

Original citation:

Francis, Leslie J., Robbins, Mandy and McKenna, Ursula (2016) Women's socio-economic rights and religion among Christian, Islamic and non-religiously affiliated students in England and Wales. In: Freedom of Religion in the 21st Century : A human rights perspective on the relation between politics and religion. Empirical Research in Religion and Human Rights, 4 . Boston: Brill, pp. 239-256. ISBN 789004304390

Permanent WRAP url:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/74063>

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions. Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

A note on versions:

The version presented here may differ from the published version or, version of record, if you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the 'permanent WRAP url' above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription. For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: publications@warwick.ac.uk

warwick**publications**wrap

highlight your research

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk>

Women's rights and religion among Christian, Islamic and non-religiously affiliated
students in England and Wales

Leslie J Francis*

University of Warwick, UK

Mandy Robbins

Glyndŵr University, UK

Ursula McKenna

University of Warwick, UK

Author note:

*Corresponding author:

Leslie J Francis

Warwick Religions & Education Research Unit

Centre for Education Studies

The University of Warwick

Coventry CV4 7AL United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0)24 7652 2539

Fax: +44 (0)24 7657 2638

Email: leslie.francis@warwick.ac.uk

Abstract

This study explores the association between self-assigned religious affiliation (Christian, Muslim, and unaffiliated) and attitudes toward women's rights among a sample of 1,058 students between the ages of 14 and 18 years in England and Wales, after taking into account personal factors, home environment factors, psychological factors, and religious factors.

While religious saliency and interreligious openness both predicted a more positive attitude toward women's rights, after taking these attitudinal factors into account self-assigned religious affiliation (both Christian and Muslim) predicted a less positive attitude toward women's rights. This finding highlights the fallacy of discussing self-assigned religious affiliation independently of distinguishing the religious saliency of such affiliation.

Keywords: Religion, human rights, adolescents, personality

Introduction

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in December 1948, attempted through its thirty Articles to identify fundamental rights to which all human beings are entitled. Although the Declaration generally avoids making specific reference to the situation of women (apart from Article 25 that states that 'motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance'), the Declaration is committed to promoting equality between men and women when, for example, Article 16 states that:

Men and women of full age, without any limitation due to race, nationality or religion, have the right to marry and to found a family. They are entitled to equal rights as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution.

Religion and human rights

The Hebrew Scriptures that form a common basis for the three Abrahamic religions (Christianity, Islam and Judaism) have provided theological legitimation for the subordinate position of women, including through certain creation narratives. For example, according to Genesis 2, God created man from the dust of the ground, but woman God created from man.

So the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and he slept; then he took one of his ribs and closed up its place with flesh. And the rib that the Lord God had taken from the man he made into a woman.

The Christian New Testament has added to the theological grounds for the subordinate position of women, especially through some of the Pauline literature. For example, 1 Corinthians 11 argues the following case.

But I want you to understand that Christ is the head of every man, and the husband is the head of his wife Indeed man was not made from woman, but woman from man. Neither was man created for the sake of woman, but woman for the sake of man.

Such scripturally-based theological perspectives on the position of women have not remained unchallenged by contemporary theological writers, including within the Christian tradition classic studies like Ruether (1983), Fiorenza (1983), Maitland (1983) and Soskice (1990). Nonetheless, the suspicion remains that religious people, especially those who ground their faith on scripture, may be less open to endorsing women's rights.

Empirical evidence

The International Empirical Research Programme Religion and Human Rights 1.0 at Radboud University Nijmegen (the Netherlands), which commenced in 2005, set out to conduct empirical research into the effects of religious beliefs and practices, as well as ethical values, on attitudes toward human rights among senior secondary school and tertiary school students from a comparative, cross-cultural perspective, in various African, Asian, and European countries. The survey administered throughout fifteen countries included two items specifically on women's rights:

- The state should protect women's rights to acquire and administer property.
- The state should protect women's rights to adequate job opportunities.

