IRD and may have outcomes of increasing spiritual or personal development, they do not seem to approach the goal of having efforts to decrease violence between religious groups. People may often feel resistant to talking about religious diversity in the workplace and campuses. One sense is that many think religions ought to be privatized, although the religious practice is public, including many universities (Patel & Brodeur, 2006).

Additionally, the choice to be tolerant is ignored by IRD work. Tolerance toward out-groups is associated with respect toward groups that are disapproved of (Simon et al., 2019). IRD may pose a challenge to those without central identities in religion to dialogue with (Williams & Ruparell, 2014).

Proclamation and Conversion

One criticism of IRD is a widespread belief that the sole motivation for religious individuals to participate in any dialogue is for the goal of conversion to their own religion. There is a fear to engage in dialogue due to the perception of dialogue being a cover for

proselytizing (Cornille, 2013). From this concern, IRD serves as a threat to established belief. As well, exposure to other religious ideas may be perceived as a sinful questioning of one's own beliefs. Certainly, there are motivations to avoid IRD that are supported by religious conviction or belief systems.

The *Nostra Aetate* (Paul, 1965) notes the hesitancy of individuals to engage in IRD and remarks that dialogue must replace proclamation in the church. The *Nostra Aetate* notes the proclamation is an obstacle to dialogue. Additionally, the church expresses the importance of creating a framework where the religious other is not seen as "lost" or in need of conversion. This work is important in creating a framework that acknowledges the direct conflict of religion to dialogues, where the proclamation and dialogue may be in conflict.

For the reason of confronting the criticisms of IRD, pluralism, proselytizing, and conversion, many facilitators and religious leaders, who promote IRD, stress the importance of knowing and having a firm footing in one's own faith before choosing to engage in dialogue. However, as we will address below, a firm or rigid belief to one's own faith may exclude someone from being willing to dialogue or be effective in dialogue. Additionally, the way an individual holds their belief, or their religious style, may prohibit them from effectively engaging in dialogue. Conversion of religions engages dialogue with the other, but dialogue may also be motivated by the aim of conversion (Wingate, 2013).

Pluralism

Pluralism plays an important role in shaping the religious marketplaces and what is held sacred within that marketplace (Bainbridge, 2003; Prothero, 2007). Multiple religious identities

represented by pluralism remain an important consideration, yet many practitioners of IRD remain ambivalent toward multiple identities in religion (Cornille, 2013).

In a consideration of Pluralism, I refrain from referring to the practice described by Eck (2006) and (Berger, 2014), where pluralism effectively represents engagement with religious diversity and is used interchangeably with terms like “interfaith dialogue” and “interreligious dialogue.” Instead, pluralism here refers to the incorporation of multiple religious identities to simultaneously practice and promote the beliefs of multiple religions.

Similarly, the concern that dialogue may take something away from one’s own belief related to the belief that IRD leads to the watering down of religion or secularization of religion and leads to a breakdown of the permeability of the religious group. It is generally unclear how actions and dialogue may be categorized as “pluralist” rather than other types of dialogue or contact absent of the connotation that multiple beliefs and being practiced. Considerations by Cornille (2013) aptly describe that religions are not, by nature, set up to be in a necessary dialogue. When dialogue is an easy route, this encompasses the practice of Pluralism.

Within intergroup contact literature, much of empirical work that focuses on dialogue and goal setting aims to secularize religious groups by advising the religious groups to obtain and share identity outside of religion. Religion is often viewed as the shared identity to which two conflicting groups can look to as a shared orientation. The Pontifical Council (2017), clearly with its own biases, promotes that religious is a shared, universal experience.

Maintaining religious differences that can lead to cooperation without resulting to pluralism are described by Stephen Prothero in *God Is Not One* (2010). Here he describes 8 religions that he says are rivals but should not be portrayed as different paths to the same God.

Instead, he argues for viewing each religion as illuminating a problem that each religion aims to solve.

Religious Diversity and Threat

Many popular efforts endorse affinity between religions as a positive experience but tend to ignore the potential negative outcomes of interaction with groups and individuals holding differing group affiliations and beliefs. We can learn the effects of IRD on particular people with motivations in IRD, giving us a clear direction of samples of people that may be challenged by aspects of IRD. So, interventions can provide a clearer route of effectively incorporating conversations about religion and religious diversity. We already know from contact, even when the criteria necessary for effective intergroup contact is not met, encourages positive attitudes towards religious outgroups. There can also be potentially uncomfortable situations by putting groups of ideologically segregated people in a room together. However, some bias in the population of people who are participating in IRD should also be considered. The participants in current IRD groups may already be open to understanding the other, even if they still hold some prejudices and stereotypes about the other religious groups. By nature, the majority of IRD groups consist of willing participants.

High levels of anxiety about direct contact can lead to awkward and counter-productive encounters (Paolini, Hewstone, Cairns, & Voci, 2004; Stephan & Stephan, 1985). Effects of threat can also indirectly affect any positive outcome associated with decreased prejudice as a result of group contact (Aberson, 2019). Exposure to other religious beliefs can lead to doubt (Berger, 2016).

The psychological consequences and benefits from exposure to religious diversity merits continued examination. Many IRD initiatives across disciplinary lines view IRD as reactions to the religious other (Cheetham et al., 2013). Cornille (2013) describes in one of many barring circumstances for dialogue that exposure to other religious beliefs creates an unstable balance between an openness to other religions and maintaining a commitment to one's own religion. Individual's motives to participate in IRD have been dichotomously described by Cornille as a "risk or an opportunity" (Cornille, 2013; Tauran, 2008). Streib (2001c) suggests that interreligious dialogue helps to develop religious identity for adolescents in a religious education setting rather than "destroy" religious identity. Sudden intergroup contact is likely to exacerbate threats to religious identity that compel individuals to defend collective identities (Moghaddam, Warren, & Love, 2013). However, dialogue can be perceived as a threat (Cornille, 2013). In her book *The Im-possibility of Interreligious Dialogue*, Cornille goes to great lengths to describe that the numerous challenges of engaging in IRD make a reality of engaging in such a practice, in her words, impossible. In one account, Cornille (2013) describes that the religious are not inclined to dialogue by nature.

Contact may reify stereotypes and threats that already exist and contribute to negative bias among groups, particularly among minority religious groups (Awad, 2010; Pasek & Cook, 2019; Yzerbyt, 2016). The extent to which differences in religious groups vary and how increments in variance effects attitudes toward out-groups has been considered by few researchers among other ideological identities (Brauer & Er-rafiy, 2011). Threats as a result of religious diversity could lead to domain specific conflicts in personal religious and spiritual struggles (Exline & Rose, 2013). Good intentions of group contact can result in negative outcomes in areas of intractable conflict (Guffler & Wagner, 2017).

Secularism

The scant empirical work that focuses on dialogue and goal setting in religion may effectively secularize IRD by advising religious groups to focus on shared identities outside of their religion (Abu-Rayya & White, 2010). Because this approach fails to account for the uniqueness of religious identities, these focused practices avoid the conflicts unique to those identities. This is problematic in that it avoids the conflicts inherent to religion that can make prejudice.

Goals directed by religion may offer clear pathways for accomplishing goals (Snyder, Sigmon, & Feldman, 2002). However, many of the goals of IRD are unclear whether they aim—to solve religious or secular issues. While many of the efforts to engage in IRD seem to be to promote solidarity between religious groups, the efforts of IRD instead ask religious groups to work together to engage in problem solving of secular problems. Additionally, widespread perceptions of pluralism are defined as scandalous and a threat to faith, leading to understanding of religions through a secular lens (Berger, 2016). IRD can center around religion or it can be secularized. Little has been informed about how these two types are distinctive from each other. However, education requires only one's own interpretation, barring it from explicitly describing interreligious dialogue. Instead, this practice is best described as religious studies.

When the subject of dialogue is something secular, there is a greater change to find common ground (Swidler, 2016). However, while finding common ground in areas outside of religion may be a critical first step, this practice allows views in conflict that are related to religious beliefs to be ignored. Such an exclusion has consequences when a conflict arises over religious means, for which finding commonality over secular subjects is no longer meaningful enough to counterbalance bias toward a religious other.

In line with Swidler's (1983, 2014) dialogue training, training people in secular communication skills may indeed help them be better at dialogue and could encourage perspective taking activities. However, it is unclear whether training for interreligious dialogue can be effective in a training program that excludes issues specific to religion. To assess these specific issues, we need to assess what's specific about religious conflict, rather than social identities that may contribute to better dialogue, and the items that make interreligious dialogue challenging or impossible.

Conclusion of Criticism

Many of these criticisms are necessary to pay attention to but may be premature. Their ability to recognize aspects that must be changed require a narrower focus on aspects we know lead to effective changes and pay attention to religious variables. Before undertaking an evaluation of group progress of IRD, we must focus on frameworks and theories that can best measure nuance of these groups and is paying attention to religion. This requires looking at religion and the ways in which people hold religion and have the capability to engage in dialogue to begin with. This creates opportunities to create programming that can be evaluated and considers religion of individuals from a variety of positions, not just affiliations. This leads to the most effective outcomes that are relevant to the context and situation. This allows for an understanding of what aspects of IRD work and which activities in IRD to discard based on a previous understanding of group processes. The goal of this work is to not only understand the phenomena of IRD by positioning it in way that isolates the parts accessible to methodology, but also accurately reflect the reality of the practice while speaking to generalized principals. We

need to identify what questions to ask about IRD, how to best ask them, and develop instruments that afford the uniqueness and explain IRD from multiple disciplines.

While scholars have developed provocative theory, they have failed to specify rigorous conceptual frameworks that account for elaborative and nuanced variables in IRD. Furthermore, any promising theoretical constructs have not been translated for application of theory to describe the phenomena of IRD. Consequently, no attention has been garnered for the creation of psychometrically sound measurement tools that look at specific religious groups processes and critically consider real nuance related to religion.

CHAPTER VI

RELATED CONSTRUCTS AND THEORY IN PSYCHOLOGY

Previous literature has yet to broadly apply theories of effective intergroup contact in psychology to interreligious dialogue in combination with considerations of popular theories across disciplines that theorize about efficacy of interreligious dialogue. Religion has had historic influence on psychology and intergroup relations (Cohen, 2015), yet a dearth of contemporary psychology applies findings from research on group processes to questions about religious groups that prompt thinking. Psychologists have directed little attention to the interactions between religion and politics in group processes (Nielsen et al., 2013, p. 323). Areas of social psychology have largely ignored religion as a viable area of study (Donahue, 2005), even though group processes and identity most relevant to IRD could reciprocally benefit from a focus on complex applied processes entangled in real world dimension and considerable consequence for the integration of empirical work to public affairs.

The use of mid-level theories represented by areas of theorizing by scholars outside of psychology benefits the foundation of theory built toward understanding a specific phenomenon, like IRD, rather than the creation of a meta-theory (Hill & Gibson, 2008). Consideration of theoretical approaches outside the direct context of religions, where reliable measures of similar constructs like group contact consider ideological identities, is a viable solution to recurrent calls for valid and theoretically robust measures of religion (Finke, Bader, & Polson, 2010; Hill & Hood, 1999).

The scant research assessing IRD practices fail to adequately position the practice within a broader, interdisciplinary, global theoretical lens. Investigating IRD using generic intergroup approaches and measures is reductionist and ignores the richness of religious contexts (Dittes, 1969) and contribute to the threat of explaining religion away in the social sciences (Pargament, 2002). IRD is a rich landscape in which to examine the uniqueness of religion in intergroup processes and its specific role in desired IRD outcomes such as prejudice reduction, conflict mitigation, and spiritual development.

Current efforts in the scientific study of IRD, both across and within disciplines, is limited by several factors. Theoretical and limited empirical investigations, isolated within their disciplines, do suggest critical elements of IRD (Cornille, 2008; Garfinkel, 2004; Swidler, 1983), but lack cohesion and fail to integrate perspectives of both scholars and practitioners that could be accomplished by employing a multilevel interdisciplinary paradigm (Emmons & Paloutzian, 2003) recurrently called for in the scientific study of religion.

The nuanced role of religious beliefs in group processes like IRD remain uninvestigated, particularly in non-Western religious cultures. Conceptualized as applied intergroup contact, IRD can align and implement empirically backed mechanisms that effectively reduce negative outcomes of group conflict (Hewstone, 2003; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008). By considering the shared criterion of a range of intergroup contact theories (Allport, 1954; Paluck, Green, & Green, 2018; Pettigrew, 1998), systematic efforts can attempt to address the efficacy of religion in contact. Group contact theories must evolve to better account for nuances brought by religious beliefs, identity, and interactions to understanding processes in IRD.

Situational factors that are considered in the context of religion can help explain contemporary relations between religion and religious violence through the lens of psychological

theory (Moghaddam et al., 2013). A consideration of the compilation of the major works on IRD across disciplines is needed to determine what psychological inquiry makes the most sense to study this avenue to build a foundation of research on IRD. Further, this inquiry would help to better understand the religion and religious identity is uniquely different from other identities and group processes.

By examining IRD practices through the lens of intergroup contact theory (Pettigrew, 1998), we can parallel criteria posed by IRD scholars and criteria for effective contact between groups, which was first proposed by Allport (1954). Intergroup contact research mirrors many of the objectives of IRD by working as one of the most effective understandings of improving intergroup relations (Wright, Mazziotta, & Tropp, 2017). Unified IRD scholars and intergroup contact identify goal commonality as a key piece toward reducing prejudice and promoting cooperation. Additionally, they identify identity salience as critically important for effective group contact (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008). In assessing religious identity in group processes, we can determine if IRD is consistent with other types of intergroup contact or if the practice has unique aspects associated with the salience of one's religion.

However, focusing on IRD through only one disciplinary lens threatens to ensure IRD remains a neglected topic in the scientific study of religion due to the focus and measurement of interreligious contact that is considered equal to any other group process, merely grouped by religious affiliation. Scant research has attempted to resolve these concerns, with attempts mainly being independent and isolated. High levels of anxiety about direct contact can lead to awkward and counter-productive encounters (Paolini et al., 2004; Stephan & Stephan, 1985). Effects of threat can also indirectly affect positive outcome associated with decreased prejudice resulting from group contact (Aberson, 2019). The diversity paradox, described by an increasing diversity

in the 21st century, poses both a threat and opportunity for positive contact (Craig et al., 2018).

Understanding religious phenomena through the lens of established mechanisms and processes in group contact in a methodology exemplified by an examination of secular mechanisms underlying prosocial behavior in religious contexts (Galen, 2018) can contribute the understanding of mechanisms that are unique to religious intergroup relations.

Good intentions of group contact can result in negative outcomes in areas of intractable conflict (Guffler & Wagner, 2017). Efforts have begun to look at the effects of contact in religion in conflict areas of Indonesia and the Philippines, which serve as important efforts to examine the effects of group contact in real world conflicts centered around religion (Kanas, Scheepers, & Sterkens, 2017). Group contact has potential to address future areas of group conflict that include issues of peacebuilding related to religious and ideological identities (Wright et al., 2017).

Efficacy of Group Contact

IRD is a rich landscape in which to examine the uniqueness of religion in intergroup processes and its specific role in desired IRD outcomes, such as prejudice reduction and spiritual development. One promising lens in researching religion in group processes is intergroup contact theory (Pettigrew, 1998). However, investigating IRD using generic intergroup approaches and measures is reductionistic and not only ignores the richness of religious contexts (Dittes, 1969), but also contributes to the threat of explaining religion away in the social sciences (Pargament, 2002).

Research on intergroup contact suggests that IRD may help reduce prejudice by focusing on shared identities and common goals (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2005). Religion represents an example of how identification with a group leads to the enhancement of conflict in intergroup

relations (Roccas & Brewer, 2002; Roccas & Elster, 2012). IRD is an example of many types of intervention to reduce prejudice and conflict (Paluck et al., 2018). Much of the work surrounding group contact encompasses the position that type of prejudicial attitudes ,targeted as areas to decrease in IRD interventions, results in favoritism of one's own in-group and negative attitudes toward groups who are dissimilar from one's own, or out-groups (Brewer, 1999).

However, applying a framework from the contact hypothesis may be vulnerable to conflict in applied, real world settings. Minority group members, who engage in contact, do not reap the benefits from contact when there is a high proportion of majority members (Barlow, Hornsey, Thai, Sengupta, & Sibley, 2013). This presents a real problem for addressing stereotypes and IRD experiences for minority religions, who wish to engage in dialogue despite their minority group status.

An investigation of in-group identity and religious affiliations of Catholic and Protestants in Northern Ireland in 2000 and 2001 revealed a need for measures of religious bias toward out-group members that are culturally sensitive and have a more sophisticated conceptualization of attitudes between religious groups (Cairns, Kenworthy, Campbell, & Hewstone, 2006).

Longitudinal effects and indirect contact with groups can improve intergroup relations (Dovidio, Eller, & Hewstone, 2011; Ramos & Hewstone, 2018). Due the variety of IRD experiences, considerations of different types of group contact should be considered in understanding the efficacy of IRD. The de-emphasis of differences in intergroup contact, is paralleled by work in ideological identities (Hahn, Banchevsky, Park, & Judd, 2015; Rattan & Ambady, 2013). Important considerations for the future of group contact should engage with the effects of indirect contact on prejudice toward out-group members (Brown & Paterson, 2016), as

an increasing number of interactions between religious groups in dialogue takes place informally and unsupervised contact may threaten to increase negative stereotypes.

Intergroup Bias

The impact of the direct relationship of intergroup contact with the reduction of intergroup bias is long standing and beginning to shift in application to consider the impact on social change and considerations of modern concerns, such as multiple identities (Dovidio, Love, Schellhaas, & Hewstone, 2017). Intergroup bias related to stereotypes of groups may play an important role in distinguishing the root of bias based on stereotypes in intergroup relations (Fiske, 2015; Yzerbyt, 2016).

Intergroup Contact

Allport's contact theory (1954) may be a promising first step in understanding effective criteria for religious group contact in IRD. Allport (1954) described that effective contact must include the following criteria: group membership must have equal status, have common goals, work cooperatively toward common goals, acknowledge authority that supports the contact and interactions between the groups, and have personal interactions with outgroup members. By examining IRD practices through the lens of intergroup contact theory (Pettigrew, 1998), we can systematically investigate IRD and develop suggestions for effective practice. Scholars of IRD and intergroup contact researchers identify goal commonality and identity salience as key criteria for contact that would reduce prejudice and promotes cooperation (Merdjanova, 2016; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008). The contact hypothesis (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008) is considered one of the most promising strategies for reducing intergroup conflict and intergroup bias. Some research has

begun to focus on the outcomes of negative contact resulting from when the criteria proposed by contact theory is not followed (Meleady & Forder, 2018). This may be an important focus for interreligious contact where apprehensions to participate in dialogue are at a high and there is ample consideration to avoid dialogue altogether (Cornille, 2013).

Purposeful action prompted by religion provides a source of meaning to goals and an understanding of religion as a meaning-making system that cannot ignore goal centrality in the generation of meaning (Emmons, 1999; Hood Jr. & Belzen, 2013). Religion sanctifies personal goals (Pargament & Mahoney, 2005). However, the effects of contact vary, particularly in interventions that address prejudice in race and ethnicity (Paluck et al., 2018).

Religion as a Social Identity

Responses to religious identity on surveys rely mainly on self-report and heavily on reports of church attendance (Brenner, 2011) which has consequences regarding understanding the role of religious identity in measures of intergroup contact (Brenner, 2017). Identity as a religious affiliation, particularly minority affiliations, leads individuals vulnerable to social conflicts described by xenophobia (Aydin et al., 2014). Work has begun to look at the role of religious identity and intergroup contact in social groups in Turkey as well as the importance of group affiliation and perceived threat of different social categories based on contextual meaning to predict how much identity influences perceptions in group contact (Bilali et al., 2018). Prejudice toward group associated with ideological identities presents a challenge for the predictive ability of measuring prejudice toward target out-groups (Brandt & Van Tongeren, 2017). Social threats impact attitudes on worldview and ideology (Duckitt & Fisher, 2003).

Complex religious identities may pose challenges for group contact that aim to facilitate contact between distinctive group identities (Bodenhausen, 2010) and out-group acceptance in intergroup relations measured by empirically supported criteria in Pettigrew's (1998) group contact hypothesis (Brewer, 2008). Complexity of religious identity as a social identity can result in varied attitudes of tolerance toward out-group members (Brewer & Pierce, 2005). Complex religious indemnities among Palestinian Jews predicted that Palestinians who identified with Judaism predict desire for retaliation during the ongoing 2015 Palestinian Stabbing Intifada (Fredman, Bastian, & Swann Jr., 2017). Additional research examining social identity complexity in multicultural societies further supports the importance of the identity of minority and majority group members within a diverse landscape, where multiple social identities may be expressed (Brewer, Gonsalkorale, & van Dommelen, 2013). This has clear important implications for examining a realistic view of IRD that manages varied social identities alongside varied religious identities that combine to represent a singular religious group in dialogue with others.

