Face-off:

Does religious context alter the way we "read" faces?

Valeria Squatrito*, Annalisa Oppo**, Giovambattista Presti*, Paolo Moderato°

*Università Kore (UKE) – Enna, Italy. ** Sigmund Freud University (SFU) - Milano, Italy. ° Istituto Europeo per lo Studio del Comportamento Umano (IESCUM) – Parma, Italy.

INTRODUCTION

According to Relational Frame Theory prejudice, as a verbal operant class, is the verbal outcome of processes of derivation and transformation of stimulus function (Hayes, Niccolls, Masuda & Rye, 2002). It is well known that the explicit assessment of prejudices is enormously influenced by social desirability, and therefore it has been suggested to investigate prejudices using implicit procedures. For example McCauley (2014) investigated implicit religious bias using Implicit Association Test (IAT), proving that Christians subjects in that study were more biased against Muslims than Muslims were against Christians.

AIM

The present study aims to empirically test the validity of an implicit model of responding (recognition) to facial positive and negative emotions (specifically joy and fear) in the context of Christian and Islamic religious symbols, using the Implicit Relational Association Procedure (IRAP). Specifically, our hypothesis was that religious symbols could alter the derivation of joy or fear in specific populations with different history with respect to religions.

~	At scales participants showed mean scores different than those reported in normative samples. Data are for this reason shown in table 1.				
	QUESTIONNAIRES	Participants N = 33	Participants of Italian		

RESULTS



Instruments

AAQ II - Acceptance and Action Questionnaire II (Bond et al., 2011); CFQ - Cognitive Fusion Questionnaire (Gillanders et al., 2010); SEE - Scale of Ethnocultural Empathy (Wang et al., 2003); SDO - Social Dominance Orientation (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999); RWA - Right Wing Authoritarianism (Altemeyer, 1998). Implicit Relational Assessment Procedure (IRAP; Figure 1).

Implicit Relational Assessment Procedure (IRAP)

	IVI (0.3.)	IVI (0.3.)	ч, р
Acceptance and Action Questionnaire II (AAQ-II)	45.33 (7.10)	51.50 (8.24)	-4.11; p<.001; ES=81
Cognitive Fusion Questionnaire (CFQ)	34.44 (12.52)	40.2 (11.04)	-2.52; p=.017; ES=49
SEE - Empathic Feeling and Expression	4.67 (.80)	4.12 (.86)	3.83; p<.001; ES=.68
SEE - Empathic Perspective Taking	6.62 (.73)	3.06 (.87)	26.9 ; p<.001; ES=4.45
SEE - Acceptance of Cultural Differences	4.00 (.70)	4.49 (1.00)	-3.81; p<.001; ES=57
SEE - Empathic Awareness	4.25 (.77)	4.43 (.99)	-1.27; p=.21

M (d c)

M (d c)

Table 1. Participant Characteristics .

At the IRAP task different patterns of brief implicit relational responding (F (3, 102) = 22.10; p <.001; η 2 = .394) emerged. Namely the 1st trial type (cross-joy) showed the greatest effect size (Fig. 2), and relational responding in the context of Islamic symbols were against the hypothesis, i.e. subjects were faster in responding that crescentmoon did not evoke fear, rather than crescent-moon evoking fear.



All the IRAP trial types are unrelated, this might prove that the acquisition of joy and fear related to religious symbols are independent operants.

Standardized picture of facial expressions of fear and happiness were presented in the context of Christian and Muslims symbols in an IRAP task (Fig 1). The instruction reported "Please answer as if the CHRISTIAN SYMBOL evokes JOY and as if the ISLAMIC SYMBOL evokes FEAR", in coherent blocks.





Figure 1 An example of the four IRAP trial-types.

CONTACT

nanni.presti@gmail.com; valeria.squatrito@gmail.com; annalisa.oppo@gmail.com

In participants with high (N=20) explicit positive bias toward Catholicism implicit positive bias toward Catholicism, experiential avoidance and cognitive fusion correlated (Fig 3). Data show that the most inflexible and conservative Italian students are faster to recognize emotions in Catholic rather than in Muslim context.

In participants with low (N=12) positive explicit bias towards Catholicism there is a correlation between RWA and implicit positive bias towards Catholicism (Figure 3).



Figure 3. Correlations with IRAP D-score with AAQ II, CFQ and RWA.

REFERENCES

Altemeyer, B. (1998). The other "authoritarian personality". Advances in experimental social psychology, 30, 47-92.

Bond, F. W., Hayes, S. C., Baer, R. A., Carpenter, K. M., Guenole, N., OrcuQ, H. K., & ZeQle, R. D. (2011). Preliminary psychometric proper#es of the Acceptance and Ac#on Ques#onnaire–II: A revised measure of psychological inflexibility and experien#al avoidance. Behavior therapy, 42(4), 676-688

Gillanders, D., Bolderston, H., Dempster, M., Bond, F., Campbell, L., Kerr, S., ... & Hermann, B. (2010, June). The Cogni#ve Fusion Ques#onnaire: Further developments in measuring cogni#ve fusion. In Conference presented at the Associa#on for Contextual Behavioral Science, World Congress VIII, Reno, NV.

Hayes, S. C., Niccolls, R., Masuda, A., & Rye, A. K. (2002). Prejudice, terrorism, and behavior therapy. Cognitive and Behavioral Practice, 9(4), 296-301.

McCauley, J. F. (2014). Measuring and Reducing Religious Bias in Post-Conflict Zones: Evidence from Côte d'Ivoire. Political Psychology, 35(2), 267-289.

Sidanius, J., & PraQo, F. (1999). Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression

Wang, Y. W., Davidson, M. M., Yakushko, O. F., Savoy, H. B., Tan, J. A., & Bleier, J. K. (2003). The scale of ethnocultural empathy: development, valida#on, and reliability. Journal of counseling psychology, 50(2), 221.

Wilson K.G. & Groom J. (2002). The Valued Living Ques:onnaire. Department of Psychology, University of Mississippi, University