These two key items have already been used in a variety of ways in the published literature emerging from the International Empirical Programme Religion and Human Rights 1.0. For example, Webb, Ziebertz, Curran, and Reindl (2012) employed these two items within their eight-item scale focusing on generation two human rights (socio-economic issues), drawing on data from a sample of 1,492 students from Germany and Palestine. Francis and Robbins (2013) employed this same eight-item scale drawing on data from a sample of 1,058 students from England and Wales. These two items on women's rights were also employed within the ten-item scale focusing on socio-economic rights proposed by Ok and Eren (2013) and employed among a sample of 422 students from Turkey.

While studies like those reported by Webb, Ziebertz, Curran, and Reindl (2012), Francis and Robbins (2013), Ok and Eren (2013) have made good use of the two items on women's rights, immersion of these items within the broader theme of socio-economic rights has distracted attention away from a clear focus on women's rights. This problem has been addressed, however, by van der Ven (2013), Anthony (2013), Botvar (2013), and van der Tuin and Fumbo (2012).

Van der Ven (2013) drew together the data from six North-West European countries: Belgium ($N = 1,229$), England and Wales ($N = 1,242$), Germany ($N = 1,785$), The Netherlands ($N = 1,116$), Norway ($N = 586$), and Sweden ($N = 1,144$). He employed these data to compare the responses of three groups of students (Christian, Muslim, and non-religious) to individual human rights issues, including the two items in the survey specifically on women's rights. On these two items little difference was found between the three groups of students.

Anthony (2013) drew on data from Tamil Nadu, India, to compare the responses of three groups of students to individual human rights issues, including women's rights: Christians ($N = 305$), Muslims ($N = 298$), and Hindu ($N = 206$). Overall he found a positive attitude toward women's rights. In terms of women's rights to adequate job opportunities, there was no significant difference between the three religious groups. In terms of women's rights to acquire and administer property, there were significant differences with Christians recording a more positive attitude than Muslims, and Muslims recording a more positive attitude than Hindus.

Botvar (2013) drew on data from 586 students in Norway and employed the two items on women's rights to produce a two-item scale ($\alpha = .85$). Employing seven independent predictor variables with a regression model, Botvar found two significant effects: female

students recorded a more positive attitude toward women's rights in comparison with male students; and a positive correlation with humanity type spirituality.

Van der Tuin and Fumbo (2012) concentrated specifically on exploring women's rights and religion among Christian and Islamic students in Tanzania, drawing on data provided by 462 participants. Using these two questions on women's rights, van der Tuin and Fumbo (2012) addressed two research questions: what are the Muslim and Christian students' attitudes toward women's rights; what influence do religious beliefs and practices have on students' attitudes? In addressing this second question, they drew on the wide range of religious and theological variables included in the survey.

In response to the first research question, using the two items separately, van der Tuin and Fumbo (2012) found that Christian students recorded a more positive attitude than Muslim students, and that this remains true both for male students and for female students. In response to the second research question, using a two-item scale ($\alpha = .70$) van der Tuin and Fumbo's regression analysis identified four variables that predicted significant differences in attitudes to women's rights among both Christian and Muslim students: belief in God's panentheistic presence in personal life (beta $.21$, $-.32$); belief in Jesus inspired by God's spirit (beta $-.26$, $-.44$); belief in religious communities' prophetic practice (beta $-.18$, $-.41$); belief in interreligious inclusive interaction (beta $-.18$, $-.38$). Among Christian students they identified the following four significant factors: belief in Jesus incarnation of God's son (beta $.21$); belief in the Bible, a divine book to be taken literally (beta $-.17$); belief in the Qur'an, a source of inspiration and wisdom for life (beta $.21$); dialogue-oriented belief in other religions (beta $.19$). Among Muslim students they identified the following four significant factors: belief in God's panentheistic presence in natural life (beta $.38$); belief in Muhammad, unique example of mystical experience (beta $-.84$); beliefs on professional (beta $.76$) and public opinion focused religious communities (beta $-.53$).

Research question

Against this background the aims of the present study is to build on the foundations created by van der Tuin and Fumbo (2012) in three ways. The first aim is to explore whether their finding that Christian students hold a more positive attitude toward women's rights than Muslim students in Tanzania holds good also in England and Wales. This aim will be extended by introducing a third group alongside Muslim and Christian students, namely religiously unaffiliated students. The second aim is to explore whether these two items cohere to generate a short reliable scale among Muslim and Christian students in England and Wales, as they did among students in Tanzania. This aim will be extended by testing the reliability of the instrument among religiously unaffiliated students. The third aim is to explore significant predictors of individual differences in attitude toward women's rights. This aim will reflect a somewhat different model of independent variables from that proposed by van der Tuin and Fumbo, building on the models proposed in earlier studies by Francis and Robbins (2013; in press), in order to establish dialogue with those earlier studies. The independent variables will reflect four areas: personal factors, home environment factors, psychological factors, and religious factors.