Social Identity Theory

Social Identity process in Social Identity Theory (SIT; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) argues that our knowledge of and emotional attachment to our own group memberships are important considerations for understanding the complexity of identity in intergroup relations (Capozza & Brown, 2000). SIT is increasingly used to understand complex international issues concerned with peacebuilding (Christie, McKeown, Haji, & Ferguson, 2016). Social Identity theory has also been proposed as a method to understand global perspectives on peace and conflict (McKeown, Haji, & Ferguson, 2016).

Appreciation of the Other

The interactions are occurring between religious others or classmates who have interacted before and shared a classroom daily, rather than strange or alien ideas often related to understanding interactions between religions (Streib & Klein, 2018). Similar constructs like openness, which are associated with tolerance for others, suggest that people high in openness are more tolerant of diverse worldviews but remain intolerant of groups whose worldview conflict with their own (Brandt, Chambers, Crawford, Wetherell, & Reyna, 2015). Similar constructs are proposed by Seul (2018) to “treat the stranger as your own” as a prosocial motive to intervene religious conflicts. Positive attitudes toward others, who are dissimilar in religious group affiliation, lead to an increased understanding of religious tolerance (Van Tongeren et al., 2016). A distinction of tolerance toward outgroups and a tolerance toward public religious expression is an important criterion in understanding relations with the other (Stewart, Edgell, & Delehanty, 2018).

Streib and Klein (2018) propose that progress is related to contact with religious others is consistent with “increasing recognition of the otherness of the other,” increasing account of the other’s dignity, and appreciation of the other as a gift. This is related to strangeness as a gift which is defined as Xenosophia by Waldenfels (1990, 2011). Xenosophia is additionally described as a culture of welcome (Nakamura, 2000). (Swidler, 2016) parallels these motives by describing an appreciation of neighbors that is enriching to the individual in an age of globalization. This must also be considered in the interactions that are occurring between religious others, classmates who have interacted before, or even more likely shared a classroom daily, rather than strange or alien ideas often related to understanding interactions between

religions (Streib & Klein, 2018). Xenosophia as a reaction to globalization plays a unique role in the shaping of identity (Ariely, 2017).

Xenophilia is the antonym of xenophobia and describes the desire to embrace religious or spiritual traditions that differ from one's own (Friedman, 2009). It is distinct from Xenosophia because instead of looking at others as "alien," xenophilia describes the other as a "stranger." This distinction may be important in evaluation because the desire for contact with others who are "strangers" rather than "alien" conceptually are tied to preconceived stereotypes affiliated with the identity of the other. While xenosophia and xenophilia may not currently represent distinctive constructs, there is a need to address religious intergroup relations that critically address the desire for contact with religious groups in a globalized world, particularly since few were ideologies are alien as a result of unavoidable exposure to religious diversity. Xenophilia has the, potential for to understand conservative religious beliefs in IRD that look at traditions as whole that look at positive outcomes of xenophilia supported by scared texts (Watson, Reagan, Chen, & Morris, 2018).

CHAPTER VII

THE RELIGIOUS STYLES PERSPECTIVE

The Religious Styles Perspective (Streib, 2001a) is well suited as a detailed explanatory theory for religious group processes that accounts for differences in skill. Research on the resulting personal spiritual development is gaining momentum as scholars across disciplines recognize the impact of eminent dialogue (Streib & Klein, 2018). In the psychology of religion, critical examination of the nuanced role of religion in group processes like IRD remain untouched and the scant research assessing practices of IRD fails to adequately position the practice within a larger theoretical lens in group processes. The theory of faith development is characterized by the increasing complexity of ideas. A consideration of the increase complexity of practices is desperately needed in understanding IRD. Measurement assumes, from the adoption of Fowler's theory (1981), that progression in a hierarchical structure leads to an abandonment of faith commitment. Some styles relate to a greater commitment versus an unexamined commitment. An unexamined commitment would easily bar participants from effective IRD, as proposed by previous theory.

Fowler

The religious styles perspective is a modification of structural-developmental theory of religion, which is derived from Fowler's (1981) faith development theory (FDT). The religious styles perspective is a typology of religious styles (Streib, 2001a). The reformulation is

influenced by the philosophical perspective of Merleau-Ponty (1962) and Ricoeur (1985), the developmental interpersonal perspective of Noam (1988), and the psychodynamic developmental perspective on religion of Rizzuto (1979). (Streib, 2001a) found that FDT is an indispensable tool for explaining religious diversity in modernity that accounts for increasing globalization and a variety of religious and spiritual motives.

This perspective rejects the adoption of structural-developmental perspectives and religious cognition in the faith development paradigm. Noam aimed to go beyond Piaget (Noam, 1988) by placing emphasis on life history rather than theories of cognition that neglect the psychodynamic dimension (Streib, 2001a). Streib's criticism of FDT also focuses on how FDT excludes dimensions of content, experiences, and function of religion in favor of cognitive development as a central place of religious development. His religious styles perspective shifts to emphasize dynamics of relationships of the self to the self, to the other, to tradition, and to the social world. These are described as four dimensions: psychodynamic-interpersonal, relational-interpersonal, interpretive-hermeneutic, and life-world.

Streib (2001a) describes an important aspect, introduced by Ricoeur and Merleau-Ponty's work on phenomenology, as the consideration of the "other" where a developmental dynamic that focuses on cognition is refocused to consider developmental dynamics in terms of interpersonal relationships. The former focused on cognition, and the new theory focuses on interpersonal relationships. In his other work, he considering the traditions represented by Erikson (1968) and Rizzuto (1979) to consider life history. Rizzuto, as a psychoanalyst, importantly integrated god representation in a psychodynamic view. This transformed developmental theories that look at a mother-child relationship to look at the original of religion, as the god-child relationship that look at god representations. Streib (2001a) says that this allows

religious development to parallel the development of object relations. Fowler references psychoanalytic descriptions about infancy and early child in his early stage descriptions (Streib, 2001a). Importantly, Streib (2001a) rejects Fowler's view that faith stages can be "invariant, sequential, and hierarchical." This is a major distinction between Fowler's faith stages and Streib's religious styles.

Streib (2001a) notes that religious development is a complex process that must consider entangled factors. This includes relationship of the individual, the self, to others in a social environment, or external objects, and the relationship to objects from the view of object-relations theory, or internal objects. Streib notes that these ideas are parallel and interrelated. The entangled factors that Streib references and merit attention to consideration of a new perspective on religion are structural development, a schematic of interpersonal relationships, and experiences or thematic. Noam (1988) is the theory that most aligns with Streib's religious styles perspective due to Noam's understanding of development as an interweaving of thematic and schemata.

Religious Styles Perspective

An important, boldened revision on FDT is based on the consideration that religious development is both indicated and promoted by interpersonal relationships (Streib, 2001a). Style is emphasized to Streib as it places emphasis on factors of life history, the worldview, and social horizon related to religious development. The first distinction away from FDT in religious styles is the self-other relationship that is related to themata historically from a psychodynamic perspective (Streib, 2001a). This refers to relationships from the self to the other rather than relationships between individuals. In this consideration, the focus of the relationship is from the

perspective of the self. Streib claims he is taking a decisive step forward in the integration of life thematic proposed by Noam into religious development. Streib says that experiences, themata, represent a challenge to the schemas that are utilized in understanding experiences of the present.

The second distinction is the narrative character of biography. This refers to understanding an individual through the story they tell about their lives and views the individual as a narrative character. Identity was established by the consideration of interwoven elements within an individual's narrative story in (Ricoeur, 1985). This provided a foundation for identity (Streib, 2005). Streib (2001a) articulates that religious styles are communicated at the same time as part of telling of a story by measuring present styles and reflecting on earlier "material" of the story. This helps us understand an individual's present style as they integrate perspectives and narratives through re-telling earlier portions of a life narrative.

The first distinction is a focus on the "life-world" aspect and consideration of one's life history. "Life-world" may refer to a form of world coherence Streib suggests obtaining an understanding of religion that focuses on perspective before life history and world coherence are considered (Streib, 2001a). The religious styles are conceived as distinct characterizations or patterns of how religion is used to understand the challenge or presentation of life experiences that have a focus on life narrative and interpersonal relations (Streib, 2001a). Religious styles are multi-layered, so an understanding of obtaining increased perspective in the styles as a milestone model, rather than a stage-wise, ascending developmental model (Streib, 2001a). The obtaining of more perspective, however, indicates a hierarchical model of religious styles. The previous hierarchical perspective must be rejected. A new consideration means that when there are times of transition, rather than not moving to a next stage, it may suit a person better to embody the ideas characterized by a certain style. This could be because it fits better for their

world views or may be a threat to their mental health. Therefore, Streib suggests dropping the assumption of structured wholeness and sequentially. A religious style follows Noam's description of interpersonal schemata. This means that religious styles are made up of different patterns or characteristics that make up the layers of a person's religious style. An image of the styles can be seen in Streib (2001a) p. 150. Each aspect in each style of the religious styles are not defined exclusively by a singular concept that each aspect describes, rather each aspect informs the total constructs of religious styles.

Changes in theory Prior to the Religious Styles Perspective

Streib (2001a) directly relates the religious styles perspective as useful in addressing postmodern challenges. Streib (2001a) proposes to revise Fowler's (1981) faith development theory while Streib (2005) argues for a revision in faith development research. Since then, Streib and Keller (2018) have argued for continued revision of faith development research to operate under religious styles research. The first proposal of revision to faith development research discussed in Streib (2005) calls for research to account for diversity in structure, narrative, and content. In this account, Streib calls for content-analytical and narrative-analytical procedures to be utilized in faith development research.

The religious styles model is the result of the evolution of faith development theory (1981) in consideration of theoretical perspectives and research methodology described by Streib (2005) in his proposal for a revision of faith development research. Streib (2005) offers that historically faith development research designs are, to some extent, disconnected from faith development theory.

Streib's religious styles model (Streib, 2001a, 2005) derives from Fowler's (1981) faith development theory. Fowler's concept of an individual's faith was the construction and reconstruction of everyday experience, particularly in response to ultimate concerns, value, and power. Fowler's faith broadly embodies meaning making and purposely remains conceptually open to account for a variety of worldviews and religions. His 6 distinct developmental stages represent qualitatively different ways of meaning-making in relation to an individual's ultimate concern relating to Tillich's concept of ultimate concern (1965). However, Fowler's concept of faith contrasts with the most widely adopted conceptualization of faith that is associated with religious beliefs. For this reason, Streib's model refers to designated "religious styles" and "religious style development" rather than "faith stages" or "faith development." The concept of religious styles aims to maintain a broad and open understanding of religion that was conceptualized by Fowler (Streib & Keller, 2018).

Like Fowler, Streib's model maintains distinctive styles and describes a hierarchy related to a developmental sequence, but, unlike Fowler, Streib's model accounts for the critique of Fowler's model of stage-wise development, where development is linear and irreversible. Religious styles are depicted with openness and flexibility with a trajectory that may be multi-directional. Additionally, Streib's model allows for an understanding of religious styles where an individual may utilize more than one style. In the Faith Development Interview, stage assignments are assessed for each of the 25 questions that make up the FDI, often resulting in a range of stages or styles in a single case. The assessment of a religious style assignment for each participant results in an aspect-specific profile that reveals aspects of life where religious styles manifest in a particular way. This distinction defines the major conceptual difference between Fowler's stages of faith and Streib's model of religious styles, where the consideration of a

combination of styles across different aspects establishes a focus on interpersonal relations (Streib & Keller, 2018). Importantly, the religious styles model critically remains accessible to interdisciplinary inquiries produced from a history of multi-method, cross-cultural approach in religious styles research.

The fourth edition of the *Manual for the Assessment of Religious Styles in Faith Development Interviews* (Streib & Keller, 2018), the former edition titled *Manual for Faith Development Research* (Fowler, Streib, & Keller, 2004) reflects the considerations of Streib's (2001a) religious style model. Along with the overt title revision which discards reference to faith development in favor of religious styles, the fourth edition of the manual principally includes a revision to the structure of the aspects of faith coding criteria. These changes come in part as a reflection on four decades of faith development research and, in part, as a reaction to new models of developmental psychology that accounts for concepts such as reflective functioning, mentalization, perspective taking, and dialogue (Streib & Keller, 2018). Additionally, referral to "stages" and "faith" may fail to integrate with conceptual and empirical developments in the scientific study of religion (Streib & Keller, 2018).

From the third to the fourth edition of the manual, aspects used to interpret the structure and style of a Faith Development Interview were reduced from 7 to 6 as a result of the consideration of a focus on interpersonal relations (Streib & Keller, 2018). In the third edition, the aspects consist of: "Form of Logic," "Social Perspective Taking," "Form of Moral Judgement," "Bounds of Social Awareness," "Locus of Authority," "Form of World Coherence," and "Symbolic Function." Importantly, the following revisions are made to the aspects from the third to the fourth edition: "Form of Logic" is omitted, "Form of Moral Judgement" is revised as "Morality," and "Bounds of Social Awareness" is conceptualized as "Social Horizon." For an in-

depth explanation of theory-driven considerations, refer to the fourth edition of the *Manual for the Assessment of Religious Styles in Faith Development Interviews* (Streib & Keller, 2018).

After revision, the remaining aspects in the fourth edition are: “Perspective Taking,” “Social Horizon,” “Morality,” “Locus of Authority,” “Form of World Coherence,” and “Symbolic Function.”

As a result, revision of the criteria determines how the content of a Faith Development Interview is coded or assigned. A religious style should be taken into consideration when measuring religious assignments. Additionally, religious style assessments may differ in how they are conceptualized over time. While religious style assignments are sourced from a common theoretical basis as previous stage or style assignment, it is unclear how a distinction of a religious style assessment may vary from previous scores that use coding criteria for faith stages or how an individual may change in overall style rating when using former or current criteria. This is an especially important concern when we aim to understand changes over time, especially when the participant may be assessed using criteria for faith stages in one time period and criteria for religious styles in another.

The Religious Styles

In this portion we will describe the Religions Styles. While one style appears to be prevalent, other styles may lay beneath the surface that are present and may become available (Streib, 2001a). Earlier orientations require revisiting and require reflexivity of the understanding of one’s earlier religious style.

Subjective

The subjective religious style relates to Noam's (1988) phase of the subjective-physical self in early childhood (Streib, 2001a). In this phase, the infant, from Noam's conceptualization, views themselves as the center of the world. Basic trust is the outcome of this developmental phase. This style corresponds to Fowler's intuitive-projective faith. These styles correspond to the origins of religion and development of God representation derived from Rizzuto (1979). God representations at this stage are characterized by a deity that is omni-seeing and is focused on punishment for wrong behavior.

Instrumental-Reciprocal

Instrumental-reciprocal or "du-ut-des" style is related to the realization of an inner self distinct from an outer self. Originally, Noam (1988) relates this to the child becoming aware of their own needs and interests as opposed to the needs of others. This translates to a reciprocal exchange to full needs of the self and others. Noam's reciprocal-instrumental self points to this structure (Streib, 2001a). The reciprocal relationship also relates to a basic pattern toward God. What is "good" is determined by God and authority figures while "bad" is the outcome of the lack of obedience to God or authority and results in punishment (Streib, 2001a).

Mutual

At this style, (Streib, 2001a) suggests that one's interpersonal horizon is widened. At style 3, to be loved and respected by others is the primary focus. Security is found in group membership and relationships at this stage within group membership are important. Any altruism shown at this stage is a result of the desire for mutuality (Streib, 2001a). Less is said about the

influence of theory that created the foundation for mutual religious styles. Streib references Rizzuto's (1979) psychodynamic process in the introduction of "new objects."

Individuative-Systemic

This style relates to a person's understanding that there is a social world where they must take a position and focus on areas of life that deal with having roles to play within this system (Streib, 2001a). This style is also characterized by a reflection on religion and the ability to provide reason for belief. This references critical reassessment and emotional distance from representations derived from Rizzuto (1979).

Dialogical

Dialogical style is primarily characterized by a new openness for the other. "Dialog" described in this style references the ability of contradiction and difference not to result in the exclusion or hostile action toward others. While the previous style is concerned with finding and defending one's own religious identity, style 5 can open up to other religious orientations and learn from them (Streib, 2001a). This style is also reflected by Ricoeur's (1985) second naiveté, which described a new openness and value of the symbolic. This is called "decentration," or according to Ricoeur, means letting go. This is paralleled by Rizzuto (1979) that there is an uncertainty of God representations but is conceptualized as a basic trust of another.

The Faith Development Interview

The Faith Development Interview (FDI) is the classic standard for eliciting responses of religious styles (Burris, 1999) and remained unequalled by other attempts to measure faith styles

by other, less costly and time prohibitive means that rely on self-assessment and forced choice reporting of perceived preferences of religious stages described by Fowler (Barnes, Doyle, & Johnson, 1989; J. I. Harris & Leak, 2013; Leak, Loucks, & Bowlin, 1999). Such measures fail to elicit the necessary depth of responses needed to categorize structural thought in the context provided by interview responses to the FDI. Measures that fail to fully consider the implications of a distinct style or stage description of participants, while theoretically problematic, also fail to consider updates and nuance of theoretical approaches addressed by Streib's (2001a) RSP. FDIs typically last between 1-3 hours and provide ample content to observe narrative structure (Streib & Keller, 2018).

The manual looks at social and historical conditions as they impact a narrative structure of understanding the self (Streib, 2005). The entirety of faith development research rests on the telling of developmental stories and recognizing developmental stories in interviews (Streib, 2005). Streib (2005) also suggests that the narrative in the life tapestry exercise allows a better knowledge of the degree of importance an event in a person's narrative merits in the evaluation of the interview. Streib (2005) suggests that narrative in an interview allows for access to dynamics of latent structures under conscious, reflected statements that an individual provides about their past that allows for an opportunity to measure a depth unavailable by other types of self report.

Faith development interviews consist of responses to a series of questions that address 4 dimensions: life review, relationships, values and commitments, and religion. This results in interviews that are about 2 hours long and describe belief statements and personal narratives (Streib, 2005). Faith development interviews have also always historically been linked to a manual of faith development research. The manual describes interpretation of interviews by

“learning to think in structural terms” (Streib, 2005). The text of faith development interviews is coded by assigning a religious style score considering the most relevant aspects (Streib, 2005; Streib & Keller, 2018). The responses displays the coherent whole of a person’s faith stage and are averaged to a final faith stage (Streib, 2005). While the aspects are considered during the evaluation of religious styles, formally known as faith stages, no further evaluative steps are used with scores assigned to each aspect (Streib, 2005). There has been no research to the knowledge of the author at this time that has used assigned scores to each aspect in additional evaluation of analysis other than style-aspect maps. When the aspect-specific character of stage or style assignments is disregarded the logic leads to the assumption that stages represent a “structural whole” (Streib, 2005). Streib (2005) argues for a focus on the aspect-specific accumulation of stage scores that can be visualized as “stage-aspect” maps.

Interview assessment of religious styles is still the best standard for accounting for the nuance of religion styles. Streib (2005) adequately addresses the limitations of shorted scales attempting to measure faith development. Streib kindly describes such efforts as an “unfinished project.” Furthermore, using an exclusively quantitative procedure allows for important dimensions in theory to be neglected in both narrative and content of the interview. Streib’s (2005) proposal for a revision of faith development research considers instruments that have been proposed for quantitative assessments in FDT and a revised research design that calls for an attention to structure, content, and narrative that aligns to create a coherent methodological procedure for future research.

Questions that Elicit Topics on Interreligious Dialogue

While the entire interview is considered in the analysis of cases, the content where interreligious dialogue may be most likely to appear if the FDI is from the following questions: It is important to note is that questions that likely engage content related to interreligious dialogue are not depicted by a single aspect, but by 4 aspects. Of course, content about IRD is not limited to these questions and may appear at any place in the interview subsumed by any aspect. Here, I'd like to just address that processes in IRD should not be expected to exist under a single aspect and describe a single process. It should be noted that the aspects are intended to reflect a flexible heuristic model and so boundaries of any aspect may better cover content in a narrative rather than the aspect assigned to a question (Streib & Keller, 2018).

These questions are posed as likely being the most relevant in understanding interreligious dialogue because they closely follow the areas in which people engage with IRD.

