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ABSTRACT

Prejudice towards Muslims has been longstanding and is on the rise in the World. To address this prejudice, it is important to understand the associated underlying mechanism. Intergroup Threat Theory (ITT) suggests that prejudice is motivated by the perceived symbolic and/or realistic threat a group represents. To date, the relationship between threat and prejudice towards Muslims has primarily been examined correlational rather than experimentally. This project experimentally examines ITT to understand the role of threat in prejudice towards Muslims. Across three studies, I examine how manipulating the salience of threat leads to prejudice, support for harsh policies, and violence towards Muslims. Studies 1 and 2 were conducted with a North American sample and aim to understand how perception of general (Study 1) and specific threat (Study 2) of Muslims predicts prejudice towards Muslims. Data was collected online via CloudResearch. Results of Study 1 indicate that individuals higher in SDO, RWA and identification with US express more prejudice towards Muslims when threat is made salient, specifically symbolic threat. Study 2 yielded no significant results. Study 3 was conducted India to assess whether perceptions of threat leads to prejudice towards Muslims in another context and results indicated that individuals exposed to threat express more prejudice towards Muslims than those not exposed to threat. This project offers unique and helpful contribution to ITT and prejudice literature. The results highlight the role of threat, individual differences and context in perpetuation of prejudice towards Muslims in USA and India.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Muslims comprise 24.1% of the World’s population and are the third largest religious minority in the United States of America (USA) comprising of 3.45 million of the population (Mohamed, 2018). Since the September 11th, 2001 attacks, there has been an increase in hate and intolerance towards Muslims in the western part of the world (Shammas, 2009; Abdo, 2005). Over the last two decades people have become increasingly more hostile towards Muslims, have accepted harsher policies against Muslims, and have been more reluctant to include Muslims in their community or country (Croucher & Cronn-Mill, 2011; Abbas, 2007). An attitudinal survey of Americans also found that there has been a significant increase in prejudiced attitudes towards Muslims (Mogahed & Mahmood, 2019). The general rhetoric surrounding Muslims in America and the West has been negative and laden with prejudice. In a 2015 town hall in New Hampshire, the then candidate for president and former President Donald Trump said “We have a problem in this country; it’s called Muslims. We know our current president is one” (Johnson & Hauslohner, 2017). Politicians and media in America and Europe have used ISIS, terrorist attacks by Jihadists, and the recent refugee crisis to suggest that Muslims pose a threat to Western society (Hawley, 2019; Mackey, 2015; Ogan et al., 2013). Response to such perceptions of threat from Muslims has been highlighted via support for torture and violence towards Muslims and an increase in hate crimes against Muslims (Conrad et al., 2017; Litchblau, 2015). Additionally, according to a project done by PEW research center (Lipka, 2017), 47% of Americans perceive Muslims to be threatening and violent. Not only a threat to the economy and safety, the dialogue surrounding Muslims also suggests that Muslims are culturally and
fundamentally different (Carr, 2006). We can see example of these threat perceptions translate into action such as the travel ban in the US and the ban on Burqa in several countries in Europe (BBC, 2018).

The perceived threat associated with Muslims and Islam can perhaps most clearly be understood via the lens of Intergroup Threat Theory (ITT; Stephan, Ybarra & Rios, 2015). The ITT states that prejudice is the result of perceived symbolic threat (threat to values, beliefs and worldview) and realistic threat (threat to resources, economy and safety) from the outgroup. Several studies have supported the theory and found both self-reported symbolic and realistic threats to be associated with negative outgroup attitudes (McLaren, 2001; Morrison & Ybarra, 2008; Stephan & Stephan, 2002). We can even see real world examples of consequences of perceptions of symbolic and realistic threat such as Brexit and the Muslim Ban in America (De Zavala et. al 2017; Niyaeash, 2019). Even though there is some evidence for realistic and symbolic threat’s association with prejudice, there is very limited experimental data that supports the theory or differentiates between symbolic and realistic threat (Rios et al. 2018). Given the rise of Islamophobia, intolerance, violence and the threat related rhetoric surrounding Muslims, it is imperative to study the underpinnings of such prejudice. Disentangling the role of symbolic and realistic threat on prejudice towards Muslims has practical as well as theoretical implications.

**Intergroup Threat Theory**

Intergroup Threat Theory (ITT) originally called the Integrated Threat Theory is a comprehensive framework of intergroup relations that describes the association of perceived threat with prejudice (Stephen & Renfro, 2002). The ITT states that individuals may perceive certain threats from others which are characterized as either symbolic (threat to believes, values,
and worldview) and realistic (threat to resources, safety, and well-being). According to ITT perceived threat has certain antecedents and consequences. ITT also emphasizes the circular nature of perceived threat, where they state that negative attitudes and behaviors are an antecedent and a consequence of threat.

**Figure 1**

*The model of Intergroup Threat Theory adapted from Stephan, Ybarra & Rios (2015)*

![Figure 1 Diagram](image)

Figure 1 depicts the current conceptualization of ITT. As the model above shows, there are several antecedents and consequences to realistic threat and symbolic threat. However, for this project, the focus is on few of these antecedents.

**Antecedents to Threat**

The antecedents to threat include individual differences such as religiosity, strength of identity with the group, right wing authoritarianism (RWA) and social dominance orientation
RWA refers to an ideology where individuals have a rigid adherence to social norms, submission to authorities, and support for aggression against those that don’t follow the group norms (Altemeyer, 1981). A study done by Cohrs and Ibler (2009) found that individuals high on authoritarianism perceived more threat and prejudice. SDO is another individual difference variable that describes an orientation to the world which is comprised of beliefs that suggest that one’s position in the social hierarchy is based on superiority – inferiority, and it is justified, desirable, and should be maintained (Pratto et al. 1994). SDO and RWA are interrelated constructs such that adherence to authority and order also influences desire to maintain social order (Duckitt et al. 2002). Yet, the two constructs are different in the way they influence perceptions of threat (Rios et al. 2018). Studies have found support for both RWA and SDO moderating threat perceptions and prejudice, with RWA moderating symbolic threat and SDO moderating realistic threat (Morrisson & Ybarra, 2008; Simpson et al. 2013). Additionally, identification with group is also associated with increased perceptions of threat and prejudice (Obaidi et al. 2018). The following section describes the role of SDO, RWA, and group identification in moderating threat perceptions and prejudice.

**Social Dominance Orientation (SDO)**

SDO refers to an ideology where individuals believe in maintaining social hierarchy and their status in societies (Pratto et al. 1994). People high in SDO are likely to express more prejudice and perceive more threat. So far, studies have found correlational evidence for those high in SDO to perceive more realistic threat and subsequent prejudice. A study done by Duckitt and Sibley (2010) found that high SDO individuals were more likely to be prejudiced against stereotypically competitive groups (depicting realistic threat) as opposed to individuals low on
SDO. Additionally, a study found that American heterosexuals high in SDO were more willing to contribute to anti-gay fund when they were made to believe that homosexuals were making status gains (Bahns & Crandalls, 2013). While SDO’s role in moderating symbolic threat and prejudice has not directly been assessed, theoretically, the impact of SDO on symbolic threat may be less since individuals who endorse SDO not only believe in the hierarchies, but also want to maintain them to stay on top. Therefore, a threat to their standing in society is perceived more strongly than a threat to values (Rios et. al 2018).

**Right Wing Authoritarianism (RWA)**

RWA refers to an ideology where individuals believe that the world is dangerous and follow group norms, submit to authority and support aggression towards those who do not follow such authority (Altemeyer, 1981). RWA is associated with prejudice and increased perceptions of threat (Rios, 2013). As opposed to SDO, the evidence for RWA is more strongly associated with symbolic threat perception than realistic threat. Since individuals who endorse authoritarian beliefs tend to think their values and beliefs are the only truth, a threat to their beliefs is perceived and responded to stronger as opposed to threat to their safety and resources. A study done by Kauf et al. (2013) found that White Americans high in RWA perceived more prejudice against immigrants and perceived their behavior as more deviant from the norms prescribed by the host culture (depicting symbolic threat).

**Identification with Group**

Similar to RWA and SDO, group identification also interacts with threat to predict prejudice. Studies have found that strong identification with group (ethnic, race, religion) lead to increased perceptions of threat and prejudice (Morrison et al. 2009, Morrison & Ybarra, 2008).
So far, the evidence for group identification’s association with perceptions of threat is mixed, with group identification moderating both realistic and symbolic threat perceptions.

Apart from individual level factors there are certain situational factors such as a country’s culture, prior intercultural contact, and prior conflict that may influence perceptions of threat. For instance, a study done in Netherlands found that prior intercultural conflict with immigrants was associated with Dutch employees perceiving more symbolic and realistic threats from immigrants (Curseyu, Stoop & Schalk, 2007). Culture also plays a role in perception of threat, collectivistic nations are more likely to perceive threat as opposed to individualistic nations due to collectivistic nations’ emphasis on close in-group ties, conformity of norms, and adherence to group values (Stephan & Stephan, 2018). Even though culture and context of country is an antecedent to perceptions of threat, studies have not addressed the role of context/culture in perception of threat. Studies have emphasized the importance of context in contributing to threat and prejudice and called for more cross-cultural studies (Stephan & Stephan, 2018; Rios, Sosa & Osborn, 2018) yet this is still lacking in the current research landscape.

**Threat**

The antecedents mentioned above lead to two types of intergroup threats laid out by ITT; realistic threat and symbolic threat. Realistic threat comprises of threat to the resources, power, and general welfare of individuals, whereas symbolic threat constitutes threat associated to values, beliefs, and worldview of people. While the ITT has not explicitly disentangled realistic and symbolic threat in how their perceptions may differ, they have suggested that a group may elicit a particular threat over the other. For instance, homosexuals are usually associated with a threat to values and norms as opposed to a threat to resources and safety. On the other hand, immigrants are usually associated with a threat to resources and jobs over threat to values. The
theory warrants more experimental research to understand the different mechanisms of realistic and symbolic threat (since both threat perceptions are also highly correlated).

**Consequences to threat**

Threat perceptions lead to several consequences including prejudice, discrimination, and negative emotions (Kamans, Otten, & Gordijn, 2010; Stephen et. al 2002). For instance, a study done by Wager, Christ and Pettigrew (2008) found that Germans who perceived intergroup threat were more prejudiced towards foreigners and were more accepting of discriminatory behavior and violence towards them. Another consequence of perceived threat is reduced contact with the target group, with increased perceptions of threat leading to less contact and more avoidance of the outgroup (Stephan, et al., 2015). Since reduced contact is an antecedent and consequence of perceived threat, this alludes to the circular nature of the theory. Similarly, negative attitudes may increase the perception of threat and negative attitudes themselves also increase as a consequence of threat, emphasizing the role of threat in development of prejudice. Symbolic and realistic threat perception are also associated with specific consequences. Cottrell and Neuburg (2005) found that realistic threat elicited anger and fear whereas symbolic threats were predominantly related to disgust.

The ITT has its roots in the Social Identity Theory, which states that groups can be biased against other groups under conditions of threat (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). The Social Identity Theory is a well-recognized theory of intergroup relations which has garnered much support. This theory mentions that identifying with group yields certain benefits to us such as enhanced self-esteem, social support, and belongingness. As a result of these benefits, one’s group is of high value to them and a sense of hostility and dislike may develop towards other groups that appear to be a threat (Stephan, Ybarra & Rios, 2015). The ITT, while similar to Social Identity
Theory, goes a step forward in making the distinctions between types of threat, what leads to these threats, and what are the consequences of such threat perceptions. Therefore, the ITT lays out a framework that provides a holistic account of threat, the antecedents to threat, and the consequences of perceived threat. There have been several studies that have found symbolic and realistic threat’s association with prejudice towards Muslims. The following section highlights the role of each type of threat in their association with prejudice towards Muslims specifically.

**Symbolic Threat and Prejudice towards Muslims**

Studies that look at symbolic threat and attitudes towards Muslims have found evidence of its association with negative attitudes towards Muslims. Ciftci (2012) assessed the perceptions of threat and subsequent negative attitudes towards Muslims in five western countries namely, Germany, US, Spain, Great Britain, and France by using PEW’s (2006) data. They found that perceptions of symbolic threat and perceptions of realistic threat was significantly associated with unfavorable attitudes towards Muslims in all the 5 countries. Additionally, a study done by Croucher et. al, (2013) found that symbolic threat was positively associated with negative stereotypes and prejudice among Americans towards Muslims. Studies have also found that perceptions of symbolic threat were positively associated with Norwegians’ intentions to join anti-Muslim movements and Americans’ intentions to support and persecute Muslims (Obaidi et. al, 2018). In support of the circular nature of the ITT, a study done by Kunst et. al. (2015) found that individuals who were more Islamophobic endorsed more symbolic threat perceptions and wanted Muslims to give up their cultural heritage.

Most of the research on symbolic threat’s association with prejudice towards Muslims has been correlational. Even though experimental manipulation of symbolic threat is limited, it has found supportive results. A study done by Moss et al. (2017) exposed participants to
conditions where Americans were asked to report how much Muslims and Christians valued
gender equality. The results found that those Americans that reported that Muslims valued
gender equality less as compared to Christians, endorsed more prejudice towards Muslims. This
study postulated that gender equality is a core belief for Americans and not endorsing it implies
symbolic threat. While this study found some support for symbolic threat’s association with
prejudice, it did not directly manipulate threat or compare individuals to a control group.
Therefore, the experimental evidence, though present is still limited and does not account for a
threat to beliefs and values that may be unique to a particular group. Hence, a thorough
manipulation of symbolic threat will provide an insight onto the role of symbolic threat in
developing prejudice and support for judicial or violent harm against Muslims.