The first set of independent variables concerns *personal factors*. The two personal factors included are sex and age, since both factors are recognised as key predictors of individual differences in adolescent religiosity. Research tends to show that females record higher levels of religiosity than males (Francis & Penny, 2013) and that levels of religiosity decline during adolescence (Kay & Francis, 1996).

The second set of independent variables concerns *home environment factors*. Three home environment factors were included in order to explore the educational level of father and mother, the extent to which political matters and religious matters are spoken about at

home, and the importance that mother and father attach to their children adopting their parents' values, faith and worldview.

The third set of independent variables concerns *psychological factors*. The three psychological factors included were measures of psychoticism, neuroticism and extraversion as proposed by the Eysenckian three dimensional model of personality (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1991). Empirical studies within the psychology of religion employing this model of personality have consistently shown an inverse association between psychoticism scores and religiosity, as crystallised by Francis (1992) and confirmed by more recent studies, including Francis, Robbins, ap Siôn, Lewis, and Barnes (2007); Francis, Robbins, Santosh, and Bhanot (2008); and Francis and Hermans (2009).

The fourth set of independent variables concerns *religious factors* and included self-assigned religious affiliation (to distinguish between religiously unaffiliated students, Christian students, and Muslim students) and the two measures of religious saliency and interreligious openness proposed and tested by Francis and Robbins (in press). The four-item Religious Saliency Scale assesses the personal importance of religion and the impact of religion on daily life. The six-item Interreligious Openness Scale assesses openness to the conversation between religious traditions and the benefits of such conversation for personal life.

Method

Procedure

The survey was conducted within selected schools in England and Wales where there was a good mix of Christian, Muslim and religiously-unaffiliated students. Within participating schools complete classes of year 10, year 11, year 12 and year 13 students (14- to 18-year-olds) were invited to take part in the survey. Students were assured of confidentiality and anonymity. Although all pupils were given the choice not to participate,

very few decided not to take part in the survey, probably in the light of the interest of the subject matter.

Measures

Women's rights were assessed by two items: the state should protect women's rights to acquire and administer property; the state should protect women's rights to adequate job opportunities. Each item was rated on a five-point scale: agree strongly (5), agree (4), not certain (3), disagree (2), and disagree strongly (1).

Personal factors were assessed by two variables: sex, male (1) and female (2); and school year, year 10 (1), year 11 (2), year 12 (3), and year 13 (4).

Home factors were assessed by three variables: educational level of father (foster/step father) and mother (foster/step mother) each rated : primary school (1); secondary school (2); college university (3); political matters and religious matters spoken about at home, rated: never (1); sometimes (2); often (3); importance to (foster/step) father and mother that you adopt their values, faith and worldview, each rated: not at all important (1); not so important (2); not sure (3); important (4); very important (5).

Psychological factors were assessed by the abbreviated form of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire Revised (EPQR-A) as developed by Francis, Brown and Philipchalk (1992) and further modified by Francis, Robbins, Loudon, and Haley (2001). This instrument comprised three six-item measures for extraversion, neuroticism and psychoticism. Each item is rated on a two-point scale: yes (1) and no (0).

Religious factors were assessed by self-assigned religious (a check list of predetermined options) and by two scales proposed by Francis and Robbins (in press): the four-item Religious Saliency Scale concerned with the personal importance of religion and the impact of religion on daily life; the six-item Interreligious Openness Scale concerned with openness to the conversation between religious traditions and the benefits of such

conversation for personal life. Each item was rated on a five-point Likert scale: agree strongly (5); agree (4); not certain (3); disagree (2); and disagree strongly (1).

Sample

The analyses were conducted on the 1,058 students who self-assigned as Christian, as Muslim, or as religiously unaffiliated, excluding from analyses those who identified with other religious traditions.