2. Past Relationships (Aspect: Perspective Taking)

Are there past relationships that have been important to your development as a person?

3. Changes in Relationships (Aspect: Perspective Taking)

Do you recall any changes in relationships that have had a significant impact on your life or your way of thinking about things?

4. Changes in Worldview (Aspect: Symbolic Function)

How has your world view changed across your life's chapters? How has this affected your image of God or of the Divine, or what is holy for you? What does it mean to you now?

9. Group Identity (Aspect: Social Horizon)

What groups, institutions, or causes, do you identify with? Why are they important to you? Are there groups that have been important to you, but are not important anymore? Did you leave a (religious) community recently?

25. Religious or Worldview Conflicts (Aspect: Form of World Coherence)

If people disagree about issues of world view or religion, how can such conflicts be resolved?

CHAPTER VIII

INTEGRATING INTERRELIGIOUS DIALOGUE IN THE RELIGIOUS STYLES PERSPECTIVE

It's important to know how we can apply the religious styles perspective to an application of a phenomena. This helps give us insight to what already established processes may be occurring. Importantly, the premise of this study is to understand how religious styles may differ in how they engage in IRD. To do this, we must first understand where IRD is most relevant in the religious styles perspective by looking at overlap in the aspects to what we may consider important components of IRD. Then, we must understand how religious styles may differ when informed by each aspect on how they engage in IRD. The aspects examine the structure of the narrative provided rather than the content as well as how an individual understands, responds, and reacts to the questions by expressing and transforming their responses (Streib & Keller, 2018). By knowing the structure of narrative, we can begin to understand what the structure of IRD or religious group contact may look like among each of the religious styles.

Streib (2005) Streib (2005)proposes that combining the aspect of “bounds of social awareness” ,conceptualized as “Social Horizon” in the 2018 edition of the Manual, and “perspective-taking” as a single aspect may be useful to understanding developmental attitudes towards the “other” or the “strange” and styles of “interreligious negotiations.” This sets up a foundation for understanding how we might be able to utilize Streib’s (2005) proposal for an aspect-specific interpretation of religious styles to better understand interreligious dialogue.

Interreligious Dialogue in the Religious Styles Model Aspects

It is important to articulate which aspects of the religious styles model may speak to different elements of IRD. Because IRD can be different interactions, strength of contact, or type of contact, we may expect to examine certain elements of IRD in certain aspect that may have the strongest case for explanatory power of the psychology of IRD.

Perspective Taking Aspect

The primary definition of the Perspective Taking aspect describes the interpretation of the relationship between the self and others in consideration of how the self-identified others are constructed. Broadly, Perspective Taking appraises how a person perceives themselves and others in the world as a reflection of which aspects of a relationship; the self, the other, or both; prompt a change in perspective. The distinction of style assignments in Perspective Taking is a result from where a person identifies the cause of any change in their worldview or changes in relationships. Perspective Taking also considers how a person reflects on internal states of thought and emotion (Streib & Keller, 2018).

Perspective Taking may have the most explanatory power of the psychological processes in IRD. Perspective Taking is deliberately the initial aspect of Streib's religious styles perspective (Streib & Keller, 2018) and may defensively be the most paramount aspect to gain an understanding of the processes and results of the variety of expressions of IRD. The aspect of Perspective Taking consists of a range of dimensions that reflect the obvious major concepts that a basic explanation of the psychological processes in IRD must engage. Additionally, these dimensions compliment established theories and variables that can be applied to best inform an

empirical understanding of IRD and from where a foundation of future research must be in conversation.

Perspective Taking is primarily involved with assessing where causes in changed relationships are and how a person perceives themselves, others, and relationships. Using this aspect, we can understand where changes, resulting from religious contact and religious diversity, cause alterations in an individual's concept of themselves or others, if there are any at all. This enables us to see what parts of relationships IRD has the potential to impact, such as viewing the self, a religious other, or a relationship differently after IRD. This would also allow us to see where a person attributes changes to themselves or others after interreligious contact. Perhaps they attribute the change to themselves and change in their own thinking or as a result of the behavior of a religious other. This allows the Perspective Taking aspect to both address changes and the source of change as a result of IRD can help us understand the impact of IRD and how that impact may differ across religious styles.

Principally, IRD exists as an application of processes described in Perspective Taking in the matters concerning religion. Perspective Taking is primarily concerned with how an individual perceives themselves, the other, and a relationship between the two, which are assessments that are happening in an IRD practice. IRD can be crudely conceptualized as the interactions between an individual who represents the self and a religious other and describes a relationship between two individuals who identify with different religions where perspective taking occurs. Through the lens of perspective taking, we can view how the self, the other, and the relationship are viewed from the applied context of relationships involving religious diversity, where IRD is an example of relationships in the context of interreligious relations. Concepts of the self and the other are determined as a result of contact between individuals who

differ in religious identity or belief in which criteria of Perspective Taking take place, where constructions of the self and others are the context of religion. Therefore, perspective taking is directly relevant in understanding the relationship between the self and others when the focus of the relationship or interaction is an issue about religion or where religious identity is central to the interaction, distinguishing the interaction as IRD rather than any other focus on relationship outside of the focus on religion.

Descriptions of IRD, while varied, characteristically must include at least one perspective that can be identified as a religious “other.” By strictly describing IRD this way, we can understand IRD through the lens of Perspective Taking where a self and other are established for the perspective taking to occur. This first requires a distinction between the self and an other, which the structure of IRD inherently provides by describing an “inter” dialogue which assumes a dialogue between two differing perspectives. In this application, the other can both describe an individual that is not the self and a distinguished other, who is an individual that characterizes an “other” because they represent a different perspective than the self. Perspective taking therefore relates to Waldenfel’s (1990, 2011) other where an individual perceives themselves and other individuals who represent different religious identities.

Second, IRD requires a person to think how others’ inner processes. How does the religious other influence an individual’s life? The aspect of perspective taking may act as an accurate descriptor of how individual’s conceptualize their self-concept, or identity, described by Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Additionally, perspective taking may be a good descriptor of how identity plays into intergroup contact, as group contact is the focus of most research on interreligious dialogue as understood as intergroup contact or intergroup relations.

Questions that deal with Perspective Taking in the FDI primarily deal with reflecting on one's life and articulating any changes in relationships that have occurred with a focus on how other people may have influenced their life. Accounts of IRD seem to exemplify interactions where contact or dialogue occurred when introduced to religious diversity, which resulted in a change in perspective or meaningful influence in a life narrative. It is important to note that the introduction of the religious other, or religious diversity, could result in positive or negative outcomes that influence one's life. Contrary to popular beliefs about IRD as an intervention option, interactions with the religious other should not be conceptualized as an inherently beneficial practice or event that only stands to positively impact an individual's life or promotes the reflection of other perspectives. How a person thinks another person influences their life encompasses perspective taking. How a person thinks about another religious person and how that other religion influences their life is understandable by looking at interreligious dialogue.

Characterizations of religious styles in Perspective Taking

Here is the description of perspective taking at each style, which should give an understanding of how we might see IRD interact with each style:

Style 1 is characterized by subjective perspective taking. Other perspectives are indistinguishable from one's own as if other perspectives do not exist. Style 2 is characterized by a simple perspective taking. Other perspectives are identifiable and recognized as concrete "others," but there is little awareness of how inner processes differ between the self and the other. The focus of other perspectives is based on reward and punishment from following incorrect perspectives in the eyes of Style 2, and others are viewed as saying the same wants and needs as one's own. As a result, style 2 may exhibit harsh judgements when characterizing

others. Style 3 is characterized by mutual interpersonal perspective taking where a person perceives interiority, focuses on feelings and emotional states of others, and social roles emerge as a result of the understanding of the self. At style 3 a person attempts to understand the perspective of others but can only do so in a limited capacity. Style 4 is characterized by a third-person perspective that focuses on a particular system or ideology. In style 4, the possibility of other perspectives and construction of other perspectives is explicitly considered. The other's worldview is considered and justified while maintaining their own perspective. Style 4 tends to only see the other in terms of their own worldview. The person is aware of the interiority of the self and the other but focuses on the discovery of one's own interiority; however, there is a genuine attempt to see the other as an other.

Style 5 is characterized by a conscious, conceptually mediated perspective. At style 5, a person considers all experience mediated and views perspectives that differ from one's own as possible views that add perspective to their own position. Style 5 can take multiple perspectives fully. It considers all the contexts that lead to a person having a particular view, holds an openness toward the other, and strives to understand things through the perspective of the other. This style does not find defining, maintaining, or defending their own perspective particularly important.

Relation to IRD by Styles

A style 1 will not be able to distinguish that other religious views and commitments exist different from one's own. For example, a person who is style 1 and holds a Christian worldview would reinterpret any other faith commitment as an aspect of their own, where everything is able to be explained by the lens of Christianity. A person at style 1 would not be able to accept that a

person has views that were not Christian. Dialogue would not be possible at style 1 because a person would not be able to identify a religious other in which to dialogue with. No “inter” dialogue could exist between two differing religions because a person at style 1 would not perceive the existence of two differing religions, only one religion or perspective.

At style 2, a person would be able to distinguish a religious other in which to have dialogue with, but such action would be unlikely to occur due to the belief that any perspectives that differ from their own are subject to punishment outlined by their worldview. A person at style 2 would likely condemn any belief that differed from their own and expect the religious other to be punished appropriately for holding a “wrong” perspective. Because a person at style 2 views another’s wants and needs as the same as their own, understanding a different motivation to dialogue may be difficult. At style 2, a person with a different religious view would be viewed as a concrete religious other. Due to the tendency of someone at style 2 to be harshly judgmental in the characterization of others, a religious other may be harshly judged as a “sinner” or “stupid” or other criticism that describes a person with differing religious beliefs. Importantly, a person at style 2 would be challenged by imagining how a religious other may perceive their own perspective.

A person with style 3 will try to understand how the interiority of the religious other with a focus on how the other feels but will only be able to achieve this in a limited way. Because a person at style 3 focuses on how they fit in social relationships, religious others define who they are. Importantly, style 3 may adopt a worldview without explicit reflection and is unable to view the religious other as part of a broader picture.

A person with style 4 will attempt to understand the interiority of the religious other and will be aware that the other has different views, but the focus will be on understanding religious

others to understand their own worldview. Religious others may be seen as part of larger systems of relationships, where they are understood through the lens of the other's worldview. In particular, a person engaged in IRD at style 4 will be able to consider the viewpoint of the other but will have a preference to defend their own perspective.

A person with style 5 will exhibit what ideal and effective IRD looks like. They will actively try to see the perspective of the religious other and will identify with perspectives of the other, even if the perspective is radically different. A person will not feel the need to defend their own perspective. Importantly, IRD at style 5 acknowledges and understands meaning from a religious other without having to view that meaning from their own worldview. They consider other religions from the perspective of how the other may see themselves. The religious other is valuable because they are a unique individual, not only because of their membership in a different religion. At style 5, IRD practices may focus less on the perspective of religious group differences and more on the relationship between two persons with differing worldviews.

Social Horizon Aspect

Social Horizon primarily deals with how a person identifies with groups. Social horizon also determines how large a person's world is perceived and how inclusive that world is. Those who are "others" or "strangers" may exist outside of the group determined by social horizon.

Relation to IRD by Styles

Because Social Horizon primarily deals with how a person identifies with groups, this aspect is important for understanding how a person's religious identity to a religious group comes into play during interreligious dialogue. Interreligious dialogue represents the dialogue

between two individuals who are connected to religious groups. So, the way in which individuals feel connected to larger groups, like religion or another social identity, will impact the way interreligious dialogue looks like.

Social Horizon also deals with how inclusive the world is and who might be determined as a religious other. In interreligious dialogue, the distinction of religious others and groups must be determined in order to have a dialogue, and dialogue may look differently if a group or individual who represents a group is considered within the boundaries of a person's social horizon.

Characterizations of religious styles in the Social Horizon aspect

In Style 1, a person must be able to distinguish that boundaries exist. In style 2, an individual fixates on boundaries that are formed by social identities, such as race, ethnicity, class, and religion. These are characterized by how much a person is like them. In style 3, a person's boundaries extend to groups that the individual has emotional bonds and personal relationships with. Style 3 is primarily centered on group membership and group goals. At Style 4, a person's boundaries are extended to groups that are ideologically compatible with one's own. At Style 5, the form of social horizon is extended to those who may be considered outgroup as well as other traditions with conflicting truth claims.

Similar to the form of perspective taking, an individual with a Style 1 form of social horizon primarily focuses on the ability to recognize that an "other" or other perspective exists. So, we would not expect a person at style 1 to be able to engage in IRD because they are unable to distinguish between other boundaries in which to have a dialogue with.

Style 2 is aware that others exist outside of their own social horizon, but only identify with the group they originate from. At Style 2, any IRD that occurs would be between two differing and concrete groups; people “like us” and those “not like us.” Distinctions between the groups fall into two concrete categories, making finding commonality or other conditions required for effective contact between differing groups difficult to establish.

At style 3, a person’s boundaries extend to people that they have personal relationships with. Effective strategies of IRD are often characterized by forming personal relationships with religious others. Here, we may expect effective IRD to occur only when an individual has a personal relationship with a religious other. This has interesting implications for how to approach IRD at a religious style.

At Style 4, a person’s boundaries are extended to groups that are ideologically compatible with one’s own. So, IRD may be expected to occur between religions that can easily find common ground or hold ideologies that do not directly conflict with one’s own belief. Religious others may be viewed as less “other-like” or less removed from the self at style 4 if the religious other is compatible with a person’s own worldview or way of thinking. Style 4 also considers a range of viewpoints but does so to preserve its own perspective. This may be indicative of some elements of pluralism or motive to engage in certain types of IRD. Individuals are seen as parts of systems or groups rather than an individual.

At Style 5, the boundary of social horizon is open to outgroups and those that hold other truth claims. For this reason, IRD may come easier to an individual who views those holding different beliefs as less removed from their own worldview because conflicting views are included in their own social horizon. Style 5 extends this to actively seek and include other groups different from one’s own for the purpose of dialogue. This explicitly reflects IRD. Style 4

seeks closure and avoid conflict while style 5 accepts dissonance and is able to hold tensions at constants.

Morality Aspect

Form of morality deals with how a person handles issues when they are morally significant.

Relation to IRD by Styles

Many dialogues concerning religion are a result of disagreements over moral concerns. For this reason, form of morality is relevant to a specific prompting that may result in dialogue, or lack thereof.

Style 1 is primarily concerned with avoiding punishment but can distinguish between good and bad. Like the other aspects at style 1, form of morality cannot distinguish between the self, the other, or any motive that determines the morality of an action. Style 2 is aware that others may have interests that conflict with one's own and attempts to resolve conflicts by exchanging favors or services to ensure fairness. It is based in instrumental reciprocity in which a person's motive is to do something for someone else so they will return the favor (Streib & Keller, 2018). Style 3 is focused on maintaining interpersonal relationships. Those outside of interpersonal relationships are perceived to have the same desires and motives as the self or are considered deviant. Style 4 is characterized by the focus to maintain a social order and explicitly takes on the perspective of the group it belongs to and obeys the rules of. Style 5 exhibits moral reasoning based on principals and exhibits reasoning where issues in conflict can be held in

tension. Importantly, style 5 has an interest in integrating multiple perspectives and considers multiple points of view that can be directed toward a moral issue.

Style 1 would be unable to engage in dialogue due to the inability to distinguish between others and to perceive motive in morality; therefore, any conversation prompted by a moral concern would lose. Style 2 may only engage in IRD if it is benefiting themselves. So, for example, a style 2 would engage in IRD if it may benefit a religious group, such as protecting a religious freedom. Or, a person may only engage in IRD to get someone else to be nice to or to do something, like convert to their religion. Any motive to engage in IRD that is self-serving may be characterized by Style 2 form of morality. Style 3 is primarily concerned with maintaining social relationships and displaying values that avoid interpersonal consequences. For this reason, IRD may only be approached as a motive to maintain a social relationship. Conversations in IRD that relate to issues of morality will relate to moral relativism (Streib & Keller, 2018) or determining that personal feelings and values are the basis for determining whether something is right or wrong. In IRD, dialogue may fail as a result of conflict in determining if something is right or wrong based on difference in personal feelings. In a conversation that surrounds a conflict of religion, a style 4 would cite the need for maintaining order and following laws over the need of any one individual. Style 5 morality is most concerned with engaging multiple perspectives to understand how issues of morality can be held in tension. For these people, dialogue in IRD may consider the multiple reasons why a moral judgement may be made, focusing on the right of the individual rather than to society or a group. Moral decisions in this style are made as a result of dialogue.

Locus of Authority Aspect

Locus of authority, like the name suggests, deals with the conception of authority in one's life. This describes how a person selects an authority, the relationship of the authority to the individual, and if an external or internal authority is primarily responded to.

Relation to IRD by Styles

This aspect appears to be less directly relevant to issues about interreligious dialogue but could have important implications for understanding the role of God or other authorities that might be considered in IRD contexts. Questions connected to the locus of authority aspects are not directly relevant to questions concerning IRD. Because this is not the focus of this review, characteristics of religion styles in this aspect are not included here. For a full review see Streib and Keller (2018).

Form of World Coherence Aspect

Form of world coherence is a description of how an individual constructs a meaningful world around them, or their worldview.

Relation to IRD by Styles

Question 25 that describes how conflicts of worldview or religion should be resolved is houses under this aspect. IRD can be the result of religious diversity which may threaten or represent a conflict for the way a person perceives the world to cohere. The way a person chooses to resolve those conflicts and return to a cohesive understanding of the world is important to understand how they may deal with religious conflicts resulting in IRD. Style 5, in

this aspect, is an embodiment of reaching out to dialogue with other conflicting perspectives and exemplifies direct motivation for engaging in IRD. This characterization seeks out contact with groups and people that are different than their own enrichment. At this style, those who have different perspectives are engaged with others and conflict as a result from differing perspectives are able to deal with as style 5 can hold conflict in tension. Style 5 in form of worldview coherences, also affirms pluralism and seeks principals that pluralism can be a part of.

Characterizations of religious styles in the Form of World Coherence aspect

Style 1 cannot distinguish between fantasy and reality and the world is viewed the same as the self.

At Style 2 the world becomes more ordered with a corresponding narrative, but there is no reflection on the narrative story of the world and the narrative is considered literal and concrete.

Style 3 there is little awareness of contradictions in their worldview as a result of the blending of ideas and attitudes from groups they belong to and people they associate with. Any awareness of a contradiction is met with avoidance rather than an explicit reasoning to combat contradiction. Style 3 may project one's values on groups and individuals they perceive to be like them. Style 3 is often characterized by Laissez-faire pluralism. Importantly, stage 3 also holds a tacit belief system and will cannot give a clear argument for why they hold their beliefs.

Style 4 can critically reflect upon their worldview or religion as an explicit system and an understanding that reality is perceived through our own inner processes. The explicit system they hold is rationally defended. At style 4, defining and maintaining boundaries is important and ,as a result, differences may be more strongly focused on than similarities ,creating a dichotomy

between worldview differences. Any ideological consistency is a major concern for a person at style 4, resulting in a strive for color and finding comprehensiveness in their worldview.

Style 5 is also characterized by an ability to hold conflicts in worldview in tension. Style 5 is characterized by actively seeking out other groups for the purpose of dialogue. Style 5 aims to accept differences and cope with dissonance by referring to higher order principals.

Importantly, style 5 can hold conflict in tension, resulting from differing perspectives, and views changes in life as part of a larger unfinished narrative.

Style 1 and Style 2 in this perspective would be unable to engage in dialogue. Style 3 will avoid any religious contact or interaction that forces them to become aware of a contradiction in their worldview. Additionally, they may find difficulty in dialogue due to the nature of projecting their own beliefs onto others that they believe are like them. Because style 3 is often categorized by Laissez-faire pluralism, religious concepts may be adopted without reflection, making some interreligious influence part of their worldview but, without discernment, any dialogue will not legitimately exist without a reflection on the nature of the beliefs or how those beliefs offer contradictory narratives. Because individuals at style 3 have a tacit belief system, they may display difficulty in articulating a clear argument for why they hold a religious belief to have a dialogue with another, which is a commonly proposed necessary criteria for effective dialogue.

Style 4 may focus more on maintaining and defining boundaries in IRD. A clear criterion that some theories propose is necessary for IRD is to have a clear identity to use in dialogue with others. However, because style 4 interacts with diverse perspectives and primarily aims to preserve their own perspective, the outcomes of any dialogue working towards community building may not be effective. Because of the tendency to dichotomize, style 4 may have

challenged dialogue by explicitly seeing others as either compatible or incompatible. This label of incompatibility may offer a challenging foundation to begin dialogue with another.