**Realistic Threat and prejudice towards Muslims**

There is considerable evidence for realistic threat’s association with prejudice towards
Muslims. A study done by Doosje and colleagues (2009) assessed the role of realistic threat in
predicting prejudice towards Muslims in nine European countries. Their study found that
individuals who perceived Muslims to be associated with terrorism and a threat to their safety
endorsed more prejudice, discrimination and, anti-immigration policies. Results along similar
line were found by Conrad et al. (2018) who conducted a study on American representative
sample examining their support for torture. They found that Americans supported torture towards
Arab (Muslim) sounding names more than Caucasian sounding names and Latino sounding
names especially if these Arabs were associated with crimes of terror. They suggested that this
was due to the underlying threat associated with Arabs/Muslims and terrorism.

Despite the correlational evidence in support of realistic threat’s association with
prejudice towards Muslims and negative behavioral intentions, the research is limited with little
experimental evidence. Mostly, realistic threat has been studied with a focus on threat to resources and economy and not the safety component of the threat. Studies done on realistic threat’s association with prejudice towards Muslims have either looked at realistic economic threat or terrorist threat separately or in combination (Rios, Sosa & Osborn, 2018). For the purpose of this dissertation we look at realistic threat, including threat to safety and resources to understand the role of perceived realistic threat’s association with prejudice towards Muslims.

**Symbolic v/s Realistic Threat and prejudice towards Muslims**

When it comes to both realistic and symbolic threat, there is some evidence of both symbolic and realistic threat’s association with prejudice and discrimination towards Muslims (Ciftci, 2012), but few studies have assessed the differential impact of each threat. A study done by González et al. (2008) aimed to deliniate the role of each type of threat on prejudice. They conducted a study on Dutch students and found that symbolic threat, but not realistic threat was associated with negative stereotypes and prejudice towards Muslims. The authors of the study concluded that perceived threat of Muslims to the host culture’s values, beliefs, and worldview was more prominent than perceived threat to economic resources, given the popular notion of Muslims in Netherlands as not being able to assimilate into the Dutch culture (Scroggins, 2005). A similar study was done to assess the outcome of perceived threat on attitudes towards Muslim immigrants and their assimilation into the host culture. Results suggested that perceived realistic and symbolic threat was associated with the perceptions that Muslims would not assimilate to the host culture (Croucher et al., 2014). All the above studies depict that perceived threat is related to less receptivity and more prejudice towards Muslims. In another attempt to delineate the effects of realistic and symbolic threat, Uenal (2016) assessed perceived threat’s association with attitudes towards Muslims. Their results suggest that realistic threat was associated more with
anti-Muslim attitudes as opposed to symbolic threat. Similarly, a study done among American participants concluded that strength of correlation between realistic threat and prejudice was stronger than the correlation between symbolic threat and prejudice towards Muslims (Croucher et. al 2013).

The bulk of the research on threat’s association with prejudice towards Muslims has been done in Europe. On the basis of studies done, there is a slight trend of symbolic threat perceptions leading to more prejudice in Europe and realistic threat perceptions leading to more prejudice in America. A stronger evidence for this difference comes from Obaidi et al.’s (2018) paper on threat perceptions and prejudice towards Muslims. In study 1, they found that symbolic threat, but not realistic threat, predicted prejudice and intentions to join anti-Muslim movements among Norwegians. In study 2, they found that both realistic and symbolic threat, but to a stronger extent realistic threat, predicted prejudice and intentions to persecute Muslims among Americans. Studies such as these highlight the role of country, context, and rhetoric in perception of the type of threat and its contribution in development and perpetuation of prejudice towards Muslims.

**Role of Moderators in perception of threat towards Muslims**

ITT suggest that individual differences contribute to perceptions of threat and prejudice. Therefore, it is likely that certain individual differences may moderate threat and prejudice. When it comes to prejudice towards Muslims, there is some evidence of SDO’s association with realistic threat. A study done by Uenal (2016) found that SDO was a stronger predictor of realistic threat perceptions and anti-Muslim sentiments as opposed to symbolic threat perceptions. RWA has also been found to moderate threat perceptions and prejudice towards Muslims. Dunwoody and McFarland (2017) found that authoritarianism increased perceptions of
threat and support of extreme anti-Muslim policies. However, specific associations of RWA with realistic and symbolic threat and prejudice towards Muslims to date appear to have not been fully examined.

In several studies assessing prejudice towards Muslims, group identification has moderated perceptions of threat. Steel et al. (2015) found that more identification with country (USA) was associated with more realistic threat and anti-Muslim prejudice. In contrast in a study done among Dutch participants, identification with their group (country) interacted only with symbolic threat perceptions to predict prejudice towards Muslims (Gonzalez et al. 2008). Identification with country is likely to impact threat perceptions along similar lines to the country’s general view of the target outgroup. Since the rhetoric surrounding Muslims in America is mostly related to terrorism and realistic threat, it can be expected that more identification with America would heighten perceptions of realistic threat of Muslims. Among the Dutch population, the perception surrounding Muslims is that they are unwilling and unable to assimilate with the host culture, therefore most studies done in Netherlands find more support for symbolic threat’s association with prejudice.

**Current Research**

As discussed above through various correlational studies and meta-analysis, perceptions of threat are consistently associated with prejudice (Reik, Mania & Gaertner, 2006). The Integrated Threat Theory has been put to the test a few times and with different target groups, however there are still some gaps in literature regarding the utility of this theory. The bulk of the research done to assess threat perceptions and prejudice is correlational. While correlational evidence is useful in understanding association between threat and prejudice, it is not enough to ascertain causality and since the ITT talks about a causal association between threat and
prejudice it is imperative to experimentally study it to fully test the theory and understand the underpinnings of prejudice. An experimental examination will also help to delineate and highlight the role of specific threat in its contribution to prejudice and negative behavioral intentions, especially since the measures of symbolic and realistic threat are highly correlated (Rios et al. 2018). Since most of the research testing ITT has been correlational, an experimental assessment will put the theory to further test and also help delineate the role of each threat perception in prediction of prejudice. Given the current times and increasing intolerance, hate crimes and prejudice towards Muslims, it is imperative to study the role of threat perceptions in development of prejudice towards Muslims.

So far, most of the studies on ITT and prejudice towards Muslims have been conducted in Europe and have found support for threat perceptions with stronger evidence for symbolic threat in predicting prejudice whereas a few studies in USA have found more support for realistic threat (Pal & Wellman, 2020; Obaidi et al. 2018). However, the evidence in the USA is limited and mostly correlation. Therefore, experimentally examining ITT and prejudice towards Muslims in USA will not only add to the literature but also help to the clarification of the theory. Additionally, the theory also mentions role of context in contributing to prejudice, but studies have not been done in non-western contexts to support that claim. Since Islamophobia, hate crimes and violence are on the rise in several parts of the World, it would be an addition to the theory to assess the role of symbolic and realistic threat in development of prejudice, support for violence and civil policies in different eastern countries as well.

This dissertation focuses on testing the Intergroup Threat Theory by experimentally manipulating symbolic and realistic threat and studying its association with prejudice towards Muslims. The research is divided in three studies. Studies 1 and 2 are conducted among an
American sample and Study 3 is conducted among an Indian sample. The goal of this research is to test and advance the Intergroup Threat Theory, as well as to contribute to the understanding of prejudice, violence, and exclusion of Muslims. My dissertation has the following specific aims:

**Aim 1.** To experimentally examine ITT with respect to threat’s role in prejudice towards Muslims (Studies 1, 2, and 3).

**Aim 2.** To delineate the role of symbolic and realistic threat in prediction of prejudice (Studies 1, 2, and 3)

**Aim 3.** To ascertain whether salience of general threat predicts prejudice towards Muslims (Study 1)

**Aim 4.** To ascertain whether salience of threat, specific to Muslims predicts prejudice towards Muslims (Study 2).

**Aim 5.** To assess whether these results replicate in another context, India (Study 3).
II. STUDY 1

The purpose of this study is to assess whether salience of threat perception predicts prejudice, support for violence, and harsh civil policies towards Muslims. For this study, participants were exposed to one of three conditions. In the *realistic threat* condition, they were asked to write about a time their safety, resources, and well-being were threatened. In the *symbolic threat* condition, participants were asked to write about a time their values and beliefs were threatened. In the *control* condition, they were asked to write about what they ate for all meals the previous day. In this study, I aim to assess the role of general realistic and symbolic threat in increasing prejudice towards Muslims. In addition to assessing for the differential role of perceived threat in predicting prejudice towards Muslims, I also test for several antecedents of threat outlined by ITT as possible moderators.

For this study I have 4 primary hypotheses, namely:

**H1.** Salience of realistic and symbolic threat would lead to more prejudice, support for harsh policies, and violent intentions towards Muslims as opposed to no threat.

**H2.** Salience of realistic threat would be more predictive of violent intentions and harsh civil policies as compared to salience of symbolic threat.

**H3.** RWA will interact with threat to predict prejudice, violent intentions, and support for harsh civil policies against Muslims when symbolic threat is salient.

**H4.** SDO and identification with country will interact with threat to predict prejudice, harsh policies, and support for violent intentions towards Muslims when realistic threat is salient.
This Study addresses aims 1, 2, and 3 of the dissertation.

Method

Participants

A total of 313 American individuals above 18 years of age participated in the study. Participants were recruited through CloudResearch, an online data collection tool (Litman, Robinson, & Abberbock, 2016) and the data was collected in May 2020. After assessing for failed attention checks and manipulation checks (N= 56) data from 257 participants remained (Race: 86.4% White, 5.8% Black or African American, 3.1% Latino or Hispanic, 1.9% Asian, 2.3% other; Religious Affiliation: 68.1% Christian, 3.1% Jew, .4% Muslim, 28.4% Other sex: 61.08% Female, 38.5% Male; Age: M = 47.92, SD =16.2. The study was pre-registered in OSF (osf.io/xgvdk).

Procedure

Participants were told they are participating in a study that assesses their attitudes towards different social issues. They were randomly assigned into one of three conditions, realistic threat condition (n = 82), symbolic threat condition (n = 78), and no threat condition (n = 97). In the realistic threat condition, participants were asked to write about a time their resources or safety were threatened. In the symbolic threat condition, participants were asked to write about a time their beliefs and values were threatened. In the no threat condition, participants were asked to describe the last breakfast they ate. The participants were asked to write for a period of 3 minutes, during which they were not be able to leave the page. To ensure that they participated in the manipulation task, only responses with minimum 15 words were included in the study. After being exposed to one of the three conditions, participants responded to questions on prejudice towards Muslims, violent intentions, support for civil policies, and
demographics. Along with these, participants also answered several measures for moderators including right-wing authoritarianism, identification with country, and social dominance orientation (See appendix A for questionnaires and conditions).

**Manipulation Verification Study**

The manipulation was assessed using a separate study so that the manipulation check questions do not draw attention to the dependent measures.

**Participants.** A total of American 140 individuals above 18 years of age participated in the study. Participants were recruited through CloudResearch, an online data collection tool (Litman, Robinson, & Abberbock, 2016). After assessing for failed attention checks and manipulation checks (N = 18) data from 122 participants remained (81.1% White, 8.3% Black or African American, 2.5% Latino or Hispanic, 5.8% Asian, 1.7% other; sex: 57.40% Female, 41.8% Male; Age: M = 45.18, SD =16.56.

**Procedure,** Participants were told they are participating in a study that assesses their attitudes towards different social issues. They were randomly assigned into one of three conditions, realistic threat condition (n = 41), symbolic threat condition (n = 40), and no threat condition (n = 41). In the realistic threat condition, participants were asked to write about a time their resources or safety were threatened. In the symbolic threat condition, participants were asked to write about a time their beliefs and values were threatened. In the no threat condition, participants were asked to describe the last breakfast they ate. The participants were asked to write for a period of 3 minutes, during which they will not be able to leave the page. To ensure that they participated in the manipulation task, only responses with minimum 15 words were included in the study. After being exposed to one of the three conditions, participants responded to questions on symbolic and realistic threat perceptions and demographics.
Measures

*Symbolic Threat* (adapted from Stephan et al. 1999; Gonzalez et al. 2008)

Symbolic threat was assessed by asking three questions adapted from the larger scale. Questions include “I feel that there is a threat to my culture” ($M = 3.76$, $SD = 1.82$, $\alpha = .95$)

*Realistic Threat* (adapted from Stephan et al. 1999; Gonzalez et al. 2008)

Realistic threat was assessed by asking four questions adapted to this study. Sample Questions include “I feel that I would have more difficulties in finding a job” ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.43$, $\alpha = .83$)

**Statistical Analysis and Results.** Data was analyzed by running One-Way ANOVA followed by post hoc analysis for significant results. Additionally, to test for significant difference between responses to manipulation, coding was done which was analyzed via independent samples t-test. The results of the study indicated that the manipulation worked as expected in making a particular threat salient when asked (see table 1.1).

**Table 1.1**

*Manipulation Study results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Symbolic Threat</th>
<th>Realistic Threat</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Comparison Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Symbolic Threat</td>
<td>4.34 (2.05)$^a$</td>
<td>4.08(2.05)$^{ab}$</td>
<td>3.20 (1.82)$^b$</td>
<td>$F(2,119)=3.759$, $p=.026$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Realistic Threat</td>
<td>3.84 (1.56)$^a$</td>
<td>4.70(1.08)$^b$</td>
<td>3.12 (1.43)$^c$</td>
<td>$F(2,119)=13.29$, $p&lt;.001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Ratings (Blind raters)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic Threat</td>
<td>2.79 (1.32)$^a$</td>
<td>1.21 (.61)$^b$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$t(88)=7.023$, $p&lt;.001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic Threat</td>
<td>1.95 (1.33)$^a$</td>
<td>3.73 (1.65)$^b$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$t(88)=-5.611$, $p&lt;.001$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Different letters in the same row indicate significant mean differences

Measures
All measures include response options that were on a Likert scale anchored at 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree.