Results and discussion

- insert table 1 about here -

The first step in data analysis explored the characteristics of the sample in terms of sex, age, and self-assigned religious affiliation. These data presented in table 1 show a balance of male and female participants, a good spread of age, and sufficient representation of the three religious groups included in the analyses.

- insert table 2 about here -

The second step in data analysis explored the three home environment characteristics in terms of the educational level of father and mother, the extent to which political matters and religious matters are spoken about at home, and the importance that mother and father attach to their children adopting their own values, faith and worldview. The data presented in table 2 show that the majority of students came from homes where the parents had received some post-secondary education (58% of fathers and 62% of mothers), that religious matters and political matters were often discussed at homes occupied by less than a quarter of the students (23% religion and 16% of politics) and that around one third of the parents considered it a matter of importance for the students to adopt their values, faith and worldviews (for 32% of fathers and for 35% of mothers).

- insert table 3 about here -

The third step in data analysis examines the responses to the two individual items concerned with women's rights. The data presented in table 3 demonstrate that the majority of students support these two issues, with 68% agreeing that the state should protect women's rights to acquire and administer property, and 71% agreeing that the state should protect women's right to adequate job opportunities. Only a minority directly oppose these two issues: 4% disagreeing with property rights and 5% disagreeing with employment rights. Of greater significance, however, is the proportion of students who have formed no clear opinion on these issues: 28% being uncertain about the role of the state in supporting women's property rights and 25% being uncertain about the role of the state in supporting women's employment rights.

- insert table 4 about here -

The fourth step in data analysis takes an overview of the psychometric properties of the six scales employed in the study in terms of means, standard deviations and the alpha coefficients (Cronbach, 1951). The data in table 4 demonstrate that the scale concerned with women's rights, the two scales concerned with religious factors (religious saliency and interreligious openness) and two of the three scales concerned with psychological factors (extraversion and introversion) recorded internal consistency reliability in terms of alpha coefficients meeting the threshold of .65 threshold commended by DeVellis (2003). The lower alpha coefficient recorded by the psychoticism scale is consistent with the known operational difficulties incurred in measuring this dimension of personality (Francis, Brown, & Philipchalk, 1992).

- insert tables 5 and 6 about here -

Tables 5 and 6 provide more details about the two scales concerned with religiosity in terms of the correlations between each item and the sum of the other items comprising that scale and in terms of the item endorsement across the whole sample expressed as the sum of

the agree strongly and agree responses. The item rest-of-scale correlations demonstrate that each item is contributing usefully to the scale of which it is part.

In terms of the Religious Saliency Scale, 60% of the young people agree that their religion or worldview is important to them. The proportions fall, however, to 39% who agree that their life would be quite different without their religion or worldview, and to 34% who agree that their religion or worldview has great influence on their daily life, and to 34% who agree that if they have to take important decisions their religion or worldview plays a major part in it.

The Interreligious Openness Scale demonstrates that around a quarter of the young people take the view that interreligious dialogue promotes the search for truth and for human flourishing. It is not, however, possible to discern from these questions the extent to which disagreement with this position is motivated by defence of one religious tradition or by disregard for all religious traditions. The data shows that: 20% of young people agree that living life to the full can only be received through conversation between religions or worldviews; 22% agree that the way to truth is only to be found when religions or worldviews have dialogue with one another; 26% agree that religions or worldviews are all equal, they are all directed to the truth; 27% agree that there is no difference between religions or worldviews, they all stem from a longing for truth; 29% agree that truth can only be found when religions or worldviews communicate with one another; and 33% agree all religions or worldviews are equally valuable; they represent different ways to the truth.

- insert table 7 about here -

The third step in data analysis explores the bivariate correlations between the two personal factors (age and sex), the three home environment factors (parental education level, discussion of religion and politics, and parental expectations of values conformity), the three psychological factors (psychoticism, neuroticism and extraversion), and the three religious

factors (self-assigned religious affiliation, religious saliency, and interreligious openness).

Two aspects of the correlations presented in table 7 merit commentary. In view of the number of correlations tested concurrently the probability level has been set at one percent.