Style 5 is characterized by actively seeking other groups and features a outstretch to dialogue. In social horizon, style 5 embodies what motivations a person may have for dialogue and places a person may seek out dialogue for the purpose of enriching their own perspective. In this aspect, we see an example of how most people may assume the primary motivation to engage in dialogue with religious others to challenge and enrich their own worldview.

Symbolic Function Aspect

Symbolic function is concerned with how a person understand symbols and images of power.

Relation to IRD by Styles

This aspect may be an interesting avenue to understand elements in IRD, but a direct link to a better understanding and foundation of the most prominent features of IRD are not described by this aspect in the religious styles model. For this reason, styles at this aspect are not described in detail or related to how symbols may be perceived relevant to issues of IRD.

CHAPTER IX

RATIONALE FOR STUDY

Interreligious dialogue is clearly a critical phenomenon that merits empirical exploration to better understanding the consequences of interreligious group relations and the efficacy of programs that aim to develop dialogue between the religions. IRD is a context-specific result of intergroup relations and contact that focuses on issues related to religious belief, identity, or affiliation. However, variables related to IRD cannot be easily measured in the same way variables in any intergroup process may be measured, in part, due to a lack of clear theory and an absence of any valid or reliable measurements that directly attend to issues of religious diversity or IRD. As a result, IRD merit the use of a design that considers the specific challenges posed by psychology of religion (Belzen & Hood, 2006). Existing measures that examine intergroup contact, group relations, or intergroup conflict are not sensitive to nuances related to religious belief or identity.

This exploratory investigation addresses those gaps in the literature by using a qualitative methodology to examine the major theoretical considerations and criticisms of posed by the challenge of an empirical understanding of IRD: 1. Life narratives shaped by IRD, 2. The presence of psychological mechanisms and processes in group contact theories (Allport, 1954; Paluck et al., 2018; Pettigrew, 1998), religious styles and exposure to the religious other (Streib & Keller, 2018; Streib & Klein, 2014, 2018), theories of effective IRD (Cornille, 2013; Garfinkel, 2004; Merdjanova, 2016; Merdjanova & Brodeur, 2009; Paul, 1965; Swidler, 1983;

Timmerman & Segaert, 2007), 3. The depiction of religious social identity (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Verkuyten, 2007) in IRD, and 4. perceptions of the efficacy of IRD for the goals of major facilitation of IRD practices.

IRD is be a beneficial topic to parallel theory in areas of psychology that focus on a broader scope of group processes and relations. Such areas in mainstream psychology may benefit from the adoption of topics unique to the psychology of religion (Hood Jr. & Belzen, 2013; James, 1950). Dittes (1969) propose that psychological mechanisms may uniquely interact in religious constructs that require the acknowledgement of religion as a cultural phenomena and merit the study of psychological processes that interact with religion (Hood Jr. & Belzen, 2013). He additionally proposes that unique religious variables operate in religion in ways that may differ from their operation in mainstream psychology or remain ignored by mainstream psychology (Hood Jr. & Belzen, 2013; Hood Jr. et al., 2005). IRD is an example of such a phenomena of religious dimensions that remained largely ignored in the psychological study of group processes and relations that described interactions between social and ideological identities like religion but fail to consider unique variables of religion that may uniquely impact group processes.

A grounded theory application paradigm (Creswell & Poth, 2017) is a particularly important approach for a developmental narrative that provides insight to what specific contexts and constructs contribute to conflict resolution between the religions that can be supported by a range of quantitative data. However, understanding the roles and motives that might spawn conflict resolution and lead to IRD are necessarily found in the qualitative data that empirically support the foundation of theory in this direction, rather than an assumption of meaning from a subjective experience rooted in anecdote. Here we have structured, empirical constructs we look

for in that data that can be systematically linked to the narrative explanations of how conflict is resolved between religious ideas and in what ways this impacts development, perspective taking, worldview, and motivation to continue to reach out to others (like xenos). Further, this supports that development in this area may be focused on a particular development of religious styles.

Qualitative Design

To confront the criticisms of the current empirical study of IRD, we employ a qualitative design to analyze narrative. A qualitative design allows for an exploration of problems and contexts involved with IRD. Using a qualitative design, social issues like those related to the goals of IRD are best able to look at real-world descriptions of complex issues that can attend to real world descriptions in application (Bloor, 2011). Qualitative research in this area will help development nascent theories that aim to explain IRD or assess the efficacy of IRD practices that do not adequately capture of the complexity of IRD by developing an in-depth description and analysis for multiple instrumental cases provides an understanding of IRD that emerges into a foundation for a clear route for grounded theory research that aims to develop a theory grounded in the data or the views of the participants.

This detail can best be established by examining the narratives provided by people who have experienced religious diversity that choose to engage in IRD. Allowing participants to tell narratives that are unencumbered by specific research questions about IRD that are influenced by what the researcher may expect to find or that is informed by the literature results in a rich data that reflects authentic and accurate descriptions of the type, content, and importance IRD in the lives of participants. Using a case study qualitative design (Creswell & Poth, 2017) where in-depth, descriptive questions are focused on that lead to a rich understanding about how different

individuals may engage differently by religious style will provide insight into the issue of IRD and skill based interpretations of efficacy and willingness to dialogue described by emergent IRD theories. The focus is not predominantly on the individual, but on the shared issue that the cases discuss. In this instance, the focus is on interreligious dialogue. A case study relied on multiple data sources rather than one individual story. Case study research builds an in-depth, contextual understanding of the case.

Through the framework of the religious styles model (Streib, 2001a) we can begin to approach a way to measure instances of interreligious dialogue that is grounded in a major theoretical framework. This framework speaks to the nuance of religion in intergroup processes that can be in conversation with major frameworks and measurement in social psychology. This sets up an even better foundation for the study of the psychology of interreligious dialogue. This has important impact to follow the examples of Streib and Klein (2014) and Farrell et al. (2018) who employ qualitative methodology to move toward an empirical understanding of interreligious relations in applied settings.

A case study qualitative design (Creswell & Poth, 2017) where in-depth, descriptive questions are focused on that lead to a rich understanding about how different cases provide insight into the issue of interreligious dialogue. Focusing on cases that surround a single issue, in this analysis, those cases dealing with issues of religious diversity and resulting interreligious dialogue. Instrumental case studies (Creswell & Poth, 2017; Patton, 2005) that select one issue (IRD) but select multiple case studies to illustrate the issue describe this procedure. Multiple-case design uses logic of replication to best enable a commonality of themes and experiences across religious styles and IRD experiences. In this case study framework, the focus is not predominantly on the individual, but on the shared issue that the cases discuss. In this instance,

the focus is on interreligious dialogue. A case study relied on multiple data sources rather than one individual story. Case study research builds an in-depth, contextual understanding of the case.

A Grounded theory paradigm (Creswell & Poth, 2017) in the qualitative analysis of cases that surround IRD allows for an approach of theory and application of IRD where theory is “grounded” in the participant data. Grounded theory is a qualitative research design where the researcher produced a general explanation or theory about a phenomenon (Creswell & Poth, 2017). Importantly, grounded theory is able to account for participant explanations of the results of religious diversity that allow for a nuanced understanding of religion group processes that broader theories of group processes may fail to consider when looking at processes in the context of religion.

Research Hypotheses

Case studies demonstrate examples of that link by the observation of narratives of participants who describe their perspective of examples and perceptions of religious diversity. An exploratory investigation of instrumental cases (Creswell & Poth, 2017) aims to answer the following big questions: How do people engage in IRD? How do they suggest religious conflicts should be resolved? What do responses inform about other theories related to IRD? Is there commonality of cases studies within religious styles that relates to other theories related to IRD or other themes?

I hypothesize that descriptions IRD will be expressed uniquely in differing religious styles. I predict that schema described by the Religious Styles Perspective will highlight the thematic experiences in narratives of different reactions to religious diversity. The themata, or

experiences, described by each case will expose common themes resulting from a thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Creswell & Poth, 2017) of the cases. I hypothesize that case examples will describe themes that are expressed across nascent theories of interreligious dialogue and serve as examples of a need for an integrative understanding of theory related to IRD that reveals a reality of perception of and engagement in IRD.

The case studies and thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) used to identify common themes in IRD test the theoretical proposal of what IRD might look like in the Religious Styles Perspective (RSP). The RSP outlines criteria that establish how a person with a religious style should react to religious diversity. Additional attention on the content of cases that were selected by coding criteria that deal specifically with IRD highlight important other dimensions and characteristics of IRD at each religious style. The data are an empirical complement to the Religious Styles Perspective (Streib, 2001a) and a further analysis of a theoretical framework of IRD in other concepts that are likely critical in understanding the outcomes and efficacy of IRD practices and as a result of exposure to religious diversity.

CHAPTER X

METHOD

Participants

Twenty instrumental cases chosen for analysis were obtained from archival data of Faith Development Interviews collected as part of the *Developmental change in Spirituality: Longitudinal study of faith biographies, religious schemata and their psychological correlates and predictors* (John Templeton Foundation #52249) in United States from 2005-2017 at two time periods (t0=2011, t1=2015-2017). Purposeful sampling (Creswell & Poth, 2017; Patton, 2005) is utilized to select cases that show different perspectives and processes in IRD. Interviews in the archived data were conducted by an interviewer trained in the most up to date training materials in religious style research according to the Manual for Faith Development Research (Fowler et al., 2004) and the revised manual of Research on Religious styles (Streib & Keller, 2018). Interviews were conducted by phone, Skype, or in-person. Participants were recruited using snowball sampling and interest in the project. Interviews were audiotaped, transcribed, and reviewed for sufficient content. All personal information in interviews was de-identified.

Materials

The Faith Development Interview

The Faith Development Interview (FDI) is a semi-structured interview that remains the gold standard for assessing religious or faith styles. The FDI has retained the 25 question format

with only a slight adaptation to the semantics of some questions to address the perspectives of a range of participants rather than limited to those that prescribe to a traditionally religious language to describe worldview (Streib & Keller, 2018). The questions are prompted to participants whose responses in the duration of the interview may last anywhere between 30 minutes and 3 hours. The FDI is susceptible to subjectivity interviewer influence, the interview and corresponding manual provide a standard form and order of the questions and prompts with clear instructions for use that contributes to a reliable and consistent measurement (Streib & Keller, 2018). The interview examines four areas: life review, relationships, values and commitments, and religion and worldview. The FDI reflects in considerable depth about issues confronted during the practice of IRD including a person's justification of decision making, moral action, and asks participants to theoretically engage in how they might solve a conflict surrounding religious beliefs or worldviews. The final question of the FDI represents the dimension of IRD, "If there is a conflict or worldview or religion, how should such a conflict be resolved?" Questions that are most relevant in addressing issues of IRD are carefully examined while also bearing in mind the content of the entire interview. The procedure of using complete FDI interviews rather than isolated questions that directly engaged with IRD allows for an examination of narrative that describes authentic but often sporadic IRD that is difficult to measure in facilitated and focused efforts to understand the diversity of these practices. IRD events that are marker event that arises without a specific prompt about IRD make the data on IRD more meaningful due to the desire of the participant to bring up the effects of a topic rather than prompted by the researcher.

The FDI is designed to examine what a respondent is thinking and feeling by asking a primary question, followed by probes to elicit a full explanation of important processes or

meaning in the question, or how they arrived at their answer. It allows interviews to explore issues that might have been missed through entirely structured interviews. The main weakness of the FDI is the reliance on the social and technical skills of the interview to elicit a subject's recall of events and full answer. The interview is structured to allow for an analysis of the interview for coders who are looking at the coding criteria of the interview to assess religious style assignments. The interview explores the complexity of an individual's religious identity, their form of worldview coherence, and how they react to and engage with others. Instances of IRD in the interviews are used to describe how different style types exhibit interreligious dialogue.

Religious Style Scores

As part of the archived data, interviews were previously assigned religious style scores. Religious style assessments were rated for the interviews in 2011, while religious stage assessments were assigned previously to 2015. The coding criteria for styles and stage change are described in the manual for religious style research (Streib & Keller, 2018). Changes in the semantics and theoretical assumptions of religious styles result in a slight deviation in the coding criteria to assign a style over criteria to assign a stage score. Each question in the Faith Development Interview is assigned a faith development stage or religious style assignment according to the coding criteria provided. The overall style assessment provided for each case is the overall, averaged religious style assessment, not a religious style assessment for an isolated question in the FDI.

Analysis Procedure

Instrumental case studies were selected as a result of containing narrative content in the FDI that illustrates engagement or reflection with IRD. This selection identifies individuals who

are engaged with religious diversity, with a focus on individuals who critically engage in how to resolve issues of disagreement in religion or worldview. The choice of 20 cases is not based on any specific number, but rather on the basis that the ideas proposed about IRD need to be detailed and saturated, at a point where additional data gathered from the inclusion of more cases at this point would not further develop an understanding about our research questions.

The interpretation of the cases reflects the scope of training and research experience of the author, with extensive experience in projects involving the narrative of life history. Case descriptions of instrumental cases are provided and categories relative to their religious style score (Streib & Keller, 2018) to provide a cohesive structure and narrative link between unique cases within a religious style. Each case will undergo a thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) used to identify common themes in IRD test the theoretical proposal of what IRD might look like in the Religious Styles Perspective (Streib, 2001a). Additionally, each case will be analyzed for phrase themes and word frequencies using Provalis WordStat (ProvalisResearch, 2018) for an independent means of to obtain congruence of analysis.

Common themes will be discussed for each cases within each religious style, and the common themes of all cases across styles will be contrasted. Additional descriptions of themata, or experiences, described by individual cases will be related to nuance in theoretical considerations outside of the religious styles perspective that merits future attention to applied understandings of IRD and perceptions of IRD efficacy.

CHAPTER XI

RESULTS

Twenty cases were selected out of 136 interviews in the archival from the *Developmental change in Spirituality: Longitudinal study of faith biographies, religious schemata and their psychological correlates and predictors* (John Templeton Foundation #52249) that had both a complete interview transcript and a religious styles score assignment. The selection criteria to include cases for analysis was the inclusion of clear examples of narrative in an interview transcript that displayed content relevant to IRD that illuminated arguments or perspectives about interacting with religious others. As a result, cases with instrumental-reciprocal ($n=2$), mutual ($n=10$), individuative-systemic ($n=6$), and dialogical religious styles ($n = 2$) were selected for analysis. Cases with subjective religious style were not found as part of the archival data, which is consistent with Fowler's (1981) theory that individuals characterized by this style are rare in adulthood (Streib, 2001; 2005).

Cases described in the instrumental-reciprocal style ($n = 2$) and the dialogical style ($n = 2$) represent the 2 out of 3 available cases for their respective style in the archival data. The available cases that were excluded from analysis in this research due to the same exclusionary criteria as other religious styles with more cases that represented that style: the cases did not significantly describe any narrative that reflected upon issues related to IRD or provided a nuanced understanding about IRD through the religious styles perspective. The case omitted from analysis in the dialogical style, which is critically important to the study of IRD and

additional data for this style would benefit the understanding of theory, was done so due to the author's disagreement with the religious style score assessment of the case accurately reflecting a dialogical religious style.

Table 11.1 Religious Styles of Participants

Psuedonym	Style	Participant ID	Time of Interview
Derek K.	instrumental-reciprocal	1481	t0
Brooke A.	Instrumental-reciprocal	1762	t0
Allison H.	mutual	1329	t0
Ke. Bernard	mutual	1197	t1
Pa. Abraham	mutual	2492	t1
Sa. Anna	mutual	2449	t1
Cu. Brendan	mutual	2528	t1
Ella H.	mutual	254	t0
Ca. Blake	mutual	2525	t1
Kara Bu.	mutual	401	t1
Valerie Ra.	mutual	523	t1
Trevor We.	mutual	1393	t1
Savannah H.	individuative-systemic	2078	t1R
Co. Emmet	individuative-systemic	2524	t1
Vicki I.	individuative-systemic	1241	t1R
Jordan J.	individuative-systemic	262	t1R
Or. Jill	individuative-systemic	2461	t1
Wh. Lois	individuative-systemic	2478	t1
Benjamin H.	dialogical	128	t0
April J.	dialogical	1186	t0

Interpretation

A description of narratives among the selected cases generated examples of IRD or engagement with religious diversity. Thematic analysis yielded major themes from transcribed interviews of cases. The results below illustrate the major themes of the cases organized by the

religious style of the cases. For each religious style, major themes are described, and unique examples of engagement with religious others are highlighted in each case. Excerpts of the interview transcript are quoted from the participants.

Instrumental-reciprocal

In this case, Derek K. mentions debate as a reaction to solving issues of conflict between worldview or religion.

“Debate or being cordial through debate and looking at history and people again looking at the cause, what it stands for and observing other... not just looking at the bible for example but looking at historical records from wrong and historical records, from outside of the church to collaborated or uncollaborated the same thing with” *Derek K. (1481, t0)*.

While Derek K. refers to debate as cordial, suggesting that there may be some dialogue, the nature of discussion being in conflict described as debate notes that there may be no conclusion or criteria for common ground. Derek K. does not include that there is a resolution to debate, or that debate solves conflict. Instead, he seems to describe a focus on how debate should take place, in his view, by examining a variety of perspectives and sources. This suggests important engagement and perspective taking during interreligious relations, but does not seem to indicate that relations between those with differing religious views will lead to a dialogue or criteria that is proposed to lead to beneficial outcomes of IRD.

“So I think just examining everything and seeing how it cooperates would be a good way and that may not come to a perfect understanding but at least like I said cleared out a little bit and the only other answer I’d add to that is just knowing ... I want to say cooperating.” *Derek K. (1481, t0)*.

In his perception of the efficacy of dialogue, Derek K. suggests that there can be a resolution to conflicts of worldview and religion, and offers a few solutions to doing so. Dialogue and listening to the other are one of his proposed solutions. However, his narratives do

not suggest that finding common ground or agreeing to disagree are clear approaches in which to resolve such issues. Notably, Derek K. addresses a motive to retain clear boundaries of religion.

“but you have your religion, I’m trying to convert you as it says I’m supposed to do but you don’t have to so I’ve done my part, if you don’t want to convert... people [...] each other or people killing each other like some of the Extremist Muslims do in the Middle East or [...] at people’s funerals like those people out in was it Kansas city or wherever they’re from. So doing your part, standing out for your part, sticking by it but once your part is done you don’t [have] to kill anybody or protest funerals.” *Derek K. (1481, t0)*.

Derek K. describes issues as a result of disagreement among religion. Conversion is described as a “part” of the experience of interaction with religious diversity. This highlights that a motivate to dialogue, or the reason for being in a position to engage in IRD in the first place, is a result of a desire to fulfil religiously-based motives such a proselytizing and conversion. The actions of extremist groups are exemplified as areas where Derek K. suggests that upholding one’s own religious beliefs in dialogue goes beyond the scope of “standing out for your part.” Derek K. emphasizes the importance of his identity with Christianity and following “God’s word.” He emphasizes finding meaning in God, and living the way God commands, explicitly noting a precise exercise to follow God’s word.

“I don’t even want to say my church because is a means of worship to God so I guess it’s the trying to follow with God’s word to the T so the cause of Christianity or being a Christian will have to be number one if you want to say going to church that’s fine but I just know some churches don’t exactly go by what you’re supposed to do so I don’t want to say that church goes before God it’s the other way around.” *Derek K. (1481, t0)*.

Similarly, Brooke A. describes a Christian religious tradition as an important part of her identity.

“I consider myself a girl scout, I consider myself a Christian and for both those groups I really kind of identify with I really... they are important to me” *Brooke A. (1762, t0)*.

Like Derek K., Brooke A. describes an understanding of other’s culture and history as essential criteria for resolving disagreements. Brooke A. notes an immediate reaction to a lack of

understanding of others may typically be establishing a clear claim on who is correct in any given situation. She notes that as a result of lack of a more in-depth investigation of the context that shapes a person's ideological stance is judgment toward others and an apparent impasse where understanding between others ceases.

“I think a big part of the disagreements of [...] is really not understanding each others views unlike not understanding each others cultures their history where they are coming from why they say what they say and the immediate reaction to be like "you are wrong I don't care you are wrong" without really doubting deeper into the situation without really seeing why they say what they say and I think that's probably the most important part is, you don't know where they are coming from you don't know why they are saying what they saying and all you are doing is sitting there and judging them and saying they wrong without really looking any further into it much just not like any way to go about dealing with things” *Brooke A. (1762, t0)*.