**Prejudice towards Muslims.** (Leibold & Kühnel, 2003; Zick et al., 2011 used by Uenal, 2016). Prejudice towards Muslims was assessed using 6 items that measure the extent to which individuals feel negatively towards Muslims. Questions in the scale include “Muslims are not trustworthy”, “Islam is a violence glorifying religion” ($M = 3.72$, $SD = 1.41$, $\alpha = .90$).

**Support for harsh policies against Muslims** (Saleem, Prot, Anderson & Leiumux, 2016) To assess support for civil policies against Muslims, 7 items were used. These items include statements such as “Muslim Americans should not be allowed to vote, The government has every right to secretly monitor Muslims who come to the U.S” ($M= 3.06$, $SD = 1.54$, $\alpha = .93$).

**Violent Intentions** (Obaidi et al. 2018). Individuals’ violent intentions was assessed using 7 items such as “I’m ready to go and fight for Americans in another country”, and “I will not personally use violence to help Americans” ($M= 3.73$, $SD = 1.53$, $\alpha = .92$).

**Social Dominance Orientation** (SDO; Pratto et al. 1996; revised Knowles et al. 2009). Social dominance orientation was assessed using the short version SDO scale. The scale consists of 4 items such as “It’s okay if some groups have more of a chance in life than others,” and “If certain groups stayed in their place, we would have fewer problems” ($M=2.69$, $SD =1.25$, $\alpha = .74$).

**Right Wing Authoritarianism** (Altemeyer 1981, revised Funke, 2005). Right wing authoritarianism was measured using a shorter version of the RWA scale. The scale consists of 15 items such as “Obedience and respect for authority are the most important values children
should learn. What our country really needs instead of more “civil rights” is a good stiff dose of law and order” \((M=3.92, SD=1.19, \alpha = .87)\).

**Identification with Country** (adapted from Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992; Gonzalez, Verktuyen & Poppe, 2008). To assess for participants level of identification with their country, 4 questions were asked. These include items like “My American identity is an important part of my self”, “It is very important to me to be an American” \((M=5.31, SD=1.61, \alpha = .90)\).

**Demographics** Participants were asked several questions about their demographics to get additional information. They were asked about their age, gender, race, religion, education and political ideology.

**Manipulation Check**

The written responses on study 1 were coded by blind raters following the same procedure as the manipulation verification task. The results showed a significant difference in the degree to which participants responses were indicative of symbolic vs realistic threat across conditions. The mean of symbolic threat responses \((M=4.39, SD=2.91)\) was significantly higher than realistic threat \((M=3.27, SD=2.37)\) in the symbolic threat condition, \(t(202) = 3.02, p < .01\). Similarly, the mean of realistic threat responses \((M=6.24, SD=3.38)\) was significantly higher than symbolic threat \((M=4.94, SD=3.17)\) in the realistic threat condition, \(t(200) = -2.78, p < .01\). Suggesting that participants in the symbolic threat conditions wrote statements corresponding more strongly to symbolic threat and participants in the realistic threat conditions wrote statements corresponding more strongly to realistic threat.

**Analysis**

To examine the hypotheses, I conducted a series of One-Way ANOVAs and hierarchical linear regressions. On Step 1 of the regression analysis condition was entered represented by the
covariate (mean centered). Political orientation has been used in similar studies as a covariate and was so used in this study given its positive correlation with prejudice (Shaver et al. 2017; Duckitt & Sibley, 2008). On Step 2, the condition was and entered using dummy variables to assess for main effects along with the moderators. On Step 3, the interaction between moderators and each dummy coded variable was entered. Significant interactions were followed-up by examination of the simple slope of each moderator within each condition and endpoint analysis at +/- 1 standard deviation of moderators.

**Results**

**Prejudice Towards Muslims**

Contrary to prediction there is no main effect of threat condition on prejudice towards Muslims $F(2, 254) = .862, p=.42$.

As predicted, there is a significant interaction of SDO with condition to predict prejudice towards Muslims $\Delta F(2, 249) = 3.38, p =.03, \Delta R^2 = .02$ Model: $F(6, 249) = 24.80, p<.01, R^2 = .37$ (See table 1.2 for full output). SDO in the realistic threat condition was associated with greater endorsement of prejudiced attitudes, $b=.52, p<.01$. SDO also significantly moderated prejudice towards Muslims within the symbolic threat $b=.45, p <.01$ but not in control condition $b=.18, p =.06$ (Figure 1.1). Low scores on SDO was associated with greater prejudice in the control condition compared to the realistic threat condition, $t (249) = -2.21, p =.02$. There is no significant difference between symbolic and control condition at low levels of SDO $t (249) = -.45, p =.64$. At high levels of SDO, symbolic threat significantly differs from control in scores of prejudice, $t(249) = 2.18, p=.02$. There is no significant difference between realistic and control condition at high levels of SDO $t (249) = 1.28, p =.19$. There is no significant difference between
symbolic and realistic threat conditions and prejudice at low \( t(249) = -1.76, p = .08 \) and high levels of SDO, \( t(249) = -0.96, p = .33 \).

**Table 1.2**

*Regression Model Summary for Prejudice towards Muslims*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1:</th>
<th>Prejudice Towards Muslims</th>
<th>B(SE)</th>
<th>CI low</th>
<th>CI High</th>
<th>( \Delta R^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Orientation (Covariate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.37(.04)</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 1 (1=Symbolic)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.22(.17)</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 2 (1=Realistic)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.10(.17)</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDO</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.38(.06)</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 1*SDO</td>
<td></td>
<td>.26(.17)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 2*SDO</td>
<td></td>
<td>.34(.13)</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1:</th>
<th>Prejudice Towards Muslims</th>
<th>B(SE)</th>
<th>CI low</th>
<th>CI High</th>
<th>( \Delta R^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Orientation (Covariate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.37(.04)</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 1 (1=Symbolic)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.14(.17)</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 2 (1=Realistic)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.33(.16)</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWA</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.54(.07)</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 1*RWA</td>
<td></td>
<td>.33(.09)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 2*RWA</td>
<td></td>
<td>.35(.13)</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1:</th>
<th>Prejudice Towards Muslims</th>
<th>B(SE)</th>
<th>CI low</th>
<th>CI High</th>
<th>( \Delta R^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Orientation (Covariate)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.37(.04)</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 1 (1=Symbolic)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08(.18)</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 2 (1=Realistic)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.16(.16)</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification with USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.17(.05)</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 1*Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td>.28(.11)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 2*Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td>.23(.10)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Bold indicated \( p < .05 \).
Similarly, as expected, RWA also interacted with condition to predict prejudice towards Muslims $\Delta F(2, 249) = 4.58, p = .01, \Delta R^2 = .02$, Model: $F (6, 249) = 29.41, p < .01, R^2 = .41$. At higher levels of RWA, individuals endorsed more prejudiced attitudes towards Muslims when exposed to realistic threat $b = .69, p < .01$ and symbolic threat $b = .66, p < .01$. RWA also was significantly related to prejudice in the control condition $b = .33, p < .01$ (Figure 1.2). End-point analysis show that at low levels of RWA, scores on prejudice are significantly higher in control condition compared to the realistic threat condition, $t (249) = -2.06, p = .04$. There is no significant difference between symbolic and control conditions at low levels of RWA $t (249) = -1.18, p = .23$. As hypothesized at high levels of RWA, scores on prejudice are significantly higher in symbolic threat condition as compared to control $t (249) = 2.28, p = .02$. Similar to results of SDO, there was no significant difference between realistic and control conditions at high levels of RWA, $t (249) = 1.75, p = .08$. There is no significant difference between symbolic and realistic threat conditions and prejudice at low $t (249) = -.75, p = .44$ and high levels of RWA, $t (249) = -.86, p = .38$. 

Figure 1.1

*Interaction of SDO with condition to predict prejudice towards Muslims*
Identification with USA also significantly interacted with condition to predict prejudice towards Muslims $\Delta F(2, 246) = 3.90, p = .02, \Delta R^2 = .02$, Model $F (6, 246) = 18.74, p < .01, R^2 = .31$. At higher levels of identification with USA, individuals expressed more prejudiced attitudes towards Muslims when exposed to realistic threat $b = .27, p < .01$ and symbolic threat $b = .32, p < .01$. Identification with USA did not significantly relate to prejudice in the control condition $b = .03, p = .63$(Figure 3). At 1 SD below the mean scores of identification with USA, realistic threat significantly differs from control, $t(246) = -2.16, p = .03$. There is no significant difference between symbolic and control conditions at 1 SD below the mean, $t (249) = -1.48, p = .13$. Similar to SDO and RWA, at high levels of identification, scores on prejudice are significantly higher in symbolic threat condition compared to control, $t (246) = 2.08, p = .04$. There is no significant difference between realistic and control conditions at high levels of identification with country, $t (249) = .90, p = .36$. There is no significant difference between symbolic and realistic threat conditions and prejudice at low ($t (249) = -.46, p = .64$) and high levels of identification with country $t (249) = -1.10, p = .27$. 

Figure 1.2

Interaction of RWA with condition to predict prejudice towards Muslims
Support for Harsh Policies towards Muslims

Results yielded no main effect of condition on support for harsh policies towards Muslims $F (2, 254) = .189, p = .82$.

As hypothesized SDO significantly interacted with condition to predict support for harsh policies towards Muslims $\Delta F(2, 249) = 3.21, p = .04, \Delta R^2 = .014$, Model $F (6, 249) = 34.44, p<.01, R^2 = .45$ (Table 1.3). SDO was more strongly related to support for harsh policies in the realistic threat condition, $b=.79, p<.01$. Similar relationships were found for symbolic threat condition $b=.55, p<.01$ and control condition $b=.44, p<.01$ (Figure 1.4). At 1 SD below the mean scores of SDO is significantly higher in the control condition compared to realistic threat, $t (249) = -1.98, p=.04$. There is no significant difference between symbolic and control at low SDO, $t (249) = .03, p=.97$. At high level of SDO there is no significant difference between symbolic and control condition, $t (249) = .98, p=.32$. Similarly there is no significant difference between realistic and control condition, $t (249) = 1.49, p = .13$. There is a marginal significant difference
between symbolic and realistic threat conditions at low SDO ($t(249) = -1.95, p = .05$) with support for harsh policies being higher under realistic threat condition. At high SDO there is no difference between symbolic and realistic threat conditions, $t(249) = .41, p = .68$.

**Table 1.3**

*Regression Model Summary for support for harsh policies towards Muslims*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Support for Harsh Policies Towards Muslims</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B(SE)</td>
<td>CI low</td>
<td>CI High</td>
<td>ΔR²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Orientation (Covariate)</td>
<td>.39(.04)</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 1 (1=Symbolic)</td>
<td>.14(.18)</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 2 (1=Realistic)</td>
<td>-.05(.17)</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDO</td>
<td>.60(.06)</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 1*SDO</td>
<td>.10(.14)</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 2*SDO</td>
<td>.34(.14)</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B(SE)</th>
<th>CI low</th>
<th>CI High</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Orientation (Covariate)</td>
<td>.37(.04)</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 1 (1=Symbolic)</td>
<td>.01(.18)</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 2 (1=Realistic)</td>
<td>.03(.18)</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWA</td>
<td>.69(.07)</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 1*RWA</td>
<td>.16(.14)</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 2*RWA</td>
<td>.29(.14)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B(SE)</th>
<th>CI low</th>
<th>CI High</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Orientation (Covariate)</td>
<td>.37(.04)</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 1 (1=Symbolic)</td>
<td>-.01(.20)</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 2 (1=Realistic)</td>
<td>-.06(.20)</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification with USA</td>
<td>.24(.05)</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 1*Identification</td>
<td>.17(.13)</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 2*Identification</td>
<td>.16(.12)</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Bold indicated p<.05.*
Figure 1.4.

*Interaction of SDO with condition to predict support for harsh policies towards Muslims.*

RWA did not significantly interact with condition to predict support for harsh civil policies towards Muslims $\Delta F(2, 249) = 2.08, p = .12, \Delta R^2 = .01$, Model $F(6, 249) = 31.35$, $p < .01, R^2 = .43$. There is a significant main effect of RWA on support for harsh policies towards Muslims, $b = .69$, $p < .01$.

Similarly, identification with USA did not significantly interact with condition to predict support for harsh policies, $\Delta F(2, 246) = 1.27, p = .282, \Delta R^2 = .007$, Model $F(6, 246) = 16.19$, $p < .01, R^2 = .28$. There was a significant main effect of identification on support for harsh policies towards Muslims, $b = .24, p < .01$.

*Violent Intentions*

There was no significant effect of condition on violent intentions $F (2, 254) = .121$, $p = .88$. 
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SDO did not significantly interact with condition to predict violent intentions $\Delta F(2, 249) = 1.05, p = .35$, $\Delta R^2 = .007$, Model $F (6, 249) = 4.70, p < .01$, $R^2 = .10$ (Table 1.4). There is a significant main effect of SDO on violent intentions, $b = .15, p < .01$.

Table 1.4

Regression Model Summary for Violent Intentions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Violent Intentions</th>
<th>B(SE)</th>
<th>CI low</th>
<th>CI High</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Orientation (Covariate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.22(.05)</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dummy 1 (1=Symbolic)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.03(.22)</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dummy 2 (1=Realistic)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01(.22)</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDO</td>
<td>.15(.07)</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Step 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dummy 1*SDO</td>
<td>-.01(.18)</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dummy 2*SDO</td>
<td>.21(.17)</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Violent Intentions</th>
<th>B(SE)</th>
<th>CI low</th>
<th>CI High</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Orientation (Covariate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.22(.04)</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dummy 1 (1=Symbolic)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.06(.22)</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dummy 2 (1=Realistic)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03(.22)</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RWA</td>
<td>.23(.09)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Step 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dummy 1*RWA</td>
<td>.16(.14)</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dummy 2*RWA</td>
<td>.19(.17)</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Violent Intentions</th>
<th>B(SE)</th>
<th>CI low</th>
<th>CI High</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Orientation (Covariate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.23(.04)</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dummy 1 (1=Symbolic)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.11(.22)</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dummy 2 (1=Realistic)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.01(.22)</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identification with USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>.16(.06)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Step 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dummy 1*Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.22(.14)</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dummy 2*Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.11(.13)</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. Bold indicated p<.05.