First, in terms of personal factors, sex emerged as a significant predictor of attitude toward women's rights, Christian affiliation and personality. Females recorded a significantly more positive attitude toward women's rights and were more likely to self-identify as Christian. The sex differences recorded on the three personality measures were consistent with the wider literature (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1991), with women recording higher scores on the extraversion scale and on the neuroticism scale and men recording higher scores on the psychoticism scale. Age also emerged as a significant predictor of women's rights and of Christian affiliation. Support for women's rights increased with age, while support for Christian affiliation decreased with age.

Second, all four groups of variables contained factors that were significantly correlated with attitude toward women's rights. As already noted, in terms of personal factors females recorded a more positive attitude toward women's rights than males, and older students recorded a more positive attitude than younger students. In terms of psychological factors, two dimensions of personality were significantly correlated with attitudes toward women's rights: a more positive attitude was associated with higher neuroticism scores and with lower psychoticism scores, but independent of extraversion scores. In terms of home environment factors, a more positive attitude toward women's rights was associated with greater discussion at home of both political matters and religious matters, but independent of parental educational levels and of parental expectations. In terms of religious factors, a more positive attitude toward women's rights was associated with higher scores of religious saliency and with higher scores of interreligious openness, but not with self-assigned religious affiliation.

- insert table 8 about here -

The fourth step in data analysis constructs a series of regression models with women's rights as the dependent variable and with the independent variables built up in the order of introducing personal factors (model 1), adding psychological factors (model 2), adding home environment factors (model 3), adding religious attitudes (model 4), and adding self-assigned religious affiliation (model 5). It is the fifth model that is of greatest interest when all the predictor factors are taken into account. In this model the factor of core importance is the discussion of political matters at home. Further prediction is added by the discussion of religious matters at home. Age remains important in the final model, with older students recording a more positive attitude. Among the psychological factors psychoticism remains important in the final model with more positive attitudes associated with lower psychoticism scores. However, when personality factors are in the model sex no longer conveys additional predictive power. The positive association with sex (females recording higher scores) on women's rights is an effect now mediated by personality differences (females recording lower psychoticism scores). Among the religious factors both religious saliency and interreligious openness are associated with a more positive attitude toward women's rights. However, when these two measures of religious attitude are entered into the equation self-assigned religious affiliation (both Christian and Muslim) now carry significant negative beta weights. This finding needs to be read alongside the data presented in table 7 where the bivariate correlation coefficients reported no significant association between self-assigned religious affiliation (neither Christian nor Muslim) and attitude toward women's rights. The implication is that, after religious salience and interreligious openness have been taken into account, religious identification apart from these religious attitudes is accompanied by less commitment to women's rights.

Conclusion

Building on the work of van der Tuin and Fumbo (2012), this study set out to address three research questions. The first research question was to explore whether the findings of van der Tuin and Fumbo (2012) that Christian students hold a more positive attitude towards women's rights than Muslim students in Tanzania holds good in England and Wales. In England and Wales this research question was contextualised alongside students who self-reported as religiously unaffiliated. The direct comparison between the three groups of students (as reported by the correlation matrix) found that neither Christian nor Muslim students differed significantly in their attitude toward women's rights from religiously unaffiliated students. In other words, van der Tuin and Fumbo's finding was not confirmed in England and Wales. The effect of Christian and Muslim affiliation on attitude toward women's rights differs from one social context to another.

The second research question was to test van der Tuin and Fumbo's claim that the two items included in the International Empirical Research Programme Religion and Human Rights 1.0 concerning women's rights cohere to form a satisfactory two-item scale in England and Wales. The data generated from a sample of Christian, Muslim and religiously unaffiliated students support this claim with a satisfactory index of internal consistency reliability (alpha).

The third research question was concerned to explore the significant predictors of individual differences in attitudes towards women's rights among students in England and Wales, distinguishing between four groups of variables characterised as personal factors, home environment factors, psychological factors, and religious factors. Three main conclusions emerge from the series of regression models addressing this research question that may be of value in shaping the trajectory of future research in this area.