In this case, no clear paths for moving past an impasse resulting from a lack of understanding of the views of religious others are articulated. A description of why individuals with differences in religious beliefs may be in conflict is provided, but little articulation is provided about how to navigate those differences beyond a vague effort to understand the context and perspectives of others.

Major themes

The instrumental-reciprocal cases yielded common themes of perspective taking, education of religious beliefs, and a clear distinction of their own religious identities.

Debate is noted as one of the major criteria that are proposed that bar the effectiveness of IRD. In both cases, participant narrative focuses on the problems of disagreements, rather than potential avenues to move past disagreements or engage in IRD that is suited to lead to beneficial outcomes. In the description of disagreements with religious others, both cases seem to approach issues caused by religious diversity by implementing a strategy that highlights potential

suggestions to resolving issues, but fail to engage in any criticism of the efficacy of their suggestions, particularly as resolutions that aim to address complex problems. Neither cases remark on strategies commonly proposed in theories of group contact and IRD like finding common ground or agreeing to disagree. Instead, cases focus on perspective taking of the other as a potential resolution.

Notable considerations of criteria of dialogue are missing in the descriptions provided by the cases with instrumental-reciprocal style. While Derek K. describes debate as some form of engaging conversation with an other's religion, neither case describes dialogue as a likely effective solution to issues of disagreements of religion. Instead, cases illustrate the need of others to seek education about the contexts and experiences that have lead individuals to hold their beliefs, rather than direct communication or contact with a religious other. Neither cases in the instrumental-reciprocal style hint at an orientation of resolving conflict in the future and instead focus on expressing immediate approaches to simple disagreements.

Mutual

In the cases with mutual religious style, half of the participants indicate that there can be no resolution for issues or conflict between religions or worldview.

"Well, I don't think they will ever be resolved because everyone has their own opinion. But I think that's great just to not take it so personally and that's what people do is they are like oh this is such a sacred thing, I'm going to take it so personally. Good, I'm glad you feel that strongly about it but you just can't project your opinions and thoughts on everyone else because everyone is different" *Allison H. (1329, t0)*.

"It's not going to be resolved. You just got to accept that there's conflicts- and like- because world peace is such a sham. You know, there isn't going to be any world peace, but that's okay, because sometimes war brings progress" *Pa. Abraham (2492, t1)*.

"Well, all you have to do is look at history. Uh, the way it's been resolved in the past was the dark ages, you know; people being burned at the stake, people being uh, persecuted,

bibles being burned, you know, the fight between the Christians that were- tried to separate themselves and be protestants from the catholic church. Or you could look at the holy wars with the Muslims versus the Christians. So, historically it has been through violence” *Trevor We. (1393, t1)*.

Allison H. describes issues with the perception of sacred concepts in IRD, but notes that everyone has their own opinions about what those view should consist of. There is seemingly no willingness here to find common ground, and instead is a distinct recognition of differences that leads to an impasse. She also describes interaction with religious others as an engagement with ideas and projection of one’s own thoughts, rather than a potential for dialogue and interaction with another person. Similarly, Pa. Abraham rejects the notion that conflict can be resolved. He remarks on some benefit of conflict, like the potential for the resulting wars to bring about progress. The acceptance of conflict that he describes is a clear rejection for any need of IRD. His narrative importantly illuminates the lack of efficacy of IRD practices in individuals who do not see a need combat conflict, believe there is some benefit as a result of conflict, and notably, he rejects any notion of world peace that is so frequent in the language and goals of a majority of IRD proponents. Trevor We. provides a historical perspective to support the lack of ability to achieve resolution to religious conflicts. Interestingly, despite the idea that diverse opinions cannot be resolved, Allison H. seems to celebrate diversity, hinting to potential benefits of culture and humanity improved by diversity.

“I think that’s just part of the diversity and I think that’s part of being human and I think it’s part of like freedom to do those things, to have your own opinion and I think it would be terrible if everyone had the same opinion. I think it would be a lot of easier of course but there would be no diversity, there would be no culture, there would be like no humanity, there would be you know, there would be nothing” *Allison H. (1329, t0)*.

Ke. Bernard echos the thoughts of Allison H., describing that individuals all have different opinions and interpretations that bar resulting conflicts from resolution.

“I don't think they can be. I think when you have different interpretations of what- so, everybody has a viewpoint. In one culture- well, the Western culture in general, um, people tend to be- uh, if you're in an institution, and generally it's some kind of biblically-based, uh, church entity, and there's Baptists, Methodists, there's Catholics, there's the Jews, there's- most of them are derived from the bible, um, and- I think it's like- you think of it as a baseball team, or a football team on a high school, "Oh, we're the best; we're the best team," because that's where you go to school at. And then, there's another school down the road, "Oh, we hate their team, yeah, they're bad, we think they suck, da-da-da, we're the best." You know, we all tend to think whatever team we're on, we're the best, okay? So, religiously, okay I'm a Christian, well, I think I'm the best. Well, that's kind of a self-righteous view, or narrow-minded maybe. *Ke. Bernarnd (1197, t1)*.

Interestingly, Ke. Bernanrd acknowledges his beliefs as “the best.” He continues to acknowledge that this view of his own beliefs may be self-righteous, but it provides a clear example of his thinking on the inability of different beliefs or religious to be resolved. In his view, conflicts may not be resolved if everyone individually believes their views are the best and correct views.

Other participants note the lack of efficacy to resolve conflict through any means as a result of lack of religious belief or a justification of conflict due to religious texts, and particularly the problematic influence of what participants describe as extremist religious groups.

“Unfortunately they never will be. I mean, that is- even with- I mean, the Bible says there will never be peace. It's sad, it can't be. It's just not going to happen. We have too many differing belief systems in our world and some- I mean, for the most part, Christianity these days, you know, tries to be one of love, and that's what it should be, but you have some extremists even within there, that are willing to do some crazy things. But you have other religions that teach it's this way or you die, and when you have that kind of ideology out there, there will be no world peace. There will be no way for those to coexist in peace. It never has, not since the beginning of anything we have historical data on. So, I don't know why we think it would happen now. We are worse than we ever were” *Sa. Anna (2449, t1)*.

“So, there's different religions in this world, okay? And some are very extreme, some are very, um, violent religions, um, and they have their own types of bibles, or, um, readings they have, or books, or philosophies. And so, I don't think any of the- well, that conflict will always prevail, because there's just too many, um, belief systems, that they all think they're right, and so they never will really be in an agreement with each other. So, there is no solution to the conflicts of the different religions. I don't think they will ever compromise” *Ke. Bernarnd (1197, t1)*.

Sa. Anna describes the inability of peace, in part, justified by the bible noting a lack of peace. However, her narrative is filled with lament and regret for the inability for peace to happen, or even a coexistence. She notes that historical data are examples of this and believes that conflict between the religions is worse than previous times in history. Both Sa. Anna and Ke. Bernard provide a perspective of extremism and violent religions, claiming that there can be no compromise due to violent extremist groups. Ke. Bernard remarks on the problem of a saturated religious landscape that provides different religious beliefs and exposure to religious diversity.

Other narrative describes the solution to religious conflict is by having others convert to their own beliefs. In these cases, beliefs described as God's word and words from the bible.

"So, I will say I believe, um, this is the most- if people don't come to the realization of the word of god, I think there will be always conflict. But, within the church, the Christianity, there are conflicts with each other" *Ke. Bernard (1197, t1)*.

"I think that the only way for all of these conflicts to actually be resolved would be for people to of their own accord accept god, accept the bible as his word, and take it at face value. Too many times people think in my opinion that they can pick and choose whichever way they want to go. But I think that there is substantial evidence that the god of the bible is the only true god, that he has a plan for people. But people will believe what they want to believe and so I don't think that it is possible to completely resolve disagreements about religions and so on and so forth because I think people in general want to do what they want to do and the fact that god calls us to obey him makes a lot of people very uncomfortable" *Ella H. (254, t0)*.

"But you know, the Christian answer is that God is going to fix it all in the end." *Trevor We. (1393, t1)*.

Both Ke. Bernard and Ella H. describe unwillingness to dialogue in favor of other's choice to accept their own truth claims as correct and convert. In additional explanation, Ella H. encourages others to seek God. Trevor We. Seems to indicate that from a Christian perspective, the answer to resolving conflict is that God will "fix it." While he does not provide further

information, the way in which a Christian God may fix resolution is by some means of converting others to that particular ideology, whatever that may be.

“So I think the question isn’t- but it’s when people disagree about issues of world view because we know that they do and I just not think that such complex can actually be resolved beyond the individual person wanting to seek god and seek what god truly wants of him. I think when you examine other world religions, you can see inconsistencies, you can see points where they just don’t jar they don’t make sense. And so I think god has given us the path that makes sense and that can be supported but if an individual is not willing to accept that, then there’s not anything you can do to resolve different issues about religion or world view” *Ella H. (254, t0)*.

Ella H. describes her interpretation of the views of other religions as inconsistent. Instead of viewing religious diversity as a potential threat to her own beliefs, she notes that it is a difference that bars the religions from achieving peace.

“I feel like in most major religions, there is a deity of some kind, and people typically believe that that deity is all powerful, and has the power to change the hearts, and minds of other people. So, you know, what I would say to them is how about you just leave it up to your God to change- to convert people instead of arguing about it. Um, I feel like everyone should just focus on their own faith, or whatever they believe, focus on their own lives, and stop worrying about trying to convert the rest of the world.” *Kara Bu. (401, t1)*.

Kara Bu. represents some agreeance with the notion of conversion being the solution to solving problems. However, in her narrative, she differs from participants like Ke. Benard, Ella H., and Trevor W. Instead of suggesting that her worldview or religion is the one in which religious other should convert and ascribe to, she instead notes that arguments should not be had over issues of religious differences. Instead, God should deal with those differences and individual’s can focus on their own faith. All these cases note the problematic role of proclamation and conversion at the root of religious conflict. While the question prompt about solving issues of disagreements in world view or religion does not indicate that the issue is having different beliefs, these cases in the mutual style respond to the prompt as if the conflict itself is that individuals hold differing religious beliefs at all.

“Sometimes you can't. And I guess the best way to do that, and the best way to open up the doors is just maybe, I guess, just being confident in your spirituality on that, and trying to develop that confidence in your own self in that spirituality, and let them do the same thing. I mean it's not my place to push somebody into a direction. I don't think that's- I mean that's not the way I read the bible. Same way. I think we pushed it on them so long that it pissed them off. And they're doing the same thing to us now and pissing us off. I mean I don't know if we find a common ground at this point” *Cu. Brendan (2528, t1)*.

Cu. Brendan notes the importance of having strong confidence in one's own beliefs and encourages the same of those who have differing religious beliefs. As a result, he seems to note that while individual beliefs should be strengthened, no overlap should exist where other are pushed in a direction about their own beliefs, and seems to suggest that increased confidence and development of a belief leads to an inability to find common ground. For IRD groups that promote finding common ground as a means to find peace, the rejection of this notion described by Cu. Brendan's narrative is problematic.

Other narratives describe avoidance of religious diversity.

“Ew, I don't know, because like I'm so quick to like distance myself from people who don't have the same views as me. And it's not me being like mean or evil or like being religious in it. Um, it's me protecting myself.” *Ca. Blake (2525, t1)*.

Ca. Blake describes those who represent views that differ from his own as potential threats. In the larger narrative of his interview, Ca. Blake explains the he experienced what he calls a “drastic” conversion from a “very conservative Christian to being the exact opposite.” His remarks on the threat of religious diversity post conversion are particularly interesting, as he notes that he changed his religious views from experience of friends in college, but then seems to wish to protect those ideas in the present by avoiding contact. He goes on to support that conflict as a result of differences in religious worldview can be solved through the same exposure and experiences he wishes to avoid – so much so that his narrative prompted an almost visceral reaction in his response to the prompt as “Ew.”

“But yes, it can be solved, I think, through experience, experiencing different things in life, um, having relationships with other people, um, can change like your worldview and conflicts.” *Ca. Blake (2525, t1)*.

Ca. Blake indicates the experience of religious diversity can resolve conflicts. The same exposure is described by Trevor We. below, who notes his similar experiences to Ca. Blake in meeting friends with diverse opinions.

“But yeah, so I have a ton of super cool minority friends who are great. Um, and so, I guess my point is that I think a lot of people, if they were exposed to people that are different from them, would see that, you know, you're really just the same, whether or not your religion or your cultural background or your race is different, and just being exposed to other people would help solve a lot of these problems.” *Trevor We. (1393, t1)*.

In contrast to Ca. Blake, Trevor We. does not indicate any hesitation to interact with religiously diverse other or individuals who have different ideas. Despite differences in the willingness to engage in contact with religious others that might be described as interreligious dialogue, both cases note that exposure to the other, and particularly having contact and relationship with people of differing beliefs has the ability to resolve conflicts resulting from differences in religion or worldview.

The remainder of the cases with mutual religious style indicate some solutions to an ability for conflicts to be resolved.

“I think understanding people and kind of trying to find common ground, because I think a lot of- I mean, a lot of religions I think do kind of have some common ground. I mean, a lot of them, you know, think certain things are wrong or right. I mean even- like I was talking about my friend that helps the homeless, that he's religious. I think, he's even like a minister, um, because he has like a church thing, and he's written like a religious book, and all this sort of stuff. But we worked together to help with the homeless and we still consider each other really good friends, and we can still have discussions, and I think it's because we have like common ground, even though- because we both kind of believe in helping people and trying to do things like that. So, we focus on the things we have in common, even though there's definitely a lot of differences.” *Valerie Ra. (523, t0)*.

Valerie Ra. indicates that finding common ground among the religions is the solution to conflicts. She continues to describe a need to focus on common ground and engage in mutual

activities like helping others and having friendship, based on their mutual desire for prosocial endeavors. However, in this description of finding common ground, Valerie Ra. describes activities like helping the homeless or other people in need where the interactions of religious others are focused on secular subjects where differences in religious beliefs and the conflicts that may result from those differences can be ignored.

“If I know there's a group that's doing a lot of positive, even if they happen to be associated with a religious group or religion, if they're doing good, I have no problem helping that group out. I have no problem donating to them, things like that, but I have a lot of friends too that are atheists that won't even like donate to a group, because it's a religious affiliation. I feel like we all need to kind of move past that stuff and try to work together.” *Valerie Ra. (523, t0).*

Valerie Ra. supports her stance on the positivity of engagement with religious others to find common ground in order to support positive group outcomes. She further articulates her stance on the ability for there to be resolution among groups with religious differences by encouraging others to “move past” issues of religious affiliation, citing her friends that create divisions as a result of avoiding group with certain religious affiliations.

A final theme in the interviews is represented by, Allison H., indicates the need for a consideration of the cultural contexts of religious beliefs, respecting the view of others, and the inability of her view of historical practices to change beliefs to be effective ways to resolve conflict that have been prompted by or affiliated with differences in religious belief.

“So, there is no way and like when people go like for instance when America goes over to another country and like tries to enforce their opinions and their rules and their democracy on people and you're like hey, you just, maybe you should have hired an anthropologist first because you just kind of can't do that. You just kind of can't, even though you have guns and shit like you just can't go over there and like change everyone's world like in a split second” *Allison H. (1329, t0).*

Allison H. describes a violent approach to efforts of changing religious beliefs. This may be her hinting at efforts to convert others by means of violence and force. In his interview

excerpt quoted above, Trevor We. also describes a historical approach of religious violence and “holy wars.” However, he describes the violence is perhaps what the historical solution has been to issues resulting from differences in religion, rather than a consideration of ways to not “enforce” opinions and beliefs on others described by Allison H.

Major Themes

The majority of the cases with a mutual religious style omit any language that involves dialogue or listening to religious other, finding common ground, or agreeing to disagree. Only half of the cases indicate that issues of worldview or religious can be resolved at all. A protection of one’s own religious beliefs, using conversion as a means to solve issues of disagreement, and relation of conflict to religious extremism are major themes in cases with mutual religious style. Paradoxically, views of religious diversity as a threat and views of exposure to religious diversity a solution through the exposure to religious others are both common themes.

Individuative-Systemic

Perspective taking and humility are the first emergent theme from cases with Individuative-systemic religious styles. While describing her identity and groups and institutions she identifies with, Savannah H. describes her identity, but also an ability to identify with everyone, even if they represent other religious views. She notes that seeing herself in everyone, perhaps as a part of perspective taking, is a central part of her identity.

“But like, you know, just like spreading kindness, like just being kind to people, and like being- yeah, seeing everyone's like humanity, seeing yourself in everyone, and like learning from everyone, and um, yeah. I don't know, I feel like I could identify with- and this is weird, like on my survey I had a really hard time like answering those questions, because I'm not sure they're all entirely accurate, but like- so, because like the yoga that I do is not actually considered part of Hinduism, it's like considered yogic science. Um but

like if you had to pick one it will be closest to Hinduism, because it evolved out of the Hindu tradition. So, I was like I guess I'm a Hindu, but I would never like identify myself, you know. And like I still also identify as a Christian, um, which doesn't bother me in the least, but it's also makes it harder to pin down, and when you're like trying to figure out like concrete things.” *Savannah N. (2078, t1R)*.

Savannah H. describes her life history in her interviews transcript. She was raised in episcopal church and later adopted the principals of a new religious movement where she follows a popular guru who’s teachings are based in Hindu religious traditions. In this excerpt she clearly defines her own religious identity, which she notes is multiple identities: both as Christian and a Hindu. The practice of multiple identities can be described as pluralism.

When describing how conflicts can be resolved due to issues of differences in worldview or religion, Savannah N. directly attributes having humility as a necessary criterion.

“I think it takes a lot of like willingness to be humble. I think that's the biggest thing. I think if you're not willing to be open, um, nothing can be resolved. But, I think if you're willing to be open to make a genuine connection with another human being, um, who has a different viewpoint than yours, and to let your life be influenced by them, um, to not try and hold on to or control your- control your beliefs, and try and make them stay the same, but just to ask like- ask your understanding of what's highest of God, of truth of whatever is highest for you, maybe it's reason, or maybe it's just mysterious forces I don't understand.” *Savannah N. (2078, t1R)*.

While describing humility, Savannah H. also describes the need to be open-minded toward others, without which she says “nothing can be resolved.” Importantly, Savannah N. notes the need for a direct relationship, through what she calls “a genuine connection” with religious others and allowing that relationship to influence one’s own perspective. Interestingly, Savannah N. also notes that holding on to one’s identity to try to “stay the same” is problematic the in pursuit of resolving such conflicts. She refers to God, hinting at some relation to God’s will of an individual to be “whatever is highest.” It is unclear what she means exactly by this, however, we may assume that she is alluding to a perspective from God that encourages engagement with religious diversity that leads to change, as the result of that diversity might be

what a higher power believes is the “highest” of an individual. Interestingly, Savannah N. also notes that the process in which identity or beliefs are changes, to which she does not explicitly state, could be reason or a mysterious force. Through this we see a theme of a case attempting to understand the processes of the result of engagement with religious diversity and engaging in IRD.

Savannah N. also engages in some uncertainty about the process of perspective taking and making decisions as a result of engaging with other view points.

“I think really in order to, um, know a truth, you also have to be able to sit with its opposite, and like consider could that be true, and like step outside of the box of that. Um, and then, if you can make a decision and like, you know, go with your God or whatever, then I think you probably have a more, uh- ummm, like informed opinion I guess, or an informed decision rather than just like staying within your own viewpoint, and not like getting outside of it, which is really scary to do, and I know because, you know, it like freaked my mind out all the time to be like totally like not sure what I believe in life, and like not sure of what I'm doing is right, or not.” *Savannah N. (2078, t1R)*.

Savannah describes the threat of considering other view points by indicating she “freaked my mind out” when as a result of choosing not to stay within her own view and instead aiming to perspective take she became less clear in her beliefs, and if what her behaviors that are guided by those beliefs are “right.”

Or. Jill briefly, but importantly describes, a similar the hesitancy of people to engage in IRD or contact with religious others because individuals do not want to exist outside of their own perspective described by Savannah N.

“A lot of bad things happen sometimes, is because people decide they don't want to consider other worldviews, and they are adamant in staying within their bubble.” *Or. Jill (2461, t1)*.