Similarly, RWA did not significantly interact with condition to predict violent intentions \(\Delta F(2, 249) = .95, p = .38, \Delta R^2 = .006, \) Model \(F (6, 249) = 5.06, p < .01, R^2 = .10.\) There is a main effect of RWA on violent intentions on violent intentions, \(b = .23, p < .01.\)

Identification with USA also did not significantly interact with condition and violent intentions \(\Delta F(2, 246) = 1.18, p = .30, \Delta R^2 = .008, \) Model \(F (6, 246) = 5.18, p < .01, R^2 = .11.\) There is a main effect of US identification on violent intentions, \(b = .16, p < .01.\)

Discussion

The primary goal of the study was to assess whether salience of threat predicted prejudice towards Muslims. Given the rise of dislike, intolerance and restrictions towards Muslims globally, the study sought to assess the underpinnings of such prejudice towards Muslims (Lipka, 2017; Croucher & Cronn-Mill, 2011). Perceived threat’s association with prejudice towards Muslims has primarily been established correlationally, in this Study I attempted to understand whether manipulating threat would contribute to prejudice towards Muslims, support for harsh policies towards Muslims and Violent Intentions (Reik, Mania & Gaertner, 2006). Prior literature has found that ideological traits like SDO, RWA and group identification to be associated with threat and prejudice (Rios, et al. 2018). Hence this study sought to assess the association of SDO, RWA and identification with country with threat and prejudice towards Muslims. Previous research has used specific manipulation of the target group which has yielded mixed results (Kunst et al, 2019; Stephan et al. 2005). The threat manipulation used here did not mention Muslims as I was interested in if the salience of a general threat might lead to negative outcomes regarding Muslims.
I found that threat by itself did not significantly predict prejudice towards Muslims, support for harsh policies towards Muslims and violent intentions. While the manipulations worked in eliciting threat, there was no significant main effect of the threat manipulation in predicting prejudice, however there were several interaction effects. One of the reasons for lack of main effects could be the high correlation between realistic and symbolic threat and their similarity in relation to prejudice related outcomes (Stephan, Ybarra & Rios, 2015). Another explanation for no difference between the threat conditions could be due to the time this data was collected, it was collected in the initial stages of the COVID pandemic and in general both threat perceptions would have been high at the time.

As predicted, individuals high in SDO, RWA and identification with country endorsed more prejudice when threat was made salient. Additionally, individuals high in SDO also expressed more support for harsh policies towards Muslims when threat was made salient. These results offer unique contributions to the existing literature on threat and prejudice by depicting that a reminder of threat and predisposition towards certain ideological traits may increase prejudice towards Muslims. While studies have found association between threat and prejudice towards Muslims (Obaidi et al. 2018; González et al. 2008), this is the first to demonstrate the interaction between experiencing a general symbolic or realistic threat and personal characteristics (SDO, RWA and identification with USA) predicting prejudice towards Muslims. As hypothesized, the results indicated that at high levels of RWA individuals expressed more prejudice when symbolic threat in made salient i.e when individuals are reminded of a threat to their beliefs and values as opposed to control. This result is in line with previous research on the association between RWA, threat and prejudice (Dunwoody & McFarland, 2017). Similar to the results of RWA but contrary to my hypotheses, I found that individuals who endorsed SDO and
identified with US expressed more prejudice when primed with symbolic threat as opposed to no threat. The results of this study are novel and essential as they add to threat and prejudice literature by providing experimental evidence of threat and individual differences impact on prejudice towards Muslims. SDO, RWA and identification with country predicts greater prejudice towards Muslims when threat is made salient. High scores of these individual difference constructs consistently predict higher scores on prejudice towards Muslims when primed with symbolic threat suggesting that a predisposition to these traits heighten a threat to one’s beliefs and values. While previous research has found more evidence of realistic threat’s association with SDO, group identification and prejudice (Rios et al, 2018), perhaps my results can be explained by the current social climate. With the current rhetoric in US being surrounded on maintaining the ethos of USA such as “making America great again” and the recent elections being fought over Americans’ rights and freedom (Kessel & Quinn, 2020) a need for maintaining hierarchies and identification with US would be more associated with threat to beliefs.

The results are unique as they indicate that even a subtle reminder of threat, such as daily encounters with members of any outgroup or high threat instances such as the COVID pandemic may increase prejudice towards Muslims when individuals endorse certain ideological traits. Previous studies have not looked at how an unrelated threat of a target group could lead to prejudice, but this study makes evident that a mere reminder of threat unrelated to Muslims may lead to increased prejudice towards them for those individuals high on SDO, RWA and identification with USA. This study brings us one step closer to understanding the mechanism behind prejudice and intolerance directed towards Muslims in the USA. Since this study found support for a general reminder of threat in its association with prejudice towards Muslims, I wanted to see whether perceptions of threat specific to Muslims would predict prejudice as well.
Studies have found evidence that reading an article, or a vignette related to Muslims leads to more expression of prejudice towards Muslims (Pal & Wellman, 2020; Conrad et al. 2018). It would be a further addition to ITT and prejudice literature to test whether salience of specific types of threats Muslims may represent leads to prejudice towards them. Therefore, I conducted another study with manipulations specific to Muslims and associations of SDO, RWA and identification with country in predicting prejudice, support for harsh policies and violent intentions towards Muslims in USA.
III. STUDY 2

The purpose of this study is to assess whether manipulating threat differently would still yield the same results. In this study, I manipulate threat using an ostensible news article, that makes either a symbolic or realistic threat of Muslims salient. These articles have been created to look like a real news article. Existing research has found that negative media representation of Muslims is related to more prejudice and less warmth towards them (Shaver et al. 2017). Since the connotation of Muslims in media is mostly negative, the manipulation used in this study emulates what people see in the real world yielding greater ecological validity (Stephan et. al. 2005). Additionally, via study 2 I wanted to understand whether a specific threat of Muslims will increase threat perceptions and prejudice similar to general salience of threat used in Study 1.

This study aimed to address Aims 1, 2 and 4 of the dissertation. For this study I have similar hypotheses as Study 1

**H1.** Salience of realistic and symbolic threat would lead to more prejudice, support for harsh policies and violent intentions towards Muslims as opposed to no threat.

**H2.** Salience of realistic threat would be more predictive of violent intentions and harsh civil policies towards Muslims as compared to salience of symbolic threat and no threat.

**H3.** RWA will interact with threat to predict prejudice, violent intentions and support for harsh civil policies against Muslims when symbolic threat is salient.

**H4.** SDO and identification with country will interact with threat to predict prejudice and support for violent intentions and harsh policies towards Muslims when realistic threat is salient.
Method

Participants

A total of 316 individuals from USA above 18 years of age participated in the study. Participants were recruited through CloudResearch, an online data collection tool (Litman, Robinson, & Abberbock, 2016) and the data was collected in October 2020. After assessing for failed attention checks and manipulation checks (N= 50) data from 266 participants remained (75.8% White, 10.9% Black or African American, 7.1% Latino or Hispanic, 3.8% Asian, 3.1% other; sex: 61.7% Female, 38.3% Male; Religious Affiliation: 67.9% Christian, 2.3% Jew, 1.5% Muslim, 28.3% Other; Age: M = 39.40, SD =14.38. The study was pre-registered in OSF (https://osf.io/xgydk).

Procedure

Participants were randomly assigned into one of three conditions, realistic threat condition (n =83) , symbolic threat condition (n= 90), and control condition (n= 93). In the realistic threat condition, participants were exposed to an ostensible news article that describes the history of Muslims in America and how the number of Muslims are steadily increasing. In this version of the article the manipulation contained phrases such as “With the increase in Muslim population in America, certain changes are expected to take place. Some of these changes may be more money and resources being devoted to community buildings such as additional community centers and mosques. Additionally, with more and more Muslims entering the job market there is expected to be increased competition for both new and existing jobs in the US.” In the symbolic threat condition, the article remained the same, but information provided focused on changes to the American way of life in terms of changing beliefs and values. This version of the article contained phrases such as, “With the increase in Americans converting to
the religion of Islam, certain changes are expected to take place. Some of these changes would cater to the religious requirements of Muslims by recognizing Islamic holidays as public holidays, such as Eid-Ul-Fitr and Eid-Ul-Zuha. In addition to this, an increase in acceptance for expressions of Islamic culture is expected, such as women wearing burqas or hijabs and seeing Muslims read namaz (Islamic prayer) in public places”. In the control condition, the article was unrelated to threat and mentions a new community center for youth in a predominantly Muslim neighborhood (See appendix B for full articles).

After being exposed to one of the three conditions, participants responded to questions on prejudice towards Muslims, violent intentions, support for civil policies and demographics. Along with these, participants also answered several questions for the moderators which were used in Study 1.

Measures

Participants reported **Prejudice towards Muslims** \(M = 3.62, \ SD = 1.46, \ \alpha = .89\), **Support for harsh policies against Muslims** \(M = 3.37, \ SD = 1.53, \ \alpha = .93\), **Violent Intentions** \(M = 3.70, \ SD = 1.32, \ \alpha = .84\), **Social Dominance Orientation** \(M = 3.25, \ SD = 1.32, \ \alpha = .72\), **Right Wing Authoritarianism** \(M = 4.11, \ SD = 0.89, \ \alpha = .75\), **Identification with country** \(M = 5.44, \ SD = 1.43, \ \alpha = .93\) and demographics using the same items as Study 1.

**Manipulation Check** Manipulation was assessed by asking participants questions pertaining to the content of the article they read to make sure they noticed key information in the manipulation.\(^1\) Participants who did not respond correctly were removed from the analysis

---

\(^1\) I attempted to pilot the manipulation elicited threat however, due to COVID the departmental subject pool had low participation in the fall, and I was unable to get enough participants for the planned pilot and had to proceed without.
**Analysis**

To examine the hypotheses, I conducted a series of One-Way ANOVAs and hierarchical linear regressions. On Step 1 of the regression analysis condition was entered represented by the covariate (mean centered). Political orientation has been used in similar studies as a covariate and was so used in this study given its positive correlation with prejudice (Shaver et al. 2017; Duckitt & Sibley, 2008). On Step 2, condition was entered using dummy variables to assess for main effects along with the moderators. On Step 3, the interaction between moderators and each dummy coded variable was entered. Significant interactions were followed-up by examination of the simple slope of each moderator within each condition and endpoint analysis at +/- 1 standard deviation of moderators.

**Results**

*Prejudice Towards Muslims*

Contrary to prediction there is no main effect of threat condition on prejudice towards Muslims: $F(2, 263) = 1.224, p=.29$

There is no significant interaction of SDO with condition to predict prejudice towards Muslims $\Delta F(2, 259) = .378, p =.68, \Delta R^2 = .002$, Model: $F(6, 259) = 17.98, p<.001, R^2 = .29$ (See table 2.1 for full output). However, there is a main effect of SDO on prejudice towards Muslims, $b = .51, p <.01$.

**Table 2.1.**

*Regression Model Summary* for Prejudice towards Muslims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prejudice Towards Muslims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B(SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Orientation</td>
<td>.21 (.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Covariate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dummy 1 (1=Symbolic) .07(.18) -.28 .44
Dummy 2 (1=Realistic) .14(.18) -.22 .52
SDO .51(.05) .40 .63
Step 3: .01
Dummy 1*SDO -.04(.13) -.31 .22
Dummy 2*SDO -.12(.14) -.40 .15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B(SE)</th>
<th>CI low</th>
<th>CI High</th>
<th>∆R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Orientation (Covariate)</td>
<td>.21(.04)</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 1 (1=Symbolic)</td>
<td>.19(.19)</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 2 (1=Realistic)</td>
<td>.22(.20)</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWA</td>
<td>.53(.09)</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 1*RWA</td>
<td>.29(.22)</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 2*RWA</td>
<td>-.12(.22)</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B(SE)</th>
<th>CI low</th>
<th>CI High</th>
<th>∆R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Orientation (Covariate)</td>
<td>.21(.04)</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 1 (1=Symbolic)</td>
<td>.20(.21)</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 2 (1=Realistic)</td>
<td>.27(.21)</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification with USA</td>
<td>.12(.06)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 1*Identification</td>
<td>-.11(.14)</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 2*Identification</td>
<td>-.22(.14)</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bold indicated p<.05.
Similarly, RWA did not interact with condition to predict prejudice towards Muslims ∆F(2, 259) = 1.71, p = .18, ∆R² = .01, Model: F (6, 259) = 9.31, p<.01, R² = .17. There is a significant main effect of RWA on prejudice towards Muslims, b = .78, p < .01.

Identification with USA also did not significantly interact with condition to predict prejudice towards Muslims ∆F(2, 259) = 1.17, p = .31, ∆R² = .008, Model F (6, 259) = 4.94, p<.01, R² = .10. There is no main effect of identification on prejudice towards Muslims b = .11, p = .29

Support for harsh policies towards Muslims
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Results yielded no main effect of condition on support for harsh policies towards Muslims $F(2, 263) = 1.21, p = .285$.

Contrary to hypothesis SDO did not significantly interact with condition to predict support for harsh policies towards Muslims $\Delta F(2, 259) = .088, p = .91, \Delta R^2 = .0004$, Model $F(6, 259) = 30.82, p < .01, R^2 = .41$ (Table 2.2). However, there is a main effect of SDO on support for harsh policies towards Muslims, $b = .65$, $p < .01$.

Table 2.2.