The first conclusion is that it may be misleading to speak of sex differences in attitudes toward women's rights among students in England and Wales unless psychological

variables (personality) are also taken into account. This observation is grounded on Eysenck's model connecting individual differences in personality with individual differences in social attitudes (see Eysenck, 1975, 1976). According to this model, tenderminded social attitudes (like supporting human rights) are associated with lower psychoticism scores. At the same time, high psychoticism as a dimension of personality is associated with being male and low psychoticism is associated with being female (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1991). The conclusion from the regression models is that all the variance that may have been attributable to sex differences is taken up by personality differences. This interpretation implies that the apparent differences in attitudes to women's rights held by male and by female students in England and Wales can be attributed to psychological differences between males and females rather than to the differential location and experience of men and women in contemporary society.

The second conclusion is that it may be misleading to speak of religious *group* differences (Christian, Muslim and religiously unaffiliated) in attitudes toward women's rights among students in England and Wales unless religious attitudes (religious saliency and interreligious openness) are also taken into account. This observation is grounded in recognition that religious affiliation by itself is an inadequate and inefficient indicator of religiosity (see Francis, 2009). The conclusion for the regression model is that higher levels of religious saliency and higher levels of interreligious openness are both (independently) predictors of more positive attitudes toward women's rights. However, when the effects of these religious attitudes have been taken into account, both self-identification as Muslim and self-identification as Christian are associated with *less* positive attitudes toward women's rights. This suggests that the religiously affiliated (both Christian and Muslim) who do not attribute religious saliency to their affiliation may be exercising religious affiliation as an

expression of personal conservatism, a position comparable with lower commitment to women's rights.

The third conclusion is that aspects of the home environment emerge from the regression models as the strongest predictor of individual differences in students' attitudes toward women's rights. In this context it is those homes in which religion and politics are frequently discussed (especially politics) that demonstrate a significant effect on students' positive attitudes toward women's rights.

The recommendations arising from these findings for future research concerning the connection between religion and women's rights among young people are as follows. First, given the general interest in discussing sex differences in attitudes toward women's rights, it would be prudent to build personality differences into the model. This facilitates some adjudication between the power of psychological explanations and social context explanations of the origin of sex differences in attitudes toward women's rights. Second, given the general interest in discussing religious group differences in attitudes toward women's rights, it would be prudent to build religious attitudes (like saliency and interreligious openness) into the model. This facilitates differentiation between different expressions of self-assigned religious affiliation, where religious affiliation on its own may confuse those for whom religious affiliation may signal personal religious engagement and commitment and those for whom religious affiliation may signal social conservatism. Third, given the main conclusion of the present data concerning the importance of home environment factors, it would be prudent to build into the model levels of discussion at home about political matters and about religious matters.

Given the intention of the International Empirical Research Programme Religion and Human Rights 1.0 to generate a context for international comparative research, it would be good for the current analyses to be replicated and tested on the comparable data from other

countries. A major limitation with the present analyses concerns the reliance on a dependent variable comprising only two items. Although this is an inevitable consequence of the scope and the ambition of the International Empirical Research Programme Religion and Human Rights 1.0, future research in the field may wish to consider the advantages of developing more robust measures of attitudes to human rights, even at the cost of reducing the range of available predictor variables.

References

- Anthony, F-V. (2013). Public significance of religion with regard to socioeconomic rights in the multireligious context of Tamil Nadu, India. In J. A. van der Ven & H-G. Ziebertz (Eds.), *Human rights and the impact of religion* (pp. 205-244). Leiden: Brill.
- Botvar, P. K. (2013). Religion and attitudes towards socioeconomic human rights: An empirical study of young adults in Norway. In J. A. van der Ven & H-G. Ziebertz (Eds.), *Human rights and the impact of religion* (pp. 245-263). Leiden: Brill.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, *16*, 297-334.
- DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. London: Sage.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1975). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (adult and junior)*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1976). *Psychoticism as a dimension of personality*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1991). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Scales*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Fiorenza, E. S. (1983). *In memory of her: A feminist theological reconstruction of Christian origins*. London: SCM Press.
- Francis, L. J. (1992). Is psychoticism really a dimension of personality fundamental to religiosity? *Personality and Individual Differences*, *13*, 645-652.
- Francis, L. J. (2009). Understanding the attitudinal dimensions of religion and spirituality. In M. De Souza, L. J. Francis, J. O'Higgins-Norman, & D. G. Scott (Eds.), *International Handbook of education for spirituality, care and wellbeing* (pp. 147-167). Dordrecht: Springer.