While Or. does not explicitly describe criteria for effect resolution, her emphasis on the result of “bad things” occurring like violence and conflict is a result of lack of perspective taking

and engaging with the challenge and potential threat of confronting ideas that exist outside of an individual's "bubble" or comfort zone. The case of Wh. Lois similarly describes experiences that force engagement with religious diversity:

"I think that- more often than not, uh, the universe has a weird way of, uh, making people face, uh, the unnecessary biases that they have in their life. Uh, it's a relatively common phrase that, you know, whatever type of person you have a problem with, like if you hate gays, or if you hate Blacks, or Asians, or Puerto Ricans, that regardless of who you hate specifically, you're probably going to have one of those types of people in your life in a serious manner to somewhat teach you humbleness, and to help you understand that they're not that much different than yourself. And I think that's the key I think that we need to find ways to be able to spend time with one another, to be able to inhabit space, and, you know, find similarities, and, you know, similar interests, and- to be able to, you know, spend time with a common- you know, our common brothers." *Wh. Lois (2478, t1)*.

Wh. Lois describes interactions that confront bias related to worldview or religion, which she suggests are destined to occur when people have specific biases, are aimed at teaching humility. Wh. Lois explicitly describes the necessity of finding common ground in those who hold beliefs that are different than one's own.

Like Savannah N., Or. Jill, and Wh. Lois, the case of Co. Emmett describes perspective taking and an open-mindedness as important criteria for resolving issues of conflict of worldview of religion. In his remarks, he puts emphases on the need for education in understanding religious others.

"Uh, I think, um- the biggest thing is education. Um, I only have an understanding of what's going on, uh, through my own perception, and that which I perceive as real. But, I also have studied nearly all of the major religions, and have come to the conclusion just from studying them, and being open-minded about it, and releasing myself from my own cognitive dissonance, to say, you know what, they're all pretty similar. So, I don't really see why we should be all hating each other, and being like "Oh, mine's right, and yours is wrong," and "I'm going to go, and preach my stuff to you, because you're going to hell, or you're going to this bad place," or- you know, whatever. And then, you know, they're not going to listen to you, because, again, they already have their own ideas, and they're all set in their own ways, and they have their own cognitive dissonance that's just going to push you out. But, um, just the education then- so just- being educated about all religions, and not just sitting at- you know, on your own, whatever you grew up as, uh, because I'm

definitely not the same as my parents, I didn't grow up- they're like strictly, uh, Baptist-like Southern Baptists, and I'm definitely different from that. Um, so, having an education of other religions, and being open-minded to hearing what other people's faith means to them, is a pretty big deal, and allowing yourself to, uh, at least sympathize, or empathize with how they do their religion, how they practice it, and things of that sort, and then ultimately realizing that in a logical sense, if we are all created by the same being, then if you hate on someone who is, you know, different from you, you're essentially hating on something that, that being created. So, it's illogical for you to hate something that is of the same creator at least in my eyes." *Co. Emmett (2524, t1)*.

In Co. Emmett's description of processes that lead to resolution, he focuses on some elements of commonality. Instead of explicitly noting shared beliefs in which to find common ground on, he instead describes his perception of others as "all pretty similar." He continues to describe that finding out about what other's faith means to them, by allowing them to define their own identity, is an important criterion. Related to the finding of commonality of others, he refers to the commonality of people from the perspective of a "creator." In his description, commonalities should be found as a result of people being created by the same being. This describes some element of relation to a common higher power.

In the case of Vicki I., who is a self-described American Buddhist, listening is the emergent theme.

"I think really the only way the can be resolved is by people trying as hard, the Dalai Lama actually talks a lot about this too. Trying as hard as they can to uh, listen whole heartedly and that is a really hard thing to do because often times when we listen, uhm, we already know what we are going to say. We are not even listening to the other person; we are just waiting our prior chance to talk." *Vicki I. (1241, t1R)*.

In her interview transcript, Vicki I. described being surrounded by childhood friends of different faith, and as a result attended different churches, zen centers, and a monastery. She identified as an "American Buddhist," and describes that she has "always a Buddhist, just didn't know she was Buddhist." While her identity did not change across her lifespan, she notes the importance of the exposure to diverse religious experiences and perspective. In her narrative to

describe how to resolve conflict, Vicki I. describes the necessity to recognize differences, but to listen to others, and ultimately find a foundation for places to agree upon and find common ground.

“If the world’s problems will ever be resolved, there has to be a way for people to say ‘I know that we differ but I am going to agree to listen to you wholeheartedly and I will try to find some convergence of what we think and believe and then we can use that as a starting point and then maybe we can workout some of these other things’ we are always going to differ about, there’s going to be lot of things we probably will differ about, but there are going to be some things surely, that we can come to some kind of an agreement on.” *Vicki I. (1241, t1R)*.

Unlike many of the other cases, Vicki I. provides a concrete example of her challenge with her own ability to perspective take with someone she has true differences in opinion with in a real-life scenario.

“I don’t do it very successfully but I do try to practice that. I mean, recently I have started reading this, I’ve sort of being making myself do this, there’s this one guy in the [local newspaper]. That I could not disagree with more profoundly. He raises my blood pressure every time I read his column, but I have said to myself ‘[Vicki], you know what? You really, you need to read this guy, read this guy and try to think about where is he coming from, why is he saying this, what if you met this guy in the street and you had to have a conversation with him, what would you talk about with him?’ you know. And so you know, you can I think, kind of, sort of make that a path that you want to tread or you can decide, uhm, I’m right their wrong and we have nothing to say to each other, you know, and that is just two different ways of looking at that I suppose.” *Vicki I. (1241, t1R)*.

Vicki I. seems to describe a necessity to perspective take of the author in the newspaper and think about “where he is coming from.” Interestingly, she describes an intervention for herself where she imagines meeting him in the street. If the meeting resulted in they were unable to find commonality, she imagines that when an impasse is reached, the two would have to agree to disagree, and acknowledge that they have two different ways of viewing things. Interestingly, Vicki I. does not seem willing to indicate that looking at an argument differently than someone, even someone she profoundly disagrees with, means that either of the perspective is “right” or “wrong.” The perspectives are simply different.

Similarly, to Vicki I., the case of Jordan J. describes an impetus to treat others with respect and protect people's ability to be religious. He uses a historical perspective to make his argument that conflicts of worldview or religion are not worth an argument.

"The English had these just bloody wars over, you know, Protestantism, and Catholicism. And she got in and then she said, "No more, you can just be whatever religion you want. Everybody stop killing each other." And it was a really great way to conduct business. And the founding fathers had, you know, a couple of hundred years of that church-state separation, like they knew exactly what they were doing, they didn't want us to be like the English had been in the, you know, 1500s-1600s. So, um, that is what you need on a societal level." *Jordan J. (262, t1R).*

Jordan J. emphasizes the need for peace keeping in his narrative by indicating that individuals should cease to kill other's due to their religious affiliation and instead allow for the practice of religious freedom. He continues to describe the results of respecting religious belief:

"Yeah, no, because- well, I mean we've touched on it briefly, and we know that we fundamentally disagree about it, and it's not- I guess it's not- we know we're not going to change each other's minds, I guess. So, it's not worth fighting over." *Jordan J. (262, t1R).*

In this excerpt, Jordan J. similarly notes the importance of acknowledging differences described by Vicki I. Both cases indicate the reaching of an impasse where no resolution can be found except to acknowledge the differences rather than try to change a person's beliefs to share a belief or perspective.

Finally, Wh. Lois describes a need for finding ground that may orient around commonalities that do not engage in the differences that people are separated by. Instead, Wh. Lois emphasizes like others cases in the individuated-systemic style, the importance of acknowledging that commonalities can highlight similarities, rather than a focus on differences that divide.

"I think if a way was found for these people of different cultures, and value systems to, you know, spend time in the same place, and, you know, converse with one another in some form, or fashion, and find something that they both enjoy doing whether it's soccer, or arts, or music, or, you know, something universally valued, and accepted, um, I think

we'd be able to find out that we're not that much different from one another, and I think problems wouldn't escalate to the level that, you know, they have in the past.” *Wh. Lois (2478, t1)*.

Major Themes

In the individuated-systemic religious style, the common themes that emerge across cases are perspective taking, humility, finding common ground, threat of religious diversity, peace building, and acknowledging and respecting differences. While the cases differ in nuances explanations of how these criteria lead to effectiveness of dialogue between religious others, the richness of description also yielded important themes in individual cases that represent important considerations of IRD. These include speculation of the threat of religious diversity, viewing commonality through the lens of a shared creator, and employing listening skills.

Dialogical

In the dialogical religious style, the case of Benjamin W. describes an in-depth relationship with exposure to religious diversity and engaging in IRD. Benjamin W. was raised as a conservative Christian, who after attending university felt he was being surrounded by liberalism. He describes that his parents thought it was professors from his liberal university, but he described that it was his liberal Christian friends who he saw having independence. Benjamin W. notes exposure to diversity changed his perspective in contrast to his sisters, important to him that people are educated about religion.

“the changes in perception would be I caused them because my perception changed so if I... and here is a great example of that I have two sisters one older, one younger, they are both... we are all about in our 20s mid 20s, late 20s and they... both of them went to a conservative Christian college in Nashville, I went to a state school, they all... they both of them believe very closely to what my parents have nothing has ever challenged them, they stay basically the same from high school to now. I changed entirely as a way that I view the world. So I think what caused that changed in perception is that I was exposed

to things and I learned about things that my sisters did not because they went to a conservative Christian school and weren't given any opportunity to see the world in a different way." *Benjamin W. (128, t0)*.

Interestingly, when prompted about what groups or institutions he affiliates with, the only group identity identified is the democratic party, but describes that he does not agree with everything the group does. He goes on to say that he does view himself as a "joiner" of groups. Unlike other cases that describe identity as a central tenant of being in dialogue with others, Benjamin W.'s identity is not a religious one, despite that he notes explicit exposure to religious diversity as a factor that lead to changes in his perspective. The sources of IRD described in the interview are his university fraternity brothers that had similar, but different religious backgrounds. He contrasts his experience and exposure to religious diversity in the except describing his sisters, who he feels did not get exposed to diverse view points and as a result did not experience a change in perspective.

When describing how conflicts of worldview or religion should be resolved Benjamin W. notes the importance of religious freedom:

"the best way to resolve that conflict is to not restrict anyone from practicing their very specific religious or spiritual beliefs except in extreme cases where people are in danger or its causing, it's infringing on the beliefs of others. I think that the united states have done a very very good job with that and they are trying very hard I guess it was [...] that said with many religions there is peace so I think that the more we encourage people to practice their religions in their own way the better it is for everyone." *Benjamin W. (128, t0)*.

Benjamin W. notes the restriction of religious freedom in extreme circumstances is an important boundary in allowing conflicts to be resolved. Rather than a focus on engagement with the perspective taking he describes previously in his transcript as a solution to conflict, Benjamin W. instead only notes that a respect of religious identity and belief is the way to resolve conflicts.

Similar to Benjamin W., April J. does not identify with a religious tradition, and instead uses a description of spiritual.

“I’m considerate of my family and friends and their beliefs and try not to upset but really I’m to the point that I’m not afraid to study anything and try to find the simple things that help me concerned with my beliefs and God and religion I am very anti-religious things really, really strong but I am and probably not probably I am more spiritual than I’ve ever been in my life because it’s like for the first time I recognize the connection between the human and the beginning. That one life that there was a thought that started this all, that the universe, there’s somebody, something, some cosmic intelligence had a thought and that’s what brought us here. And so I really tried to everyday look for that connection and the small things and the trees and my brother or sister or and the people I’m in contact with and live my life everyday to try to be that, and more knowledgeable, more conscious or the effect that I have on people around me.” *April J. (1186, t0)*.

In her description of her identity, April J. notes the influence of studying religions, and a lack of fear to do so.

“Mature faith? Well needless to say it’s not in the bible and it’s not in religion I can honestly say that probably separating myself from the dogma of what, just the church, just maybe I’m still not mature. I found that just being able to not feel guilty about believing different. Accepting that if there is an end which there is because there was a beginning, just realizing that my point of view is even if it’s all the important to me I don’t have to feel condemned by other people. I can accept them for who and what they are and not be hurt or feel rejected because they don’t understand where I’m at.” *April J. (1186, t0)*.

In this excerpt of her narrative, April J. describes accepting other for who they are, and similarly an acceptance about her beliefs, even if they differ from others. In her description of how to resolve issues of religious conflict or worldview, she concludes with noting the importance of respecting other’s faiths and opinions.

“I think the person who has more knowledge, has more understanding has to be the one that makes the concession. First of all I believe that you cannot upset anybody’s beliefs. They believe them for a reason, they’ve never had cause, not to believe what they do believe and when you become more conscious of the connection. Of your connection and their connection you have to step back and not upset their [...] you can say things like I said earlier I jolt people. I say things that’ll make them stop in their tracks and think but not be harmful. And so I think that the person with more understanding has to be the one that is the biggest, gives the biggest leeway. You have to respect somebody else’s faith and opinions.” *April J. (1186, t0)*.

April J.’s portrayal of the role of individual’s in resolving religious conflicts is unique among all cases. She notes the importance of evaluating the skill set and capacity of individuals

to possess more understanding than others. In this evaluation, April J. seems to suggest an important step in conflict resolution over worldview is the recognition of each person's ability to perspective take and that individual's in conflict may not have equal skill set or capacity to engage in a dialogue that leads to what she describes, as a concession. The result of dialogue ending in a concession rather than equal gain or loss as a result of conflict is a unique description in the narratives.

Major Themes

The two cases with dialogical religious style assignments share numerous common themes. These include: exposure to religious diversity, seeking out diversity, growing through experiences, perspective taking, practice of religious freedoms, and respect for other's religious beliefs.

Major themes across Religious Styles

No major themes are common across all religious styles. Perspective Taking is a theme for instrumental-reciprocal, individuative-systemic, and dialogical. Exposure to religious diversity is shared by mutual and dialogical. Religious diversity as a threat is shared by mutual and individuative-systemic. The last shared common theme is respecting differences of other's religious beliefs shared by individuative-systemic and dialogue. Table 11. 2 provides an overview of the major themes across religious styles. Themes that are presented in bold lettering indicate a theme that presented in more than one religious style.

Table 11.2 Major Themes across Religious Styles

Instrumental-reciprocal	Mutual	Individuative-Systemic	Dialogical
Perspective Taking	Exposure to Religious Others	Perspective Taking	Perspective Taking
Distinct religious identities	Religious Diversity as a Threat	Religious Diversity as a Threat	Exposure to Religious Diversity
Education of religious beliefs, particularly Historical Contexts	Avoid Religious Diversity	Respecting Differences of Other's Religious Beliefs	Respecting Differences of Other's Religious Beliefs
	No resolution	Humility	practice of religious freedom
	Inclusion of the Sacred	Common Higher Power; Common Ground	seeking out religious diversity
	Conversion	Listening	growing through experience
	Extremist Religious Groups	Acknowledgment of Differences	
		No Killing in Name of Religion	
		Reaching an Impasse	

Analysis of Frequency of Word and Phrases

An analysis of Phrase themes in Provalis WordStat (Provalis Research, 2018) yielded the following words not represented by the repetition of participant narrative that reflects the prompt from question of the FDI: God, Bible, Common, Faith, and Understanding. These are represented by a visual word cloud (Figure 11.1) and as a frequency table (Table 11.3). Common phrases revealed by WordStat are Common Ground, Cognitive Dissonance, Middle East, Open-minded, and World Peace. Each phrase was used in more than one case.



Figure 11.1 WordStat Word Cloud

Table 11.3 WordStat Word Frequencies

Term	FRE- QUENCY	% SHOWN	% PROCESSED	% TOTAL	NO. CASES	% CASES	I
PEOPLE	87	27.27%	4.27%	1.14%	17	85.00%	6.1
KIND	20	6.27%	0.98%	0.26%	9	45.00%	6.9
WORLD	19	5.96%	0.93%	0.25%	8	40.00%	7.6
GOD	18	5.64%	0.88%	0.24%	5	25.00%	10.8
RELIGIONS	17	5.33%	0.83%	0.22%	10	50.00%	5.1
PART	13	4.08%	0.64%	0.17%	6	30.00%	6.8
GOOD	12	3.76%	0.59%	0.16%	9	45.00%	4.2
RELIGIOUS	12	3.76%	0.59%	0.16%	5	25.00%	7.2
BIBLE	11	3.45%	0.54%	0.14%	5	25.00%	6.6
GUESS	11	3.45%	0.54%	0.14%	6	30.00%	5.8
HATE	11	3.45%	0.54%	0.14%	5	25.00%	6.6
MAKE	11	3.45%	0.54%	0.14%	7	35.00%	5
RESOLVED	11	3.45%	0.54%	0.14%	9	45.00%	3.8
COMMON	10	3.13%	0.49%	0.13%	4	20.00%	7
FAITH	10	3.13%	0.49%	0.13%	4	20.00%	7
GROUP	10	3.13%	0.49%	0.13%	3	15.00%	8.2
LIFE	10	3.13%	0.49%	0.13%	4	20.00%	7
UNDERSTANDING	10	3.13%	0.49%	0.13%	6	30.00%	5.2

Table 11.4 WordStat Phrase Frequencies

	FRE- QUENCY	NO. CASES	% CASES	LENGTH	TF • IDF
COMMON GROUND	5	2	10.00%	2	5
COGNITIVE					
DISSONANCE	4	2	10.00%	2	4
WORD OF GOD	4	1	5.00%	3	5.2
BIGGEST THING	3	3	15.00%	2	2.5
HISTORICAL RECORDS	3	1	5.00%	2	3.9
MIDDLE EAST	3	3	15.00%	2	2.5
OPEN MINDED	3	2	10.00%	2	3
SPEND TIME	3	1	5.00%	2	3.9
WORLD PEACE	3	2	10.00%	2	3

CHAPTER XII

DISCUSSION

When we compare major themes across religious styles as a result of thematic analysis of instrumental cases and a phrase frequency using an independent phrase-based analysis software of the interview transcript we find important common themes that lead to an understanding about IRD. Common ground was revealed by WordStat (Provalis Research, 2018) and is shared as a common theme as a result of a thematic analysis, but only in the individuative-systemic religious style. Perspective Taking emerged as a theme in all the religious styles except for the mutual religious style and was additionally an emergent theme in the phrase analysis provided by Word Stat. This suggests that perspective taking, one of the aspects in the religious styles perspective, is a critical component of IRD. Looking at the ways different religious styles engage in IRD presents a skill-based and development based engagement in interreligious dialogue. Whether people will engage in dialogue, and for what purposes, is a result on individual's ability to communicate, perspective taking, and other developmental skills.

The potential application of this data is a support for different approaches of IRD based on religious styles that can lead to suggestions for effective interventions in IRD for practitioners and religious leaders. As a result, interventions may focus on helping develop to different styles so they are able to engage in types of IRD, dependent on what the articulated outcome of the organized IRD is, with a particular focus on perspective taking. Importantly, IRD initiatives must understand that what the consequences are for failing to perspective take.

If people fail to perspective take, communication skills are at risk where religious belief informs prejudice and there are beliefs that are inherently in conflict. (Streib, 2001a, 2005) describes resulting issues related to fundamentalist beliefs in relation to religious styles that are important considerations for future research on religious group processes that considers belief rigidity and the content of belief in religious relations.

Of major concern, is the lack of all but one efficacy theory in IRD, Swidler's dialogue Decalogue (1983) which is easily the least defined theory with extensive explanation for efficacy, fail to incorporate perspective taking as part of major criteria needed for effective IRD or religious group contact. The lack of consideration for this clearly important element results in poor measurement and understanding of a complex phenomenon. Understanding a unique phenomenon that does not dilute the complexity of the processes in IRD is needed to build a clear foundation of research in IRD that attends to nuance in understanding of interreligious group relations. This analysis leads to a foundation for future research on interreligious dialogue to use a phenomenology qualitative design wherein commonalities about the experience of interreligious dialogue can be answered. Questions about what is at the essence that all individuals experience about a phenomenon. Further, this analysis results in a critical advancement of theory related to IRD and an empirical complement to Streib's (Streib, 2001a) conceptual model of religious styles.

Examining perceptions of the efficacy of IRD described by common criteria in intergroup contact theories and practitioners of IRD allows for a better knowledge of when criteria are considered important in religious conflicts and if perception of efficacy remain constant over time. Variables of religious importance that bar the efficacy of conflict resolution in religion that are described in the case narratives can lead to a better understanding of where application of

religious intergroup interventions like those empirically backed in group contact may fragment in religious disagreements. A need for future research on IRD is clear by the weight given to the practice as an intervention by religious leaders and practitioners. IRD practices that focus on issues of pragmatism.

Limitations

Limitation of qualitative methodology such as the researcher's influence on the themes that are generated and analyzed. There are limitations to this method that primarily rely on the training of the coders and ability of coders to perform accurate and reliable assessments of style scores. However, individual religious style assessment for particular questions may be relevant to best understand the processes in interreligious dialogue. Future research may wish to type by only a single selected question and religious style assessment for a particular aspect.