Regression Model Summary for Support for harsh policies towards Muslims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>B(SE)</th>
<th>CI low</th>
<th>CI High</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Orientation (Covariate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 1 (1=Symbolic)</td>
<td>.03(.17)</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 2 (1=Realistic)</td>
<td>.13(.18)</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDO</td>
<td>.65(.05)</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 1*SDO</td>
<td>-.003(.13)</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 2*SDO</td>
<td>.05(.13)</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>B(SE)</th>
<th>CI low</th>
<th>CI High</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Orientation (Covariate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 1 (1=Symbolic)</td>
<td>.17(.19)</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 2 (1=Realistic)</td>
<td>.22(.20)</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWA</td>
<td>.71(.10)</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 1*RWA</td>
<td>.17(.22)</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 2*RWA</td>
<td>-.01(.22)</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>B(SE)</th>
<th>CI low</th>
<th>CI High</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Orientation (Covariate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Step 2:

| Dummy 1 (1=Symbolic) | .19(.21) | -.22 | .61 |
| Dummy 2 (1=Realistic) | .29(.21) | -.13 | .71 |
| Identification with USA | **.22(.06)** | **.09** | **.35** |

Step 3:

| Dummy 1*Identification | -.08(.14) | -.38 | .20 |
| Dummy 2*Identification | -.23(.15) | -.53 | .05 |

Note. Bold indicated p<.05.

There is no significant interaction of RWA with condition to predict support for harsh policies either $F(2, 259) = .421, p = .65, \Delta R^2 = .002$, Model $F (6, 259) = 14.27, p<.01, R^2 = .24$.

There is a main effect of RWA on support for harsh policies towards Muslims, $b = .71, p<.01$.

Similarly, identification with USA did not interact with condition to predict support for harsh policies $F(2, 259) = 1.26, p = .28, \Delta R^2 = .008$, Model $F (6, 259) = 7.99, p<.01, R^2 = .15$.

There is a significant main effect of identification with USA on support for harsh policies, $b = .22, p = .03$.

Violent Intentions

There is no significant main effect of condition on violent intentions $F (2, 263) = 2.23, p = .10$.

SDO did not significantly interact with condition to predict violent intentions $\Delta F(2, 259) = .78, p = .45, \Delta R^2 = .005$, Model $F (6, 259) = 8.98, p<.01, R^2 = .17$ (Table 2.3). There is a significant main effect of SDO on violent intentions, $b = .35, p < .01$.

Table 2.3.

Regression Model Summary for Violent Intentions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violent Intentions</th>
<th>B(SE)</th>
<th>CI low</th>
<th>CI High</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Orientation</td>
<td><strong>.12(.04)</strong></td>
<td><strong>.04</strong></td>
<td><strong>.21</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Covariate)
Step 2:  
| Dummy 1 (1=Symbolic) | .13(.18) | -.21 | .49 |
| Dummy 2 (1=Realistic) | -.29(.18) | -.66 | .06 |
| SDO | .35(.05) | .23 | .46 |
Step 3: 
| Dummy 1*SDO | -.04(.13) | -.31 | .21 |
| Dummy 2*SDO | .13(.14) | -.14 | .41 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B(SE)</th>
<th>CI low</th>
<th>CI High</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 1 (1=Symbolic)</td>
<td>.20(.17)</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 2 (1=Realistic)</td>
<td>-.26(.18)</td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWA</td>
<td>.60(.09)</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3:</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 1*RWA</td>
<td>-.18(.20)</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 2*RWA</td>
<td>.07(.20)</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B(SE)</th>
<th>CI low</th>
<th>CI High</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1:</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Orientation (Covariate)</td>
<td>.12(.04)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2:</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 1 (1=Symbolic)</td>
<td>.22(.18)</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 2 (1=Realistic)</td>
<td>-.20(.19)</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification with USA</td>
<td>.22(.06)</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3:</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 1*Identification</td>
<td>-.10(.13)</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy 2*Identification</td>
<td>-.01(.13)</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Bold indicated p<.05

Similarly, RWA did not significantly interact with condition to predict violent intentions. 
ΔF(2, 259) = .79, p = .45, ΔR² = .005, Model F (6, 259) = 9.94, p<.01, R² = .18. There is a significant main effect of RWA on violent intentions, b=.60, p<.01.
Identification with USA also did not significantly moderate condition and violent intentions $\Delta F(2, 259) = .38, p = .67, \Delta R^2 = .002$, Model $F (6, 259) = 4.99, p < .01, R^2 = .10$. There is no main effect of identification with USA on violent intentions, $b = .22, p < .01$.

**Discussion**

The purpose of Study 2 was to assess whether salience of threat from Muslims contributes to prejudice towards Muslims. Additionally, I wanted to assess whether ideological constructs related to prejudice would interact with threat to predict prejudice, support for harsh policies and violent intentions. Contrary to my hypotheses the results indicated no significant difference between conditions in prediction of prejudice, harsh policies and violent intentions towards Muslims. Similarly, there is no interaction of SDO, RWA and US identification with condition to predict prejudice, harsh policies and violent intentions. I see a significant main effect of SDO and RWA on prejudice, harsh policies and violent intentions suggesting that higher levels of SDO and RWA predict higher prejudice, support for harsh policies and violent intentions towards Muslims. This result is consistent with previous research on SDO and RWA’s association with prejudice (Rios, 2013; Kauf et al. 2013; Duckit & Sibley 2010).

The results of Study 2 are not in line with those of Study 1 or my hypotheses. There may be several reasons for these results. One of these could be that the manipulations may not have worked as I anticipated. Since I was not able to collect pilot data due to time and participant restrictions arising from the pandemic, I used manipulation check questions I intended to examine in a manipulation pilot at the end of the study. The results showed no significant difference by condition in self-reported threat. This could indicate that the articles were unsuccessful at manipulating threat or could indicate the manipulation was no longer salient by the end of the study. The lack of a pilot and significant manipulation check cast doubt on the
meaning of the null effects found in this study. Another explanation for these unexpected results could be the time and context at which data was collected. The data collection occurred in the middle of the COVID pandemic and at the peak of Black Lives Matter movement. At the time individuals’ awareness about social issues and general threat perceptions would have been high which may have resulted in more socially desirable responses.

Even though the results of this study were not significant, I still ran a version of Study 2 in India to assess the role of perceived threat in prejudice towards Muslims in a different context. Given the importance of context and need for studies in non-western cultures, it seemed imperative to test ITT in a country such as India where prejudice towards Muslims is longstanding. Therefore, I conduct Study 3 to test whether salience of threat of Muslims would contribute to prejudice towards Muslims in India.

---

2 Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and time constraints both Study 2 and 3 were collected before either was analyzed so no modifications of Study 3 were able to be made based on the results of Study 2.
IV STUDY 3

Since ITT mentions the role of context in influencing perceptions of threat, it would be useful to see whether the results of Study 1 and 2 replicate in a different context to understand prejudice. Prejudice towards Muslims is not limited to the USA or western countries. Instances of anti-Muslim rhetoric and negative actions towards Muslims in eastern countries have been rising, such as Muslims genocides is Myanmar, China and anti-Muslim riots in India (Landale, 2021; BBC, 2020; Ellis-Peterson, 2020). For this study, I test ITT and prejudice towards Muslims among Indians living in India. The reason I choose India is because of India’s unique past and present with Muslims. India has a long history of conflict with Muslims, as a Hindu majority nation, Hindus and Muslims have always been at odds to assert their place in Indian society, especially since the partition in 1947 (Khan & Sen, 2009). In the last few years, negativity towards Muslims has been progressively increasing and can be seen via instances of mob violence, riots against Muslims and introduction of laws such as CAA that prevent Muslims from immigrating to the country (Iftikhar, 2020; Ellis-Peterson, 2020; Bano et al., 2018).

Recently, there has been a push for creating and maintaining India as a Hindu nation despite it traditionally being a secular nation. The current leading government (Bhartia Janata Party) is pushing this agenda to stay in power by creating a threat of Muslims or instilling a sense that Muslims are not part of the Indian way of life (Maizland, 2020; Sircar 2020). Historically, Muslims have been perceived to represent a strong realistic threat, with Mughals ruling over India, the partition and currently it is prevalent due to conflict between Indian and Pakistan (Pandya, 2008; Rao, 2008). Muslims also are often cast as posing a symbolic threat as Indians
(predominantly of Hindu faith) believe that Muslims’ beliefs and values are contradictory to theirs, such as consumption of beef or praying in mosques on land that may have belonged to Hindus Gods (Old Writer, 2017; Madan, 2010).

Given India’s current sociopolitical climate and the negative rhetoric surrounding Muslims, it would be beneficial to understand perceived threat’s role in perpetuation of such negative attitudes. For this study, I have two sets of competing hypotheses. One set of hypotheses remains the same as previous 2 studies, where I expect the results from America to replicate to India, this would indicate that the cultural context maybe irrelevant to perception of threat and prejudice toward Muslims. However, given that India’s sociopolitical context and culture is very different from that of America, one might expect the results to be slightly different. While there is evidence of Muslims posing both realistic and symbolic threat, given that the dialogue surrounding Muslims in India is presently focused on them being different and not part of Indian/Hindu culture, the salience of symbolic threat seems like it may be more closely tied to Muslim prejudice (Ruback & Singh, 2008). A study done by Tausch, Hewstone, and Roy (2009) to assess perceived threat and prejudice among Hindus and Muslims in India, found that Hindus perceived more symbolic threat of Muslims and prejudice towards them as opposed to realistic threat. Their study provides some correlational evidence for symbolic threat’s association with prejudice towards Muslims and is consistent with India’s general perception of Muslims as a threat to the majority Hindu religion and customs. Therefore, examined these two sets of competing hypotheses for this study:

**Replication Hypotheses:**

**H1.** Salience of realistic threat would lead to more violent intentions, support for harsh policies towards Muslims as compared to salience of symbolic threat and no threat.
H2 Identification with country will interact with threat to predict prejudice, harsh policies, and support for violent intentions towards Muslims when realistic threat is salient.

Hypotheses based on contextual differences:

H1. Salience of symbolic threat will lead to more prejudice, violent intentions, and support for harsh civil policies towards Muslims as opposed to realistic threat.

H2. Identification with country will interact with threat perception to predict, violent intentions, and support for harsh policies when symbolic threat is salient.

This study will target Aims 1, 2 and 5 of the dissertation project.

Method

Participants

A total of 322 individuals residing in India above 18 years of age participated in the study. Participants were recruited through CloudResearch, an online data collection tool (Litman, Robinson, & Abberbock, 2016) and the data was collected in February 2021. After assessing for failed attention checks and manipulation checks (N=123) data from 206 participants remained (sex: 50% Female, 50% Male; Religious Affiliation: 5.8% Christian, 80.6% Hindu, 5.3% Muslim, 1.9% Sikh, 4.9% Other; Age: M = 32.48, SD =10.22. The study was pre-registered in OSF (osf.io/xjn3z).

Procedure

Participants were randomly assigned into one of three conditions, realistic threat (n=69) condition, symbolic threat (n=83) condition and no threat (n=54) condition. In each condition, participants read an ostensible news article, similar to ones used in Study 2 but adapted to the Indian context. In the symbolic threat condition, the manipulation contained phrases such as
“With the increase in Muslim population in India, certain changes are expected to take place. Some of these changes may be more money and resources being devoted to community buildings such as additional community centers and mosques. Additionally, with more and more Muslims entering the job market there is expected to be increased competition for both new and existing jobs in the India.” In the symbolic threat condition the manipulation contained phrases such as “With the increase in Indians converting to the religion of Islam, certain changes are expected to take place. Some of these changes would cater to the religious requirements of Muslims such as increase in mosques, acceptance of sharia (Islamic law) and seeing Muslims read namaz (Islamic prayer) in public places.” After being exposed to one of the three conditions, participants responded to questions on prejudice towards Muslims, violent intentions, support for civil policies, group identification and demographics. For exploratory analysis, responses on SDO and RWA were also collected like Studies 1 and 2. After participants completed the questionnaires, they were thanked for their participation (See appendix C for articles and questionnaires).

Measures

All measures were adapted to the Indian context and include response options on a Likert scale anchored at 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree.

Prejudice towards Muslims (Leibold & Kühnel, 2003; Zick et al., 2011 used by Uenal, 2016). Prejudice towards Muslims was assessed using 6 items that measure the extent to which individuals feel negatively towards Muslims. Questions in the scale include “Muslims are not trustworthy”, “Islam is a violence glorifying religion” ($M = 3.47$, $SD = 1.48$, $\alpha = .89$).

Support for harsh policies against Muslims (adapted from Saleem, Prot, Anderson & Leiumux, 2016). To assess support for civil policies against Muslims, 7 items were used. These
items include statements such as “Muslim Indians should not be allowed to vote, The government has every right to secretly monitor Muslims who come to India” ($M = 3.38$, $SD = 1.33$, $\alpha = .81$).

**Violent Intentions** (adapted from Obaidi et al., 2018). Individuals’ violent intentions was assessed using 7 items such as “I will personally use violence against people harming other Indians that I care about” ($M = 3.68$, $SD = 1.38$, $\alpha = .78$).

**Identification with Country** (adapted from Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992; Gonzalez, Verktuyen & Poppe, 2008). To assess for participants level of identification with their country, 4 questions were asked. These include items like “My Indian identity is an important part of my self”, “It is very important to me to be an Indian” ($M = 6.37$, $SD = .97$, $\alpha = .89$).

**Social Dominance Orientation** (SDO; Pratto et al. 1996; revised Knowles et al. 2009)

Social dominance orientation was assessed using the short version SDO scale. The scale consists of 4 items such as “It’s okay if some groups have more of a chance in life than others,” and “If certain groups stayed in their place, we would have fewer problems” ($M = 3.75$, $SD = .97$, $\alpha = .23$).

**Right Wing Authoritarianism** (Altemeyer 1981, revised Funke, 2005)

Right wing authoritarianism was measured using a shorter version of the RWA scale. The scale consists of 15 items such as “Obedience and respect for authority are the most important values children should learn, What our country really needs instead of more “civil rights” is a good stiff dose of law and order” ($M = 4.36$, $SD = .97$, $\alpha = .34$)

**Manipulation Checks**

Manipulation was assessed by asking participants questions pertaining to the article they read. Participants who did not respond correctly were removed from the analysis.
**Demographics**

Participants were asked several questions about their demographics to get additional information similar to Studies 1 and 2.

**Analysis**

To examine the hypotheses, I conducted a series of One-Way ANOVAs. Given the lack of range of scores on identification, this measure was not used in the analysis. Similarly, SDO and RWA were not used in the analysis as the reliability of scales could not be established.

**Results**

**Prejudice Towards Muslims**

As predicted there is a main effect of threat condition on prejudice towards Muslims $F(2, 203) = 3.93, p = .021, \eta^2 = .16$ (Figure 1.5). To further test for differences between conditions a post hoc analysis was done. The realistic threat condition ($M = 3.64, SD = 1.43$) significantly differed from the control condition ($M = 2.99, SD = .19, M_{diff} = .652, p < .05$). The symbolic threat condition ($M = 3.64, SD = 1.53$) was also significantly different from the control condition, $M_{diff} = .651, p < .05$. There is no significant difference between symbolic and realistic threat conditions, with their means being the same ($M_{diff} = .00, p = 1.00$).
Support for harsh policies towards Muslims

Results yielded no main effect of condition on support for harsh policies towards Muslims $F(2, 198) = 1.41, p = .24$.

Violent Intentions

There is no significant main effect of condition on violent intentions $F(2, 198) = .144, p = .86$.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to assess whether perceptions of threat of Muslims contribute to increased prejudice towards Muslims in India as well. Given India’s complicated history with Muslims and the increasing inter-religious and political propaganda focused on portraying Muslims as threat, it seemed imperative to evaluate the role of threat in predicting prejudice towards Muslims (Maizlan, 2020). As hypothesized the results indicate that salience of threat of Muslims predicted more prejudice towards Muslims. However, contrary to my
hypothesis there was no significant difference between symbolic and realistic threat conditions. Similar to study 2, an explanation for this result could be the context of data collection. During the last few years, the leading government of India has constantly used threat of Muslims (symbolic and realistic) to portray Muslims in negative light and as anti-Indian. While mob lynching of Muslims (for consumption, production or possession of beef) has been increasing over the past 5 years, portraying Muslims as symbolic threat, the recent laws to prohibit Muslims from immigrating to the country (CAA) reflect a realistic threat (Vasudeva & Barkdull, 2020; Tamkin, 2020; Frayer, 2019). Additionally, when the data was collected the pandemic was reaching a peak in India and Muslims were blamed for intentional spread due to a religious congregation where a few tested positive, reflecting both a symbolic and realistic threat (Ellis-Peterson & Rahman, 2020). These contextual instances depict how both realistic and symbolic threat of Muslims would have been high at the time, therefore a difference between the two could not be established.

My other primary hypothesis was that identification with India would interact with threat perception to predict prejudice, harsh policies and violent intentions. The results were not analyzed as the identification measure was not reliable due to the ceiling effect observed with no range of responses. Again this could be context laden since over the past few years the rhetoric in India has been surrounded around maintaining nationalism by supporting the current government (Tamkin, 2020).

The aim of Study 3 was to see whether the results would be replication of Study 2 (or study 1) or would they differ based on Indian context. The results while not a replication, are consistent with the idea that both symbolic and realistic threat is driving prejudice towards Muslims (Rios et al. 2018). The results of study 3 offer novel and valuable insight into threat and
prejudice literature. This was one of the first studies, to my knowledge, which offers an experimental examination of ITT and prejudice towards Muslims in India. The importance of context is highlighted in this study. Given the rise of Covid-19 and increasing political/religious tensions in India, the results of this study take on greater importance.
V. OVERALL DISCUSSION

The purpose of this dissertation was to experimentally test the Intergroup Threat Theory and establish threat’s role in predicting prejudice towards Muslims in different contexts. Across three studies I sought to ascertain whether perceptions of realistic and symbolic threat (general or specific to Muslims) would predict prejudice, support for harsh policies and violent intentions towards Muslims. Additionally, I assessed whether individual differences such as SDO, RWA and identification with country would interact with threat perception to predict these outcomes.

The results of Study 1 were partially in line with hypotheses suggesting that endorsing SDO, RWA and identifying with USA predicts higher prejudice towards Muslims when threat is made salient, particularly when symbolic threat is made salient. These results though expected were not supported by Study 2, perhaps due to nature of manipulation, lack of a pilot study, context of data collection and likelihood of socially desirable responses. Study 3 used similar manipulation as Study 2 (specific threat of Muslims) and the results indicated that individuals did express more prejudice towards Muslims when either a realistic or symbolic threat was made salient.

While the results across these studies are not entirely consistent or as hypothesized, they offer novel contributions and addition to ITT. Study 1 depicted that when one endorses SDO, RWA and identifies with US more, symbolic threat seems to be driving prejudice towards Muslims more as compared to control. While the results in realistic threat condition were along the same line as symbolic threat, they did not differ from the control conditions. This result is unique as previous research has found more evidence for realistic threat’s association with prejudice in USA among Christian participants (Pal & Wellman, 2020). The results suggest that being exposed to
any threat regardless of Muslims may lead to an increase in prejudice towards Muslims. This is particularly important in current times as general threat perceptions are on the rise and so is intolerance, prejudice towards Muslims. These results suggest that individuals may use an outgroup as a scapegoat under situations where threat perceptions are highlighted, evidence of such behavior is visible via the recent backlash and hate crimes against Asians (Nuyen, 2021).

Another valuable insight provided via these studies is the role of context. This dissertation was conducted at the peak of a pandemic which may have greatly influenced the responses and specifically threat perceptions. Additionally, this was one of the first studies to have experimentally tested ITT in India. The results were similar to that of Study 1, in highlighting the role of threat in predicting prejudice towards Muslims. The current rhetoric around Muslims in India is one of hate, otherness and intolerance which is being perpetuated by spreading fabricated information via social media apps such as WhatsApp messenger (Maizland, 2020, Vasudeva & Barkdull, 2019). Scholars believe that Muslims are being increasingly discriminated against and marginalized in India (Agarwal, 2020; Human Rights Watch, 2020). Therefore, the results of this study are keeping in line with India’s current climate and highlight an acceptability of perpetuating prejudice towards Muslims. One aspect that is evident across these studies is that there is minimal evidence for differential impact of type of threat i.e both symbolic and realistic threat seem to be driving prejudice towards Muslims, a result that is somewhat consistent with previous research (Ciftci, 2012; Reik et al. 2006). While previous research has found more support for one type of threat being more consistent with prejudice towards specific groups, such as symbolic threat being associated with homosexuals (Rios, 2013; Herek, 2002) the evidence for specific threat’s association with Muslims still remains unclear.
This project offers more support and evidence for both realistic and symbolic threat’s association with prejudice towards Muslims.

Overall the results of this dissertation offer unique and valuable contribution to the role of perceived threat in contributing to prejudice towards Muslims. The experimental evidence corroborates previous research and the theory’s premise that threat and individual traits are an antecedent to prejudice. These results are valuable to understanding prejudice and intergroup relations as a mere reminder of threat may lead to negative perception of outgroups. Additionally, by assessing the theory’s applicability in a different country among non-WEIRD (Western Educated Industrialized Rich and Democratic) sample, I add to the theory by exhibiting the importance of context and a wider representation of sample.

Limitations

While this dissertation project is useful and novel, it is not without limitations. Given the self-report nature of the study and questions surrounding prejudice, the results may have failed to capture individuals’ true beliefs due to concern over providing socially desirable responses. This may be particularly true for studies 2 and 3 since the manipulations mentioned Muslims. Additionally, given the constraints of time and resources, I was not able to pilot test the manipulations for Studies 2 and 3 resulted in a lack of a threat manipulation check and a clarity of whether the manipulation is effective in eliciting the desired threat. Lastly, the results of this project may have been heavily influenced by the onset and continuation of the COVID pandemic which may have resulted in higher sensitivity to threat. This may have led to manipulations not eliciting differences between threat conditions or confounded the responses to outcome measures. Individuals may have already been threatened due to a rising pandemic and its consequences to health, resources, well-being and beliefs. A relatively large number of
participants in Study 3 failed the manipulation check which may also have resulted in the results being less accurate.

**Future Directions**

The current research was successful in establishing threat and individual differences’ role in predicting prejudice towards Muslims. However, given the limitations due COVID, it will be pertinent to understand whether these manipulations truly make threat salient and lead to prejudice. This can be achieved by doing a replication study at a later time when threat perceptions may not be as high. Additionally, future research may use similar manipulations to test prejudice towards different target groups as a further test of the model, specifically of general threat perceptions and prejudice.

As per Stephan and Stephan (2018) culture plays an important role in how threat is perceived, however not much research has been done to test the theory while taking culture in account or conducting cross-cultural comparisons. Since this was one of the first projects to test ITT and prejudice towards Muslims in India and the results made evident the role of threat suggesting the impact India’s context may have on such perceptions. It would be beneficial to conduct a thorough cross-cultural examination to understand how much of threat is being driven by context as it currently remains unclear. Additionally, given the large number of participants failing manipulation checks in Study 3, perhaps future researchers could benefit from collecting data in person in India instead of online for more accurate response and representation.

While the results suggested that individuals high on SDO, RWA and identification with USA express more prejudice when realistic and symbolic threat is made salient, particularly symbolic threat, there was little evidence of delineation by threat type. ITT and several studies indicate an overlap between symbolic and realistic threat perceptions as was found in my studies.
(Stephan & Stephan, 2018; Reik et al. 2007). However, this may be specific to Muslims and may not apply to other groups. Perhaps further research could look more closely at assessing differences between threat perceptions and interventions catered at particular threat perception for Muslims and other groups.

Prior research has found that when Muslims feel relative deprivation or unfairness they are more likely to support extremist movements (Obaidi et al. 2019). Taking ITT further, it would be interesting to assess meta-perceptions of threat of Muslims (i.e Muslims’ perception of how others view them as a threat) and how that relates to Muslims’ willingness to engage in extremist action, prejudice and threat from others. Essentially it would help to understand whether meta-perceptions of threat would lead to increased threat perceptions of the other group and prejudice related behaviors towards that group. This would be an attempt for greater expansion of the theory by seeing how perceptions of meta-threat would lead the target group to be prejudiced towards the group who they perceive as perceiving them as threatening.

**Conclusion**

The purpose of this project was to experimentally test the Intergroup Threat Theory and establish threat’s role in predicting prejudice towards Muslims. The results indicate that when primed with threat unrelated to any group, individuals who endorse SDO, RWA and identify with USA express more prejudice towards Muslims. These results are particularly stronger for individuals high in SDO, RWA and identification with USA when a symbolic threat is made salient. Additionally, threat seems to be driving prejudice towards Muslims in India as well as USA. This project makes valuable contribution to prejudice and intergroup relations literature by providing evidence that exposure to threat regardless of group may lead individuals to engage in more prejudice. Future research should test ITT among different groups and establish the role of
context by conducting cross-cultural examination between USA and India since there is evidence of threat’s role in perpetuating prejudice towards Muslims in both countries.
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Appendix A

Study 1

Manipulations

Instructions

Please read the statement and answer in the space below. You have to write for at least 3 minutes, after which if you are done, you can press continue and move on to the next page.

Symbolic Threat

Please describe a time when your beliefs, values, and/or worldview were threatened

Realistic Threat

Please describe a time when your resources, safety, and/or well-being were threatened

No Threat

Please describe what you ate for breakfast today

Questionnaires

Instructions

Please rate your agreement or disagreement with each statement below. Remember your responses are completely anonymous. Please give us your honest opinion.

1: Very Strongly Disagree  2  3  4  5  6.  7 : Very Strongly Agree

Prejudice towards Muslims

1. The Islamist terrorists find strong support among Muslims.

2. Muslims are not trustworthy

3. Immigration to America should be forbidden for Muslims.

4. Islam is a sexist religion

5. Islam is a violence-glorifying religion.
6. Islam is an anti-Semitic religion

**Support for harsher civil restrictions for Muslim-Americans**

1. Muslims should have more restrictions in obtaining U.S. citizenship.
2. Muslim Americans should have to do annual security clearance checks with government agencies.
3. It is unfair to treat Muslim Americans different than other religious/ethnic groups in America.
4. The government has every right to secretly monitor Muslims who come to the U.S.
5. Muslims should not be allowed to own guns, even if they are U.S. citizens.
6. Muslims should not be allowed to vote in America even if they are US citizens.
7. Muslims in the U.S. should have to go thorough separate and more through airport security lines.

**Violent behavioral Intentions**

1. As a last resort I’m personally ready to use violence for the sake of other Americans
2. If nothing else helps I'm prepared to use violence to defend Americans.
3. I’m ready to go and fight for Americans in another country.
4. I will not personally use violence to help Americans
5. I'm not prepared to use violence in any situation
6. I will personally use violence against people harming other Americans that I care about.
7. Even as a last resort, I will not use violence for the sake of other Americans

**Identification with Country**

1. I am proud of being American.
2. Being American is a very important part of how I see myself.
3. My American identity is an important part of my self.

4. It is very important to me to be an American.

**Right Wing Authoritarianism**

1. What our country really needs instead of more “civil rights” is a good stiff dose of law and order.

2. What our country really needs is a strong, determined Chancellor which will crush the evil and set us on our right way again.

3. There is no such crime to justify capital punishment.

4. It is important to protect the rights of radicals and deviants in all ways.

5. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important values children should learn.

6. The real keys to the “good life” are obedience, discipline, and virtue.

7. The days when women are submissive should belong strictly in the past. A “woman’s place” in society should be wherever she wants to be.