Future Directions

The work on understanding emergent themes in narratives of IRD lays a foundation for future research on IRD by highlighting the areas of research that make the most sense to begin a foundation of research within a well-founded theory like the Religious Styles Perspective (Streib, 2001a). The work presented in this research can be integrated with data collected as part of a larger student on religious styles and faith development that uses both interviews and quantitative data that can be combined for a strong multi-method design that have the ability to organized the data into categories or themes that speak across data sources by using a triangulation of theory (Creswell & Poth, 2017).

Generation of a visual model of theory based on a grounded theory on religious styles in interreligious dialogue as suggested systematic step in research design by Creswell and Poth

(2017) which would allow for data to be re-examined based on coding categories. This could lay a foundation for a more detailed theoretical examination of conditions that may lead to IRD, resulting actions in response to exposure to religious diversity or engagement with IRD, situational factors that may influence those responses, and what consequences and outcomes result from a variety of strategies that are used in responses to IRD and exposure to religious diversity. Additional analysis and inclusion of the data could allow variables from the qualitative data to inform more sophisticated statistical analysis that look at associations and correlations, prediction, and examining group differences.

REFERENCES

- Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue [PCID] (1991). *Dialogue and Proclamation*.
- Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue [PCID] (2017). Retrieved from http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/interelg/index.htm
- Abdool, A., Potgieter, F., Van der Walt, J. L., & Wolhuter, C. (2007). Inter-religious dialogue in schools: a pedagogical and civic unavoidability. *HTS: Theological Studies*, 63(2), 543-560.
- Aberson, C. L. (2019). Indirect Effects of Threat on the Contact–Prejudice Relationship. *Social Psychology*, 50(2), 105-126.
- Abu-Rayya, H. M., & White, F. A. (2010). Acculturation orientations and religious identity as predictors of Anglo-Australians' attitudes towards Australian Muslims. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 34(6), 592-599.
- Adams, N., Rawls, J. H., Audi, R., & Wolterstorff, N. (2013). Interreligious Engagement in the Public Sphere. *Understanding Interreligious Relations*, 281-305.
- Al-Khattar, A. M. (2003). *Religion and terrorism: An interfaith perspective*. Santa Barbara: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge: Addison-Wiley.
- Allport, G. W. (1966). The Religious Context of Prejudice. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 5, 447-457.
- Allport, G. W., & Ross, J. M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5, 432–443.
- Argo, N., & Ginges, J. (2015). Beyond impasse: Addressing sacred values in international political negotiations. In G. M. (Ed.), *Handbook of international negotiation* (pp. 311-327). Switzerland: Springer, Cham.
- Ariely, G. (2017). Global identification, xenophobia and globalisation: A cross-national exploration. *International Journal of Psychology*, 52, 87-96.

- Atran, S. (2016). The devoted actor: unconditional commitment and intractable conflict across cultures. *Current Anthropology*, 57(13), 192-203.
- Atran, S., & Ginges, J. (2012). Religious and sacred imperatives in human conflict. *Science*, 336(6083), 855-857.
- Awad, G. H. (2010). The impact of acculturation and religious identification on perceived discrimination for Arab/Middle Eastern Americans. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 16(1), 59.
- Aydin, N., Krueger, J. I., Frey, D., Kastenmüller, A., & Fischer, P. (2014). Social exclusion and xenophobia: Intolerant attitudes toward ethnic and religious minorities. *Group processes & Intergroup relations*, 17(3), 371-387.
- Bainbridge, W. S. (2003). *A Prophet's Reward: Dynamics of Religious Exchange*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Bar-Tal, D., & Hammack, P. L. (2012). Conflict, delegitimization, and violence. In L. R. Tropp (Ed.), *Oxford library of psychology* (pp. 29-52). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Barlow, F. K., Hornsey, M. J., Thai, M., Sengupta, N. K., & Sibley, C. G. (2013). The wallpaper effect: The contact hypothesis fails for minority group members who live in areas with a high proportion of majority group members. *PLOS ONE*, 8(12), Article e82228.
- Barnes, M., Doyle, D., & Johnson, B. (1989). The formulation of a Fowler scale; an empirical assessment among Catholics. *Review of Religious Research*, 412-420.
- Batson, C. D. (1976). Religion as prosocial: Agent or double agent? *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 15(1), 29-45.
- Beck, U. (2010). *A God of one's own: religion's capacity for peace and potential for violence*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Beller, J., & Kröger, C. (2018). Religiosity, religious fundamentalism, and perceived threat as predictors of Muslim support for extremist violence. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 10(4), 345.
- Belzen, J. A., & Hood, R. W. (2006). Methodological issues in the psychology of religion: Toward another paradigm? *The Journal of Psychology*, 140(1), 5-28.
- Berger, P. L. (2014). *The many altars of modernity: Toward a paradigm for religion in a pluralist age*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Berger, P. L. (2016). The Good Of Religious Pluralism. *First Things*, 262, 39-42.

- Bilali, R., Iqbal, Y., & Çelik, A. B. (2018). The role of national identity, religious identity, and intergroup contact on social distance across multiple social divides in Turkey. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*(65), 73-85.
- Blogowska, J., Lambert, C., & Saroglou, V. (2013). Religious prosociality and aggression: It's real. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 53(3), 524-536.
- Bloor, M. (2011). Addressing Social Problems through Qualitative Research. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research* (pp. 399–415). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Bodenhausen, G. V. (2010). Diversity in the person, diversity in the group: Challenges of identity complexity for social perception and social interaction. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 40(1), 1-16.
- Brandt, M. J., Chambers, J. R., Crawford, J. T., Wetherell, G., & Reyna, C. (2015). Bounded openness: The effect of openness to experience on intolerance is moderated by target group conventionality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 109(3), 549.
- Brandt, M. J., & Reyna, C. (2010). The Role of Prejudice and the Need for Closure in Religious Fundamentalism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36, 715-725.
- Brandt, M. J., & Van Tongeren, D. R. (2017). People both high and low on religious fundamentalism are prejudiced toward dissimilar groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 112(1), 76.
- Brauer, M., & Er-rafiy, A. (2011). Increasing Perceived Variability Reduces Prejudice and Discrimination. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47, 871-881.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Brenner, P. S. (2011). Identity importance and the overreporting of religious service attendance: Multiple imputation of religious attendance using the American Time Use Study and the General Social Survey. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 50(1), 103-115.
- Brenner, P. S. (2017). How Religious Identity Shapes Survey Responses. In R. Finke, C. D. Bader, & E. C. Polson (Eds.), *Faithful measures: Developing improved measures of religion*. State College, PA: Association of Religion Data Archives.
- Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love and outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues*, 55(3), 429-444.
- Brewer, M. B. (2008). Deprovincialization: Social identity complexity and out-group acceptance. In L. T. U. Wagner, G. Finchilescu, & C. Tredoux (Eds.), *Emerging research directions for improving intergroup relations: Building on the legacy of Thomas F. Pettigrew*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Brewer, M. B., Gonsalkorale, K., & van Dommelen, A. (2013). Social identity complexity: Comparing majority and minority ethnic group members in a multicultural society. *Group processes & Intergroup relations*, 16(5), 529-544.
- Brewer, M. B., & Pierce, K. P. (2005). Social identity complexity and outgroup tolerance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(3), 428-437.
- Brodeur, P. (2005). From the margins to the centers of power: The increasing relevance of the global interfaith movement. *CrossCurrents*, 42-53.
- Brodeur, P. (2019). Retrieved from <http://patricebrodeur.com/presentation/>
- Brown, R., & Paterson, J. (2016). Indirect contact and prejudice reduction: limits and possibilities. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 11, 20-24.
- Burris, C. T. (1999). Faith Development Interview guide (Fowler, 1981). In P. C. Hill & R. W. Hood (Eds.), *Measures of religiosity* (pp. 163–168). Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press.
- Burris, C. T., Branscombe, N. R., & Jackson, L. M. (2000). *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 31(4), 517-527.
- Bushman, B. J., Ridge, R. D., Das, E., Key, C. W., & Busath, G. L. (2007). When God sanctions killing: Effect of scriptural violence on aggression. *Psychological Science*, 18(3), 204-207.
- Cairns, E., Kenworthy, J., Campbell, A., & Hewstone, M. (2006). The role of in-group identification, religious group membership and intergroup conflict in moderating in-group and out-group affect. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 45, 701-716.
- Capozza, D., & Brown, R. (Eds.). (2000). *Social identity processes: Trends in theory and research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Catto, R. (2017). Interfaith Dialogue and the Challenge of Indifference: Reflections from Fieldwork in the City of Peace and Reconciliation. In Q. J. & S. C. (Eds.), *Religious Indifference*. Switzerland: Springer, Cham.
- Pew Research Center (2013). *Arab Spring Adds to Global Restrictions on Religion*. Retrieved from Pew Research Center:
- Pew Research Center (2014). *Religious Hostilities Reach Six-Year High*.
- Pew Research Center (2017). *Americans Express Increasingly Warm Feelings Toward Religious Groups*. Retrieved from
- Pew Research Center (2018). *Global Uptick in Government Restrictions on Religion in 2016*. Retrieved from Washington, DC

- Cheetham, D., Pratt, D., & Thomas, D. (Eds.). (2013). *Understanding interreligious relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Christie, D., Mckeown, S., Haji, R., & Ferguson, N. (2016). *Understanding Peace and Conflict Through Social Identity Theory: Contemporary Global Perspectives*. New York: Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Cohen, A. B. (2015). Religion's profound influences on psychology: Morality, intergroup relations, self-construal, and enculturation. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 24(1), 77-82.
- Cohen, A. B., & Hill, P. C. (2007). Religion as culture: Religious individualism and collectivism among American Catholics, Jews, and Protestants. *Journal of personality*, 75(4), 709-742.
- Cohrs, J. C. (2012). Ideological bases of violent conflict. In L. Tropp (Ed.), *Oxford handbook of intergroup conflict* (pp. 53-71). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Coleman, S., & Collins, P. (Eds.). (2017). *Religion, identity and change: perspectives on global transformations*. Abingdon-on-Thames: Routledge.
- Cooper, B. (2017). Americans Who Interact with Muslims Hold More Positive Views of Muslims, Refugees. Retrieved from <https://www.prii.org/spotlight/social-contact-muslims-refugee-ban/>
- Core, I. Y. (2018). *Campus Interfaith Inventory Findings Through the Lens of the First Year Experience: Featuring Innovative Campus Practices*. Retrieved from Chicago, IL
- Cornille, C. (2008). *The im-possibility of interreligious dialogue*. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company.
- Cornille, C. (2010). *Many mansions?: multiple religious belonging and Christian identity*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- Cornille, C. (Ed.) (2013). *Conditions for inter-religious dialogue*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.
- Cornille, C., & Corigliano, S. (Eds.). (2012). *Interreligious Dialogue and Cultural Change* (Vol. 4). Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- Cox, D., & Jones, R. P. (2015). *Nearly Half of Americans Worried That They or Their Family Will Be a Victim of Terrorism*.
- Craig, M. A., & Richeson, J. A. (2014). More diverse yet less tolerant? How the increasingly-diverse racial landscape affects White Americans' racial attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 40(6), 750-776.

- Craig, M. A., Rucker, J. M., & Richeson, J. A. (2018). The pitfalls and promise of increasing racial diversity: Threat, contact, and race relations in the 21st century. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 27(3), 188-193.
- Crane, M. F., Louis, W. R., Phillips, J. K., Amiot, C. E., & Steffens, N. K. (2018). Identity centrality moderates the relationship between acceptance of group-based stressors and well-being. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 48(6), 866-882.
- Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2017). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks: Sage publications.
- Dittes, J. (1969). The psychology of religion. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 5). Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Donahue, M. (2005). Disregarding (and Disrespecting?) Religion in Social Psychology: The Case of the The Handbook of Social Psychology. *Archive for the Psychology of Religion*, 27(1), 45-68.
- Dovidio, J. F., Eller, A., & Hewstone, M. (2011). Improving intergroup relations through direct, extended and other forms of indirect contact. *Group processes & Intergroup relations*, 14(2), 147-160.
- Dovidio, J. F., Love, A., Schellhaas, F. M., & Hewstone, M. (2017). Reducing intergroup bias through intergroup contact: Twenty years of progress and future directions. *Group processes & Intergroup relations*, 20(5), 606-620.
- Duckitt, J., & Fisher, K. (2003). The impact of social threat on worldview and ideological attitudes. *Political Psychology*, 24(1), 199-222.
- Durrant, R., & Poppelwell, Z. (2017). The Dark Side of Religion? Prejudice, Inter-Group Conflict, and War. In *Religion, Crime and Punishment* (pp. 89-126). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Eck, D. L. (2002). *A new religious America*. New York: HarperCollins World.
- Eck, D. L. (2006). What is pluralism? On Common Ground: World Religions in America.
- Eck, D. L. (2007). Prospects for pluralism: Voice and vision in the study of religion. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 75(4), 743-776.
- Emmons, R. A. (1999). *The psychology of ultimate concerns: Motivation and spirituality in personality*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Emmons, R. A., & Paloutzian, R. F. (2003). The psychology of religion. *Annual review of psychology*, 54(1), 377-402.

- Emmons, R. A., & Schnitker, S. A. (2013). Gods and Goals. In R. F. Paloutzian, & Park, C. L. (Eds.), *Handbook of the psychology of religion and spirituality* (pp. 256). New York: Guilford.
- Erikson, E. (1968). *Youth: Identity and crisis*. New York: WW.
- Exline, J. J., & Rose, E. (2013). Religious and spiritual struggles. In R. F. Paloutzian & C. L. Park (Eds.), *Handbook of the psychology of religion and spirituality* (pp. 380-398). New York: Guilford Publications.
- Farrell, J. E., Hook, J. N., Zhang, H., Mosher, D., Aten, J. D., Van Tongeren, D. R., & Davis, D. E. (2018). Religious attitudes and behaviors toward individuals who hold different religious beliefs and perspectives: An exploratory qualitative study. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 10(1), 63.
- Finke, R. (1997). The consequences of religious competition. In L. A. Young (Ed.), *Rational choice theory and religion: Summary and assessment* (pp. 46-65). New York: Routledge.
- Finke, R., Bader, C. D., & Polson, E. C. (2010). *Faithful measures: Developing improved measures of religion*. State College, PA: Association of Religion Data Archives.
- Finke, R., & Stark, R. (1998). Religious choice and competition. *American Sociological Review*, 63(5), 761-766.
- Fischer, P., Ai, A. L., Aydin, N., Frey, D., & Haslam, S. A. (2010). The relationship between religious identity and preferred coping strategies: An examination of the relative importance of interpersonal and intrapersonal coping in Muslim and Christian faiths. *Review of General Psychology*, 14(4), 365-381.
- Fischer, P., Greitemeyer, T., & Kastenmüller, A. (2007). What do we think about Muslims? The validity of westerners' implicit theories about the associations between Muslims' religiosity, religious identity, aggression potential, and attitudes toward terrorism. *Group processes & Intergroup relations*, 10(3), 373-382.
- Fiske, S. T. (2015). Intergroup biases: A focus on stereotype content. *Current opinion in behavioral sciences*, 3, 45-50.
- Flunger, B., & Ziebertz, H. G. (2010). Intercultural identity—religion, values, in-group and out-group attitudes. *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 23(1), 1-28.
- Fowler, J. W. (1981). *Stages of faith. The psychology of human development and the quest for meaning*. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.
- Fowler, J. W., Streib, H., & Keller, B. (2004). *Manual for faith development research (3rd ed.)*. Bielefeld, Germany: Research Center for Biographical Studies in Contemporary Religion.

- Fredman, L. A., Bastian, B., & Swann Jr., W. B. (2017). God or country? Fusion with Judaism predicts desire for retaliation following Palestinian stabbing Intifada. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 8(8), 882-887.
- Friedman, H. (2009). Xenophilia as a cultural trap: Bridging the gap between transpersonal psychology and religious/spiritual traditions. *International Journal of Transpersonal Studies*, 28(1), 10.
- Galen, L. W. (2012). Does religious belief promote prosociality? A critical examination. *Psychological bulletin*, 138(5), 876.
- Galen, L. W. (2018). Focusing on the nonreligious reveals secular mechanisms underlying well-being and prosociality. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 10(3), 296.
- Garfinkel, R. (2004). *What works?: Evaluating interfaith dialogue programs*.
- Ginges, J., Atran, S., Medin, D., & Shikaki, K. (2007). Sacred bounds on rational resolution of violent political conflict. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(18), 7357-7360.
- Ginges, J., Atran, S., Sachdeva, S., & Medin, D. (2011). Psychology out of the laboratory: the challenge of violent extremism. *American Psychologist*, 66(6), 507.
- Ginges, J., Hansen, I., & Norenzayan, A. (2009). Religion and support for suicide attacks. *Psychological Science*, 20(2), 224-230.
- Grim, B. J., & Finke, R. (2010). *The price of freedom denied: Religious persecution and conflict in the twenty-first century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Guffler, K., & Wagner, U. (2017). Backfire of good intentions: Unexpected long-term contact intervention effects in an intractable conflict area. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 23(4), 383.
- Gutenbrunner, L., & Wagner, U. (2016). Perspective-taking techniques in the mediation of intergroup conflict. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 22(4), 298.
- Haddad, Y. Y., & Harb, N. N. (2014). Post-9/11: making Islam an American religion. *Religions*, 5(2), 477-501.
- Hahn, A., Banchevsky, S., Park, B., & Judd, C. M. (2015). Measuring intergroup ideologies: Positive and negative aspects of emphasizing versus looking beyond group differences. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 41(12), 1646-1664.
- Harris, J. I., & Leak, G. K. (2013). The Revised Faith Development Scale: An option for a more reliable self-report measurement of postconventional religious reasoning. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 24, 1-13.

- Harris, S. (2005). *The end of faith: Religion, terror, and the future of reason*. New York: WW Norton & Company.
- Hasenclever, A. (2012). War on earth and peace from heaven: Preventing religions from instrumentalisation. In R. Czada, T. Held, & M. Weingardt (Eds.), *Religions and World Peace* (pp. 185-196). Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH & Co. KG.
- Hewstone, M. (2003). Intergroup Contact: Panacea for prejudice? *The Psychologist*, 16(7), 352-353.
- Hewstone, M., Cairns, E., Voci, A., Hamberger, J., & Niens, U. (2006). Intergroup contact, forgiveness, and experience of “The Troubles” in Northern Ireland. *Journal of Social Issues*, 62(1), 99-120.
- Hill, P. C., & Gibson, N. J. (2008). Whither the roots? Achieving conceptual depth in psychology of religion. *Archive for the Psychology of Religion*, 30(1), 19-36.
- Hill, P. C., & Hood, R. W. (Eds.). (1999). *Measures of religiosity*. Birmingham: Religious Education Press.
- Hood Jr., R. W., & Belzen, J. A. (2013). Research methods in the psychology of religion and spirituality. In R. F. Paloutzian, & Park, C. L. (Ed.), *Handbook of the psychology of religion and spirituality* (pp. 75-93). New York: Guilford.
- Hood Jr., R. W., Hill, P. C., & Williamson, W. P. (2005). *The psychology of religious fundamentalism*. New York: Guilford.
- Hurd, E. S. (2017). *Beyond religious freedom: The new global politics of religion*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- James, W. (1950). *Principles of Psychology Vol. I and II Complete*. Mineola: Dover Publications.
- U.S. Department of Justice (2017). *Hate Crime Statistics*. U.S. Department of Justice: Federal Bureau of Investigation.
- KAICIID. (2018). <https://www.kaiciid.org/knowledge-hub/mapping-dialogue-peace>. Retrieved from <https://www.kaiciid.org/knowledge-hub/mapping-dialogue-peace>
- Kanas, A., Scheepers, P., & Sterkens, C. (2017). Positive and negative contact and attitudes towards the religious out-group: Testing the contact hypothesis in conflict and non-conflict regions of Indonesia and the Philippines. *Social science research*, 63, 95-110.
- Katzarska-Miller, I., Barnsley, C. A., & Reysen, S. (2014). Global citizenship identification and religiosity. *Archive for the Psychology of Religion*, 36(3), 344-367.