8. It is good that nowadays young people have greater freedom “to make their own rules” and to protest against things they don’t like.

9. The withdrawal from tradition will turn out to be a fatal fault one day.

10. Being virtuous and law-abiding is in the long run better for us than permanently challenging the foundation of our society.

11. People should develop their own personal standards about good and evil and pay less attention to the Bible and other old, traditional forms of religious guidance.

12. Homosexual long-term relationships should be treated as equivalent to marriage.

**Social Dominance Orientation**
1. To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on other groups.
2. If certain groups stayed in their place, we would have fewer problems.
3. We would have fewer problems if we treated other people more equally.
4. It’s okay if some groups have more of a chance in life than others

**Demographics**

Please answer the following demographic questions. Feel free to skip any question you do not feel comfortable answering.

1. What is your gender identity?
   a) Man  
   b) Woman  
   c) Other  
2. What is your age? ______
3. What is your race/ethnicity?
   a) White  
   b) Black/African American  
   c) Hispanic or Latinx  
   d) Asian  
   e) American Indian or Alaska Native  
   f) Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander  
   g) Mixed/Other  
4. What is your religion?
   a) Christian  
   b) Jew
c) Hindu

d) Muslim

e) Not defined

5. How would you describe your political attitudes and beliefs?

1: Very Liberal  2  3  4  5  6  7: Very Conservative

6. What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed?

a) Less than high school

b) High school graduate or equivalent (i.e. GED)

c) Some college; no degree

d) Associate degree

e) Bachelor’s degree

f) Master’s degree

g) Professional degree

h) Doctorate degree

7. Was any part of the study unclear to you in any way? If so, please describe what was confusing to you.
Appendix B

Study 2

Manipulations

Instructions

Please read the following article. You will be asked to answer questions regarding the article later on. Press continue when finished reading

Symbolic Threat

Muslims in today’s America

The current population in the United States of America (USA) is 327.2 million. Demographically the USA is comprised of multiple ethnic and religious groups. Muslims, individuals who practice Islam and the focus of this article, is one such group within the melting pot. Muslims have a longstanding history in America, dating back to the earliest days of the country's founding.

When the first Muslims came to the land that would be present-day United States remains unclear. However, many historians claim the earliest Muslims originated from the Senegambian region of Africa in the early 14th century. It is believed they were Moors, who were expelled from Spain and made their way to the Caribbean, and possibly to the Gulf of Mexico.

Others claim there were Muslims, most notably a man named Istafan, who accompanied Spaniards as a guide to the New World in the early 16th century in their conquest of what would become Arizona and New Mexico. The immigration of Muslims increased in 1930s, and 40s and after 1950s. Not only did the number of Muslims continue to increase in America due to immigration, but the numbers also increased due to more Americans embracing Islam as a religion.
Currently, there are 2.45 million Muslims in America and these numbers are rapidly increasing. With the increase in Americans converting to the religion of Islam, certain changes are expected to take place. Some of these changes would cater to the religious requirements of Muslims by recognizing Islamic holidays as public holidays, such as Eid-Ul-Fitr and Eid-Ul-Zuha. Further, Islamic individuals have a particular way of producing meat, known as Halal meat. A spokesperson from the American Foods Group -- a leading meat producer in America -- stated that, “We have begun to cut all the meat in our factories using the Halal procedure to sustain the increasing demand for Halal meat we are experiencing in the US.” In addition to this, an increase in acceptance for expressions of Islamic culture is expected, such as women wearing burqas or hijabs and seeing Muslims read namaz (Islamic prayer) in public places.

With the increasing number of Muslims in USA, the American way of life is expected to undergo changes. There may also be a visible shift in the political and demographic landscapes. The future of America is yet to be determined.

Manipulation Checks

Please answer the following questions based on your reading of the article

1: Very Strongly Disagree  2  3  4  5  6  7: Very Strongly Agree

1. Was the article understandable

2. Was the article easy to read?

3. Was the article thought provoking?

4. Did you learn something new from the article?

5. Was the article enjoyable?

6. Did the article keep you engaged till the end?
Realistic Threat

Muslims in today’s America

The current population in the United States of America (USA) is 327.2 million. Demographically the USA is comprised of multiple ethnic and religious groups. Muslims, individuals who practice Islam and the focus of this article, is one such group within the melting pot. Muslims have a longstanding history in America, dating back to the earliest days of the country's founding.

When the first Muslims came to the land that would be present-day United States is unclear. Many historians claim that the earliest Muslims came from the Senegambian region of Africa in the early 14th century. It is believed they were Moors, who were expelled from Spain and made their way to the Caribbean and possibly to the Gulf of Mexico.

Others claim there were Muslims, most notably a man named Istafan, who accompanied the Spaniards as a guide to the New World in the early 16th century in their conquest of what
would become Arizona and New Mexico. The immigration of Muslims increased in 1930s and 40s and after 1950s.

Currently, there are 2.45 million Muslims in America and these numbers are rapidly increasing. With the increase in Muslim population in America due to rising birth rate of Muslims, certain changes are expected to take place. Some of these changes may be more money and resources being devoted to community buildings such as additional community centers and mosques. Additionally, with more and more Muslims entering the job market there is expected to be increased competition for both new and existing jobs in the US. With the increasing number of Muslims, some Americans have expressed concern over safety as statistics on Americans joining Jihad or ISIS have increased in recent years. In a recent interview, a spokesperson from CIA stated, “the number of Americans who are joining ISIS is rapidly increasing and is becoming very difficult to track”.

With the increasing number of Muslims in USA, it is expected that America will change in many ways. We can also see the political and demographic landscape shifting. The future of America is yet to be determined.

Manipulation Checks

Please answer the following questions based on your reading of the article

1:Very Strongly Disagree   2   3   4   5   6   7 : Very Strongly Agree

1. Was the article understandable
2. Was the article easy to read?
3. Was the article thought provoking?
4. Did you learn something new from the article?
5. Was the article enjoyable?
6. Did the article keep you engaged till the end?

7. What was the theme of the article?
   a. Increasing Muslims in the country
   b. Decreasing Muslims in the country
   c. War within the country
   d. Muslims fleeing the country.

8. What did the article talk about?
   a. Sports competition
   b. Opening a new restaurant
   c. Increased prices
   d. Competition for jobs

Control

**Neighborhood Community Center**

The Shalom Hills Muslim organization is planning to build an afterschool community center for the local youth regardless of their faith. The community center is a social and recreational center intended primarily for use by children ages 11 to 18 years. In some cases, children as young as six years old will also be able to use the center, but usually only if special programs are in place to accommodate them. The center supports opportunities for youth to develop their physical, social, emotional, and cognitive abilities and to experience achievement, leadership, enjoyment, friendship, and recognition.

The community center will offer organized instructional programs for physical activities such as dance, yoga, and basketball and for academic and arts programs such as science, crafts,
and theater. It will also offer opportunities for unstructured activities such as playing games, socializing, club meetings, and outdoor play.

While unstructured activities are an essential part of a community center, there are staffed facilities where supervision is a critical element. Staff will be made up of volunteers from the Shallom Hills Muslim organization as well as professional instructors. Safety is also of paramount importance.

The activity rooms will range from small classroom spaces to a full-sized gymnasium, depending on facility mission, programs offered, and available budget. At least two activity rooms will be provided: one configured for more academic or arts and crafts instruction and the other configured for physical activities. If the budget allows, a computer room will also be provided to the youth with supervised computer and internet access for recreation and homework purposes.

There will also be teen room that will provides a separate space for older youth to socialize independently from the rest of the facility. It will function similarly to those of the commons area and should include space for games, TV watching, and conversation. Ideally, the teen room should feel private while retaining a sense of connection to the rest of the facility.

The community center will provide neighborhood youths with a safe place and ample opportunities to participate in structured and unstructured after school activities.

**Manipulation Checks**

Please answer the following questions based on your reading of the article

1: Very Strongly Disagree  2  3  4  5  6  7: Very Strongly Agree

1. Was the article understandable

2. Was the article easy to read?
3. Was the article thought provoking?

4. Did you learn something new from the article?

5. Was the article enjoyable?

6. Did the article keep you engaged till the end?

7. What was the theme of the article?
   a. A rewritable paper
   b. A disappearing tree
   c. Re-usable Ink
   d. Eco- friendly Ink

8. The research done in the article is done at a
   a. Private firm
   b. Government organization
   c. University
   d. Nuclear plant

**Questionnaires**

**Instructions**

Please rate your agreement or disagreement with each statement below. Remember your responses are completely anonymous. Please give us your honest opinion.

1: Very Strongly Disagree  2  3  4  5  6  7: Very Strongly Agree

**Prejudice towards Muslims**

1. The Islamist terrorists find strong support among Muslims.

2. Muslims are not trustworthy

3. Immigration to America should be forbidden for Muslims.
4. Islam is a sexist religion
5. Islam is a violence-glorying religion.
6. Islam is an anti-Semitic religion

Support for harsher civil restrictions for Muslim-Americans

1. Muslims should have more restrictions in obtaining U.S. citizenship.
2. Muslim Americans should have to do annual security clearance checks with government agencies.
3. It is unfair to treat Muslim Americans different than other religious/ethnic groups in America.
4. The government has every right to secretly monitor Muslims who come to the U.S.
5. Muslims should not be allowed to own guns, even if they are U.S. citizens.
6. Muslims should not be allowed to vote in America even if they are US citizens.
7. Muslims in the U.S. should have to go thorough separate and more through airport security lines.

Violent behavioral Intentions

1. As a last resort I’m personally ready to use violence for the sake of other Americans
2. If nothing else helps I’m prepared to use violence to defend Americans.
3. I’m ready to go and fight for Americans in another country.
4. I will not personally use violence to help Americans
5. I’m not prepared to use violence in any situation
6. I will personally use violence against people harming other Americans that I care about.
7. Even as a last resort, I will not use violence for the sake of other Americans

Identification with Country
1. I am proud of being American.

2. Being American is a very important part of how I see myself.

3. My American identity is an important part of my self.

4. It is very important to me to be an American.

**Right Wing Authoritarianism**

1. What our country really needs instead of more “civil rights” is a good stiff dose of law and order.

2. What our country really needs is a strong, determined Chancellor which will crush the evil and set us on our right way again.

3. There is no such crime to justify capital punishment.

4. It is important to protect the rights of radicals and deviants in all ways.

5. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important values children should learn.

6. The real keys to the “good life” are obedience, discipline, and virtue.

7. The days when women are submissive should belong strictly in the past. A “woman’s place” in society should be wherever she wants to be.

8. It is good that nowadays young people have greater freedom “to make their own rules” and to protest against things they don’t like.

9. The withdrawal from tradition will turn out to be a fatal fault one day.

10. Being virtuous and law-abiding is in the long run better for us than permanently challenging the foundation of our society.

11. People should develop their own personal standards about good and evil and pay less attention to the Bible and other old, traditional forms of religious guidance.

12. Homosexual long-term relationships should be treated as equivalent to marriage.
**Social Dominance Orientation**

1. To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on other groups.
2. If certain groups stayed in their place, we would have fewer problems.
3. We would have fewer problems if we treated other people more equally.
4. It’s okay if some groups have more of a chance in life than others.

**Demographics**

Please answer the following demographic questions. Feel free to skip any question you do not feel comfortable answering.

1. What is your gender identity?
   a) Man
   b) Woman
   c) Other
2. What is your age? ______
3. What is your race/ethnicity?
   a) White
   b) Black/African American
   c) Hispanic or Latinx
   d) Asian
   e) American Indian or Alaska Native
   f) Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
   g) Mixed/Other
4. What is your religion?
   f) Christian
g) Jew
h) Hindu
i) Muslim
j) Not defined

5. How would you describe your political attitudes and beliefs?
   1: Very Liberal  2  3  4  5  6  7: Very Conservative

6. What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed?
   a. Less than high school
   b. High school graduate or equivalent (i.e. GED)
   c. Some college; no degree
   d. Associate degree
   e. Bachelor’s degree
   f. Master’s degree
   g. Professional degree
   h. Doctorate degree

7. Was any part of the study unclear to you in any way? If so, please describe what was confusing to you.
Appendix C

Study 3

Manipulations

Instructions

Please read the following article. You will be asked to answer questions regarding the article later on. Press continue when finished reading.

Symbolic Threat

Muslims in today’s India

The current population of India is 1.353 billion. Demographically India is comprised of multiple ethnic and religious groups. Muslims, individuals who practice Islam and the focus of this article, and is the second largest religious group in the country. Muslims have a longstanding history India, dating back to the country’s origin.

Muslim influx and influence in India started almost at the inception of the religion. The traders from Arabia were frequent visitors to the Indian subcontinent and brought the word of Muhammad to India in the 7th century and this resulted in some peaceful conversions of Hindus to Islam. Following this, Mohammad-ibn-Quasim in the year 712 A.D conquered the Province of Sindh. Beginning with the invasion of Mohammad of Ghazni in the 10th century, followed by a barrage of invaders from Persia, Turkey and Afghanistan in the 11th and 12th centuries, a full force of Islam was thrust upon India. From 12th century onwards India was ruled by Mughals and the Muslims population in India rose drastically. With the British invasion of India from the 17th century, the stronghold of Muslims in India was reduced. Post-Independence, bulk of the Muslim population chose to move to Pakistan, however several chose to stay in India.
Currently, there are 195 million Muslims in India and these numbers are rapidly increasing. With the increase in Indians converting to the religion of Islam, certain changes are expected to take place. Some of these changes would cater to the religious requirements of Muslims such as increase in mosques, acceptance of sharia (Islamic law) and seeing Muslims read namaz (Islamic prayer) in public places. Further, Islamic individuals have a particular way of producing meat, known as Halal meat. A spokesperson from the Indian Foods Group -- a leading meat producer in India-- stated that, “We have begun to cut all the meat in our factories using the Halal procedure to sustain the increasing demand for Halal meat we are experiencing in India” In addition to this, an increase in acceptance for expressions of Islamic culture is expected, such as women wearing burqas or hijabs and Muslims consuming beef.