- Kayyali, R. A. (2018). Race, religion and identity: Arab Christians in the United States. *Culture and Religion*, 19(1), 1-19.
- Kirkpatrick, L. A. (2013). Evolutionary psychology as a foundation for the psychology of religion. In R. F. Paloutzian, & Park, C. L. (Ed.), *Handbook of the Psychology of Religion and Spirituality* (pp. 118-138). New York: Guilford.
- Kishi, K. (2015). Anti-Muslim assaults reach 9/11-era levels, FBI data show. <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/11/21/anti-muslim-assaults-reach-911-era-levels-fbi-data-show/>
- Knitter, P. F. (Ed.) (2013). *Inter-Religious Dialogue and Social Action*. Chinchester: Wiley.
- Lama, D. (1976). *Universal responsibility and the good heart*. Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works.
- Landau, M. J., Khenfer, J., Keefer, L. A., Swanson, T. J., & Kay, A. C. (2018). When and why does belief in a controlling God strengthen goal commitment? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 75, 71-82.
- Leak, G. K., Loucks, A. A., & Bowlin, P. (1999). Development and initial validation of an objective measure of faith development. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 9(2), 105-124.
- Leggewie, C. (2004). Dialogue? Thank You, No! Ten Commandments for Interfaith Dialogue. *European Judaism: a Journal for the New Europe*, 27.
- Malka, A., Soto, C. J., Cohen, A. B., & Miller, D. T. (2011). Religiosity and social welfare: Competing influences of cultural conservatism and prosocial value orientation. *Journal of personality*, 79(4), 763-792.
- Marty, M. E. (1997). *The one and the many: America's struggle for the common good*. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- Mbachu, D., & Ibukun, Y. (2018, May 24 2018). Qaddafi Regime's Legacy Fuels Violence in West Africa. Retrieved from <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2018-05-22/qaddafi-regime-s-legacy-fuels-bloody-conflicts-in-west-africa>
- Mccallum, R. (2017). Towards a Framework and Methodology for the Evaluation of Inter-Faith Initiatives. *Studies in Interreligious Dialogue*, 27(1), 63-81.
- McFarland, S., Brown, D., & Webb, M. (2013). Identification With All Humanity as a Moral Concept and Psychological Construct. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 22, 194-198.
- McKeown, S., Haji, R., & Ferguson, N. (2016). *Understanding Peace and Conflict Through Social Identity Theory. Contemporary Global Perspectives*. Switzerland: Springer.

- Meleady, R., & Forder, L. (2018). When contact goes wrong: Negative intergroup contact promotes generalized outgroup avoidance. *Group processes & Intergroup relations*, 22(2), 688-707.
- Merdjanova, I. (2016). Overhauling Interreligious Dialogue for Peacebuilding. *Occasional Papers on Religion in Eastern Europe*, 36(1), 3.
- Merdjanova, I., & Brodeur, P. (2009). *Religion as a conversation starter: interreligious dialogue for peacebuilding in the Balkans* Edinburgh: A&C Black.
- Merino, S. M. (2010). Religious diversity in a “Christian nation”: The effects of theological exclusivity and interreligious contact on the acceptance of religious diversity. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 49(2), 231-246.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). *Phenomenology of Perception* (C. Smith, Trans.). New York. NY: Routledge.
- Mitchell, C. (2017). *Religion, identity and politics in Northern Ireland: Boundaries of belonging and belief*. London: Routledge.
- Moghaddam, F. M. (2008). *How globalization spurs terrorism: The lopsided benefits of “one world” and why that fuels violence*. Westport: Praeger Security International.
- Moghaddam, F. M., Warren, Z., & Love, K. (2013). Religion and the staircase to terrorism. In R. F. Paloutzian & C. L. Park (Eds.), *Handbook of the psychology of religion and spirituality* (pp. 632-648). New York: Guilford Publications.
- Moyaert, M. (Ed.) (2013). *Scriptural reasoning as inter-religious dialogue*. Chinchester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Myers, D. G. (2012). Reflections on religious belief and prosociality: Comment on Galen (2012). *Psychological bulletin*, 138(5), 913-917.
- Nakamura, Y. (2000). *Xenosophie: Bausteine für eine Theorie der Fremdheit [Xenosophia: Building blocks of a theory of alien-mess]*. Darmstadt, Germany: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Nielsen, M. E. (1998). An assessment of religious conflicts and their resolutions. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 181-190.
- Nielsen, M. E., Hatton, A. T., & Donahue, M. J. (Eds.). (2013). *Religiousness, social psychology, and behavior*. New York: Guilford Publications.
- Noam, G. G. (1988). A constructivist approach to developmental psychopathology. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 39, 91-121.

- Orton, A. (2007). Contesting 'good practice' in faith-based action for social change: diversity, dialogue & dilemmas in Christian community work. *Journal for faith, spirituality & social change*, 1(1), 20-33.
- Orton, A. (2016). Interfaith dialogue: seven key questions for theory, policy and practice. *Religion, State & Society*, 44(4), 349-365.
- Paluck, E. L., Green, S. A., & Green, D. P. (2018). The contact hypothesis re-evaluated. *Behavioural Public Policy*, 1-30.
- Paolini, S., Hewstone, M., Cairns, E., & Voci, A. (2004). Effects of direct and indirect cross-group friendships on judgments of Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland: The mediating role of an anxiety-reduction mechanism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(6), 770-786.
- Pargament, K. I. (2002). Is religion nothing but ... ? Explaining religion versus explaining religion away. *Psychological Inquiry*, 13, 239-244.
- Pargament, K. I., & Mahoney, A. (2005). Sacred Matters: Sanctification as a Vital Topic for the Psychology of Religion. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 15(3), 179-198.
- Pasek, M. H., & Cook, J. E. (2019). Religion from the target's perspective: A portrait of religious threat and its consequences in the United States. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 10(1), 82-93.
- Patel, E. (2012). *Sacred ground: Pluralism, prejudice, and the promise of America*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Patel, E. (2016). *Interfaith leadership: A primer*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Patel, E. (2018). *Out of Many Faiths: Religious Diversity and the American Promise (Vol. 4)*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Patel, E., & Brodeur, P. (Eds.). (2006). *Building the interfaith youth movement: Beyond dialogue to action*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Patton, M. Q. (2005). Qualitative research. In *Encyclopedia of statistics in behavioral science*.: Wiley.
- Paul, V. I. (1965). Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions: Nostra Aetate. In (Vol. 28). Vatican: Vatican.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual review of psychology*, 49, 65-85.

- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2005). Allport's intergroup contact hypothesis: Its history and influence. In J. F. Dovidio, P. Glick, & L. A. Rudman (Eds.), *On the nature of prejudice: Fifty years after Allport* (pp. 262-277). Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2008). How does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Meta-analytic tests of three mediators. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 28(6), 922-934.
- Pratt, D. (2016). Routledge Revivals: The Challenge of Islam (2005): Encounters in Interfaith Dialogue. In: Routledge.
- Prothero, S. (2010). *God is Not One: The Eight Rival Religions that Run the World, and why Their Differences Matter*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Prothero, S. (Ed.) (2007). *A nation of religions: The politics of pluralism in multireligious America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Ramos, M. R., & Hewstone, M. (2018). The Good, the Bad, and the Long-Term Implications of Social Diversity. *Emerging Trends in the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 1-14.
- Rattan, A., & Ambady, N. (2013). Diversity ideologies and intergroup relations: An examination of colorblindness and multiculturalism. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 43(1), 12-21.
- Provalis Research (2018). WordStat: Content Analysis Module for SIMSTAT & QDA Miner. Montreal, QC: Provalis Research.
- Ricoeur, P. (1985). History as narrative and practice. *Philosophy Today*, 29(3), 213-222.
- Rink, A., & Sharma, K. (2018). The determinants of religious radicalization: Evidence from Kenya. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 62(6), 1229-1261.
- Rizzuto, A. M. (1979). *The birth of the living God*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.
- Roccas, S., & Brewer, M. B. (2002). Social identity complexity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 6, 88-106.
- Roccas, S., & Elster, A. (2012). Group identities. In L. Tropp (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of intergroup conflict*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rózycka-Tran, J. (2017). Personality and Individual Differences. 115, 7-12.
- Saroglou, V. (2012). Is religion not prosocial at all? Comment on Galen (2012). *Psychological bulletin*, 138(5), 907-912.
- Saroglou, V. (2016). Intergroup conflict, religious fundamentalism, and culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 47(1), 33-41.

- Scheitle, C. P., & Finke, R. (2012). *Places of Faith: A Road Trip Across America's Religious Landscape*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schnitker, S. A., & Emmons, R. A. (2013). Spiritual striving and seeking the sacred: Religion as meaningful goal-directed behavior. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 23(4), 315-324.
- Service, R. N. (2019). For houses of worship, interfaith collaboration is the future of security. Retrieved from https://religionnews.com/2019/05/10/for-houses-of-worship-interfaith-collaboration-is-the-future-of-security/?fbclid=IwAR1vvLmltrVlo1veRXamEkzLd0OuHejVoOlw0dYAL72oeC_LkkieKIKKTOY
- Seul, J. R. (1999). Ours is the way of god': Religion, identity, and intergroup conflict. *Journal of peace research*, 36(5), 553-569.
- Seul, J. R. (2018). Treat the Stranger as Your Own: Religious Prosociality and Conflict Transformation. *Journal of Interreligious Studies*, 24, 26-60.
- Sheikh, H., Ginges, J., Coman, A., & Atran, S. (2012). Religion, group threat and sacred values. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 7(2), 110.
- Sidanius, J., Levin, S., van Laar, C., & Sears, D. O. (2010). *The Diversity Challenge: Social Identity and Intergroup Relations on the College Campus*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Simon, B., Eschert, S., Schaefer, C. D., Reininger, K. M., Zitzmann, S., & Smith, H. J. (2019). Disapproved, but Tolerated: The Role of Respect in Outgroup Tolerance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 45(3), 406-415.
- Sisk, T. D. (2011). *Between Terror and Tolerance: Religious Leaders, Conflict, and Peacemaking*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Skorinko, J. L., & Sinclair, S. A. (2013). Perspective taking can increase stereotyping: The role of apparent stereotype confirmation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49(1), 10-18.
- Snyder, C. R., Sigmon, D. R., & Feldman, D. B. (2002). Hope for the sacred and vice versa: Positive goal-directed thinking and religion. *Psychological Inquiry*, 13(3), 234-238.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Social Issues*, 41(3), 157-175.
- Stewart, E., Edgell, P., & Delehanty, J. (2018). The Politics of Religious Prejudice and Tolerance for Cultural Others. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 59(1), 17-39.

- Streib, H. (2001a). Faith Development Theory Revisited: The Religious Styles Perspective. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 11, 143-158.
- Streib, H. (2001b). Fundamentalism as a challenge for religious education. *Religious education*, 96(2), 227-244.
- Streib, H. (2001c). Inter-religious negotiations: Case studies on students' perception of and dealing with religious diversity. In *Towards religious competence: Diversity as a challenge for education in Europe* (pp. 129-149).
- Streib, H. (2005). Faith Development Research Revisited: Accounting for Diversity in Structure, Content, and Narrativity of Faith. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 15(2), 99-121.
- Streib, H., & Keller, B. (2018). Manual for the Assessment of Religious Styles in Faith Development Interviews (Fourth, revised edition of the Manual for Faith Development Research). *Bielefeld: Research Center for Biographical Studies in Contemporary Religion*.
- Streib, H., & Klein, C. (2014). Religious Styles Predict Inter-religious Prejudice: A study of German adolescents with the Religious Schema Scale. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 24(2), 151-163.
- Streib, H., & Klein, C. (Eds.). (2018). *Xenosophia and Religion: Biographical and Statistical Paths for a Culture of Welcome*. Cham, Heidelberg, New York, Dordrecht, London: Springer International Publishing
- Sullivan, W. F., Hurd, E. S., Mahmood, S., & Danchin, P. G. (Eds.). (2015). *Politics of religious freedom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Svensson, I. (2007). Fighting with faith religion and conflict resolution in civil wars. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 51(6), 930-949.
- Swidler, L. (1983). The dialogue decalogue: Ground rules for interreligious dialogue. *Horizons*, 10(2), 348-351.
- Swidler, L. (1991). Death or Dialogue: From the Age of Monologue to the Age of Dialogue. *Grand Valley Review*, 6(2), 16.
- Swidler, L. (2013). The History of Inter-Religious Dialogue. In C. C. (Ed.) (Ed.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Inter-Religious Dialogue* Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Swidler, L. (2014). The Dialogue Decalogue: Ground Rules for Interreligious, Interideological Dialogue. In *Dialogue for Interreligious Understanding. Interreligious Studies in Theory and Practice*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Swidler, L. (2016). *The age of global dialogue*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers.
- Swidler, L., & Mojzes, P. (2000). *The study of religion in an age of global dialogue*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & L. W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.
- Takim, L. (2004). From conversion to conversation: Interfaith dialogue in post 9-11 America. *The Muslim World*, 94(4), 343.
- Tauran, J.-L. C. (2008). Interreligious Dialogue – a risk or an opportunity? *Thinking Faith*. Retrieved from https://www.thinkingfaith.org/articles/20080531_1.html
- Tillich, P. (1965). *Ultimate Concern*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Timmerman, C., & Segaert, B. (Eds.). (2007). *How to conquer the barriers to intercultural dialogue: Christianity, Islam and Judaism* (Vol. 5). Pieterlen: Peter Lang.
- Van Tongeren, D. R., Hakim, S., Hook, J. N., Johnson, K. A., Green, J. D., Hulsey, T. L., & Davis, D. E. (2016). Toward an understanding of religious tolerance: Quest religiousness and positive attitudes toward religiously dissimilar others. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 26(3), 212-224.
- Verkuyten, M. (2007). Religious group identification and inter-religious relations: A study among Turkish-Dutch Muslims. *Group processes & Intergroup relations*, 10(3), 341-357.
- Waldenfels, B. (1990). *Der Stachel des Fremden [The good of the alien]*. Frankfurt, Germany: Suhrkamp.
- Waldenfels, B. (2011). *Phenomenology of the Alien: Basic Concepts [Grundmotive einer Phänomenologie des Fremden, Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp, 2006, transl. by A. Kozin and T. Stähler]*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Watson, P. J., Reagan, B. S., Chen, Z. J., & Morris, R. J. (2018). Xenophilia and the Religious Openness Hypothesis: Love of the “Stranger” within Religious Fundamentalist and Biblical Foundationalist Ideological Surrounds. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*.
- Williams, R. J., & Ruparell, T. (2014). On being in the middle: Inter-religious dialogue and network centrality. *Journal of Contemporary Religion*, 29(3), 471-489.
- Wingate, A. (2013). Interreligious Conversion. In D. Cheetham, D. Pratt, & D. Thomas (Eds.), *Understanding Interreligious Relations* (pp. 175-192). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Wright, S. C., Mazziotta, A., & Tropp, L. R. (2017). Contact and intergroup conflict: New ideas for the road ahead. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 23(3), 317.
- Yitmen, Ş., & Verkuyten, M. (2018). Feelings toward refugees and non-Muslims in Turkey: The roles of national and religious identifications, and multiculturalism. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 48(2), 90-100.
- Ysseldyk, R., Matheson, K., & Anisman, H. (2010). Religiosity as identity: Toward an understanding of religion from a social identity perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 14(1), 60-71.
- Yzerbyt, V. (2016). Intergroup stereotyping. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 11, 90-95.

APPENDIX A
IRB EXEMPT LETTER

Institutional Review Board

Dept 4915
615 McCallie Avenue
Chattanooga, TN 37403
Phone: (423) 425-5867
Fax: (423) 425-4052
instrb@utc.edu
<http://www.utc.edu/irb>

TO: Sally Swanson **IRB # 19-080**
Dr. Ralph W. Hood Jr.

FROM: Lindsay Pardue, Director of Research Integrity
Dr. Amy Doolittle, IRB Committee Chair

DATE: 6/5/2019

SUBJECT: IRB #19-080: Interreligious Dialogue in the Religious Styles Perspective

Thank you for submitting your application for exemption to The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga Institutional Review Board. Your proposal was evaluated in light of the federal regulations that govern the protection of human subjects.

Specifically, 45 CFR 46.104(d) identifies studies that are exempt from IRB oversight. The UTC IRB Chairperson or his/her designee has determined that your proposed project falls within the category described in the following subsection of this policy:

46.104(d)(4)(i): Secondary research for which consent is not required: use of identifiable information or identifiable biospecimen that have been or will be collected for some other 'primary' or 'initial' activity, and biospecimens or information is publicly available

Even though your project is exempt from further IRB review, the research must be conducted according to the proposal submitted to the UTC IRB. If changes to the approved protocol occur, a revised protocol must be reviewed and approved by the IRB before implementation. For any proposed changes in your research protocol, please submit an Application for Changes, Annual Review, or Project Termination/Completion form to the UTC IRB. Please be aware that changes to the research protocol may prevent the research from qualifying for exempt review and require submission of a new IRB application or other materials to the UTC IRB.

A goal of the IRB is to prevent negative occurrences during any research study. However, despite our best intent, unforeseen circumstances or events may arise during the research. If an unexpected situation or adverse event happens during your investigation, please notify the UTC IRB as soon as possible. Once notified, we will ask for a complete explanation of the event and your response. Other actions also may be required depending on the nature of the event.

The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga is a comprehensive, community-engaged campus of the University of Tennessee System. 

Please refer to the protocol number denoted above in all communication or correspondence related to your application and this approval.

For additional information, please consult our web page <http://www.utc.edu/irb> or email instrb@utc.edu.

Best wishes for a successful research project.

APPENDIX B

FAITH DEVELOPMENT INTERVIEW

FAITH DEVELOPMENT INTERVIEW (FDI)

LIFE REVIEW

1. Reflecting on your life thus far, identify its major chapters. - If your life were a book – how would you name the different chapters? - What marker events stand out as especially important?
2. Are there past relationships that have been important to your development as a person?
3. Do you recall any changes in relationships that have had a significant impact on your life or your way of thinking about things?
4. How has your world view changed across your life's chapters?
How has this affected your image of God or of the Divine? What does it mean to you now?
5. Have you ever had moments of intense joy or breakthrough experiences that have affirmed or changed your sense of life's meaning?
6. Have you experienced times of crisis or suffering in your life?
Have you experienced times when you felt profound disillusionment, or that life had no meaning? - What happened to you at these times? - How have these experiences affected you?

RELATIONSHIPS

7. Focusing now on the present, how would you describe your parents and your current relationship to them?
Have there been any changes in your perceptions of your parents over the years? If so, what caused the change?
8. Are there any other relationships that are important to you?
9. What groups, institutions, or causes, do you identify with? Why are they important to you?

PRESENT VALUES AND COMMITMENTS

10. Do you feel that your life has meaning at present? - What makes your life meaningful to you?
11. If you could change one thing about yourself or your life, what would you most want to change?
12. Are there any beliefs, values, or commitments that seem important to your life right now?
13. When or where do you find yourself most in communion or harmony with the Universe?
14. What is your image or model of mature faith, of a mature response to questions of existential meaning?
15. When you have an important decision to make, how do you generally go about making it? - Can you give me an example? If you have a very difficult problem to solve, to whom or what would you look for guidance?
16. Do you think that actions can be right or wrong? - If so, what makes an action right in your opinion?
17. Are there certain actions or types of actions that are always right under any circumstances?
Are there certain moral opinions that you think everyone should agree on?

RELIGION AND WORLD VIEW

18. Do you think that human life has a purpose? - If so, what is it?
Is there a plan for our lives, or are we affected by a power or powers beyond our control?
19. What does death mean to you? - What happens to us when we die?
20. Do you consider yourself a religious, spiritual or faithful person? (Or would you prefer another description?)
What does it mean to you?
21. Are there any religious, spiritual or other ideas, symbols or rituals that are important to you, or have been important to you? - If so, what are they and what makes them important?
22. Do you pray, meditate, or perform any other spiritual discipline?
23. What is sin, to your understanding?
24. How do you explain the presence of evil in our world?
25. If people disagree about issues of world view or religion, how can such conflicts be resolved?

VITA

Sally Beatrix Swanson was born in Baltimore, Maryland. Sally attended Elgin High School in Elgin, Illinois before moving to Chattanooga, Tennessee to pursue her undergraduate education at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, receiving a Bachelors of Science in Psychology with a minor in Religious Studies. She continued her studies at The University of Tennessee to pursue a master's degree in Research Psychology under the advisement of Dr. Ralph W. Hood Jr. During her time in the program, she served as the Director of the Ralph W. Hood Jr. Psychology of Religion Lab and Chief Editor of *Modern Psychological Studies*, an undergraduate journal of research in psychology. Sally will continue her education in the psychology of religion, group processes, and interreligious dialogue by pursuing her Ph.D. in Psychological Science with a Social Psychology concentration at the University of Maine under the advisement of Dr. Jordan P. LaBouff.