With the increasing number of Muslims in India, the Indian way of life is expected to undergo changes. There may also be a visible shift in the political and demographic landscapes. The future of India is yet to be determined.

*Manipulation Checks*

Please answer the following questions based on your reading of the article

1: Very Strongly Disagree  2  3  4  5  6  7: Very Strongly Agree

1. Was the article understandable
2. Was the article easy to read?
3. Was the article thought provoking?
4. Did you learn something new from the article?
5. Was the article enjoyable?
6. Did the article keep you engaged till the end?
7. What was the theme of the article?
Realistic Threat

Muslims in today’s India

The current population of India is 1.353 billion. Demographically India is comprised of multiple ethnic and religious groups. Muslims, individuals who practice Islam and the focus of this article, and is the second largest religious group in the country. Muslims have a longstanding history India, dating back to the country’s origin.

Muslim influx and influence in India started almost at the inception of the religion. The traders from Arabia were frequent visitors to the Indian subcontinent and brought the word of Muhammad to India in the 7th century and this resulted in some peaceful conversions of Hindus to Islam. Following this, Mohammad-ibn-Quasim in the year 712 A.D conquered the Province of Sindh. Beginning with the invasion of Mohammad of Ghazni in the 10th century, followed by a barrage of invaders from Persia, Turkey and Afghanistan in the 11th and 12th centuries, a full force of Islam was thrust upon India. From 12th century onwards India was ruled by Mughals and the Muslims population in India rose drastically. With the British invasion of India from the 17th
century, the stronghold of Muslims in India was reduced. Post-Independence, bulk of the Muslim population chose to move to Pakistan, however several chose to stay in India.

Currently, there are 195 million Muslims in India and these numbers are rapidly increasing. With the increase in Muslim population in India due to rising birth rate of Muslims, certain changes are expected to take place. Some of these changes may be more money and resources being devoted to community buildings such as additional community centers and meat shops. Additionally, with more and more Muslims entering the job market there is expected to be increased competition for both new and existing jobs in India. With the increasing number of Muslims, Indians have expressed concern over safety as statistics on Indians joining Jihad and/or Pakistani militancia have increased in recent years. In a recent interview, a spokesperson from CBI stated, “the number of Indians who are joining terrorist groups is rapidly increasing and is becoming very difficult to track”.

With the increasing number of Muslims in India, it is expected that India will change in many ways. We can also see the political and demographic landscape shifting. The future of India is yet to be determined.

**Manipulation Checks**

Please answer the following questions based on your reading of the article

1: Very Strongly Disagree  2  3  4  5  6  7: Very Strongly Agree

1. Was the article understandable

2. Was the article easy to read?

3. Was the article thought provoking?

4. Did you learn something new from the article?

5. Was the article enjoyable?
6. Did the article keep you engaged till the end?

7. What was the theme of the article?
   a. Increasing Muslims in the country
   b. Decreasing Muslims in the country
   c. War within the country
   d. Muslims fleeing the country.

8. What did the article talk about?
   a. Sports competition
   b. Opening a new restaurant
   c. Increased prices
   d. Competition for jobs

Control

Neighborhood Community Center

The Nizzamuddin Muslim organization is planning to build an afterschool community center for the local youth regardless of their faith. The community center is a social and recreational center intended primarily for use by children ages 11 to 18 years. In some cases, children as young as six years old will also be able to use the center, but usually only if special programs are in place to accommodate them. The center supports opportunities for youth to develop their physical, social, emotional, and cognitive abilities and to experience achievement, leadership, enjoyment, friendship, and recognition.

The community center will offer organized instructional programs for physical activities such as dance, yoga, and basketball and for academic and arts programs such as science, crafts,
and theater. It will also offer opportunities for unstructured activities such as playing games, socializing, club meetings, and outdoor play.

While unstructured activities are an essential part of a community center, there are staffed facilities where supervision is a critical element. Staff will be made up of volunteers from the Nizzamuddin Muslim organization as well as professional instructors. Safety is also of paramount importance.

The activity rooms will range from small classroom spaces to a full-sized gymnasium, depending on facility mission, programs offered, and available budget. At least two activity rooms will be provided: one configured for more academic or arts and crafts instruction and the other configured for physical activities. If the budget allows, a computer room will also be provided to the youth with supervised computer and internet access for recreation and homework purposes.

There will also be teen room that will provides a separate space for older youth to socialize independently from the rest of the facility. It will function similarly to those of the commons area and should include space for games, TV watching, and conversation. Ideally, the teen room should feel private while retaining a sense of connection to the rest of the facility.

The community center will provide neighborhood youths with a safe place and ample opportunities to participate in structured and unstructured after school activities.

*Manipulation Checks*

Please answer the following questions based on your reading of the article

1:Very Strongly Disagree  2  3  4  5  6  7 : Very Strongly Agree

1. Was the article understandable

2. Was the article easy to read?
3. Was the article thought provoking?
4. Did you learn something new from the article?
5. Was the article enjoyable?
6. Did the article keep you engaged till the end?
7. What was the theme of the article?
   a. A rewritable paper
   b. A disappearing tree
   c. Re-usable Ink
   d. Eco- friendly Ink
8. The research done in the article is done at a
   a. Private firm
   b. Government organization
   c. University
   d. Nuclear plant

Questionnaires

Instructions

Please rate your agreement or disagreement with each statement below. Remember your responses are completely anonymous. Please give us your honest opinion.

1: Very Strongly Disagree  2  3  4  5  6  7: Very Strongly Agree

Prejudice towards Muslims

1. The Islamist terrorists find strong support among Muslims.
2. Muslims are not trustworthy
3. Immigration to America should be forbidden for Muslims.
4. Islam is a sexist religion
5. Islam is a violence-glorifying religion.
6. Islam is an anti-Semitic religion

Support for harsher civil restrictions for Muslim-Americans

1. Muslims should have more restrictions in obtaining Indian citizenship
2. Muslim Indians should have to do annual security clearance checks with government agencies
3. It is unfair to treat Muslim Indians different than other religious/ethnic groups in India
4. The government has every right to secretly monitor Muslims who come to India
5. Muslims should not be allowed to consume beef in India.
6. Muslims should not be allowed to vote in India even if they are Indian citizens
7. Muslims in India should have to go thorough separate and more through airport security lines.

Violent behavioral Intentions

1. As a last resort I’m personally ready to use violence for the sake of other Indians
2. If nothing else helps I’m prepared to use violence to defend Indians
3. I’m ready to go and fight for Indians in another country
4. I will not personally use violence to help Indians
5. I'm not prepared to use violence in any situation
6. I will personally use violence against people harming other Indins that I care about
7. Even as a last resort, I will not use violence for the sake of other Indians

Identification with Country

1. I am proud of being Indian
2. Being Indian is a very important part of how I see myself

3. My Indian identity is an important part of my self

4. It is very important to me to be an Indian

**Demographics**

Please answer the following demographic questions. Feel free to skip any question you do not feel comfortable answering.

1. What is your gender identity?
   a) Man
   b) Woman
   c) Other

2. What is your age? ______

3. What is your race/ethnicity?
   a) White
   b) Black/African American
   c) Hispanic or Latinx
   d) Asian
   e) American Indian or Alaska Native
   f) Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
   g) Mixed/Other

4. What is your religion?
   a) Christian
   b) Sikh
   c) Hindu
5. How would you describe your political attitudes and beliefs?
   1: Very Liberal  2  3  4  5  6.  7: Very Conservative

6. What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed?
   a) Less than high school
   b) High school graduate
   c) Bachelor’s degree
   d) Master’s degree
   e) Professional degree
   f) Doctorate degree

7. Was any part of the study unclear to you in any way? If so, please describe what was confusing to you.
VITA

Education

PhD Psychology (Experimental) 2017- Present
Graduate Minor in Applied Statistics
Graduate Teaching Endorsement
University of Mississippi GPA – 3.83

MSc Psychology (Clinical) 2014-2016
Christ University GPA -3.76

B.A. Psychology w/Honours 2011-2014
Kamala Nehru College, Delhi University GPA 3.9

Leadership, Awards and Scholarships

University of Mississippi, Oxford, MS

• Graduate Student Honors Fellowship 2017-2021
• Graduate Student Dissertation Scholarship Fall 2020
• Graduate Student Summer Research Fellowship Summer 2020
• Graduate Student Representative for the department of Psychology 2019-2020
• SPSP Diversity Student Travel Award 2020
• Travel Award from UM 2019
• Travel Award from UM 2018

Kamala Nehru College, New Delhi

• Vice President for the department of Psychology 2013-2014
• Award for First rank in academics for Bachelor of Arts in Psychology 2012-2014
• All-rounder award from the department of Psychology. 2012-2013
• Class Representative for department of Psychology 2011-2013

Instruction and Advisement

University of Mississippi, Oxford, MS
Teaching Instructor
PSY 205 Research Methods (Lab) January 2021- May 2021
PSY 321 Social Psychology January 2020- May 2020
PSY 201 Introduction to Psychology August 2019-December 2019
PSY 205 Research Methods (Lab) January 2019- May 2019

Teaching Assistant
PSY 319 Brain and Behaviour (Web) January 2021-May 2021
PSY 201 Introduction to Psychology August 2019- May 2020
PSY 301 Developmental Psychology (Web) July 2019- August 2019
PSY 315 Theories of Personality January 2019-May 2019
PSY 201 Introduction to Psychology August 2017-December 2017

Guest Lectures
PSY 330 Gender Identification and LGBTQIA+ Identity October 2019
PSY 315 Erikson’s stages of Psychosocial development March 2018
PSY 315 Maslow’s stages of self-actualisation
PSY 201 Culture and Psychology October 2017

Workshop- Co Conduction
INST 111-Intercultural Communication - Re-entry September 2017
INST 110-Intercultural Communication-Pre-Departure April 2018

Tutor for Statistics August 2019- May 2020

Publications


Manuscript in preparation


• Pal, S. & Johnson, L.R. Fundamentalism, authoritarianism & Homophobia: A cross cultural comparison between India and America.

• Lair, E.C., Jordan, L & Pal, S. General negative affect and need for cognition influence cognitive processing of everyday life events.


Research Experience
University of Mississippi, Oxford, MS
• Dissertation Project titled “Your Presence Threatens Me! An experimental examination of prejudice towards Muslims from an Intergroup Threat Theory Approach”. January 2020-Present
• Research Project on COVID related Discrimination and health outcomes on Asian Americans May 2020-Present
• Independent Research Project on Cross Cultural Religious fundamentalism, right wing authoritarianism and homophobia between Hindus (India) and Christians (America) January 2018-January 2019

St. Vincent Hospital, Worcester, MA September 2019-December 2019
Statistical analysis for project titled “Overall TIPS (Trans Jugular Intrahepatic portosystemic shunt) performance and predictors in University hospital over 5 year period”

Christ University, Bangalore, India July 2015- March 2016
Master’s thesis on Religious fundamentalism, right wing authoritarianism and homophobia among Hindus.

Kamala Nehru College, Delhi University, India January 2014-May 2014
Research Project on Personality, Stress and Coping resources among working women Presented a thesis on the above-mentioned topic using quantitative research methods in the final term of the Undergraduate degree.

Artemis Hospital, Gurgaon, India June 2013- July 2013
Assisted the Clinical Psychologist in conducting a research on application of positive psychology techniques for treatment of stress, anxiety and depression Reviewed literature administered tests and evaluated data.

Conference and Presentations

Oral Presentation


Poster Presentation


Service

Professional Service
• Diversity undergraduate award reviewer for SPSP September 2019
• Ad hoc reviewer  
  Men and Masculinity April 2020  
  Journal of Homosexuality April 2020  
  Journal of Environmental Psychology February 2018  
  Child and Health Care Forum September 2017

Service to the University
• Co-Leader of Lambda (Support group for LGBTQIA+ students). August 2017- May 2020
• Co-Leader of International Ladies Club  
  (Support group for International Students) August 2017-May 2018
• Earth day writing judge for undergraduates October 2017

Service to the Department
• Graduate Student Mentor for new graduate students August 2020 – present
• Facilitator for Non-Academic Jobs Colloquium September 2020
• Undergraduate Poster Judge for Psychology Research Conference April 2019

Community Service
• Make A Wish foundation of India November 2014 - March 2015
• Dream Connect, Bangalore, India July 2014- October 2014
• Naz Foundation, India September 2011 - March 2013
• The Happiness Project, India  
  August 2012 – December 2012

**Other Work Experience**

**North Mississippi Regional Center, Oxford, MS**  
Psychology and Behavioral Sciences Intern  
July 2018 – January 2019

**The Mind Tree, New Delhi**  
Psychologist  
June 2016 – June 2017

**Door of Hope (Wellness Center), New Delhi**  
Psychologist  
October 2016 – July 2017

**Serenity Clinic, New Delhi**  
Psychologist  
April 2016 – July 2016

**Certifications and Courses**

• User Research Methods & Best Practices, IDF  
  July 2020 – Present

• Certified Course on child and mental health from CCAW, New Delhi  
  December 2012

• Certified course on experiential counseling skills from IIC, New Delhi.  
  July-October 2013

• Workshop on Art and Movement therapy at Fortis Memorial Research Hospital.  
  May 2015

**Internships**

• Maanas clinic, Bangalore  
  November 2015 – March 2016

• Kempagowda Institute of Medical Sciences (KIMS), Bangalore  
  June 2015 – September 2015

• Fortis Memorial Research hospital, Gurgaon  
  April 2015 – May 2015

• Artemis Hospital, Gurgaon  
  June 2013 – July 2013

• Centre for Child and Adolescent Well-being, New Delhi  
  December 2012 – January 2012

**Technical Skills**

• Microsoft Office  
• R  
• Stata  
• SPSS