- Francis, L. J., Brown, L. B., & Philipchalk, R. (1992). The development of an abbreviated form of the Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQR-A): Its use among students in England, Canada, the USA and Australia. *Personality and Individual Differences, 13*, 443-449.
- Francis, L. J., & Hermans, C. A. M. (2009). Psychological health and attitude toward Christianity: a study among pupils attending Catholic schools in the Netherlands. *Journal of Religious Education, 57*(2), 47-58.
- Francis, L. J., & Penny, G. (2013). Gender differences in religion. In V. Saroglou (Ed.), *Religion, personality and social behaviour* (pp. 191-209). New York: Psychology Press.
- Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2013). Religion, personality and human rights: An empirical study among adolescents in England and Wales distinguishing between religious identity and textual authority among Christians and Muslims. In J. A. van der Ven & H-G. Ziebertz (Eds.), *Human rights and the impact of religion* (pp. 97-118). Leiden: Brill.
- Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (in press) Attitudes toward human rights and religiosity among adolescents in England and Wales: Replicating and extending a study in Turkey. Collected edition.
- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., Loudon, S. H., & Haley, J. M. (2001). A revised psychoticism scale for the Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire: A study among clergy. *Psychological Reports, 88*, 1131-1134.
- Francis L. J., Robbins M., ap Siôn T, Lewis C. A., & Barnes, L. P. (2007). Psychological health and attitude toward Christianity among Protestant and Catholic sixth-form pupils in Northern Ireland. *Pastoral Psychology, 56*, 157-164.

- Francis, L. J., Robbins, M., Santosh, R., & Bhanot, S. (2008). Religion and mental health among Hindu young people in England. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture, 11*, 341-347.
- Kay, W. K., & Francis, L. J. (1996). *Drift from the Churches: Attitude toward Christianity during childhood and adolescence*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Maitland, S. (1983). *A map of the new country: Women and Christianity*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Ok, U., & Eren, S. (2013). Attitudes towards human rights and religiosity: A case of Turkish adolescents. In J. A. van der Ven & H-G. Ziebertz (Eds.), *Human rights and the impact of religion* (pp. 145-165). Leiden: Brill.
- Ruether, R. R. (1983). *Sexism and God-talk: Towards a feminist theology*. London: SCM Press.
- Soskice, J. M. (1990). *After Eve: Women, theology and the Christian tradition*. London: Marshall Pickering.
- van der Tuin, L. W. J. M., & Fumbo, C. D. (2012). Women rights and religion among Christian and Islamic students in Tanzania. In J. A. van der Ven & H-G. Ziebertz (Eds.), *Tensions within and between religions and human rights* (pp. 203-222). Leiden: Brill.
- van der Ven, J. A. (2013). Towards a legitimate role of religion in the domain of socioeconomic rights: An empirical study among adolescents in North West European countries. In J. A. van der Ven & H-G. Ziebertz (Eds.), *Human rights and the impact of religion* (pp. 167-203). Leiden: Brill.
- Webb, R. J., Ziebertz, H-G., Curran, J., & Reindl, M. (2012). Human rights among Muslims and Christians in Palestine and Germany. In J. A. van der Ven & H-G. Ziebertz

(Eds.), *Tensions within and between religions and human rights* (pp. 177-201).

Leiden: Brill.

Table 1

Sample characteristics

		%
Sex	male	52
	female	48
Age	fourteen	13
	fifteen	37
	sixteen	31
	seventeen	15
	eighteen	5
Religious affiliation	none	36
	Christian	45
	Muslim	19

Table 2

Home environment characteristics

		%
educational level of (foster/step) father	primary school	3
	secondary school	39
	college/university	58
educational level of (foster/step) mother	primary school	3
	secondary school	35
	college/university	62
political matters spoken about at home	never	21
	sometimes	64
	often	16
religious matters spoken about at home	never	25
	sometimes	51
	often	23
importance to father of adopting his values	not at all important	20
	not so important	20
	not sure	28
	important	20
	very important	12
importance to mother of adopting his values	not at all important	16
	not so important	22
	not sure	27
	important	21
	very important	14

Table 3

Women's rights: frequency

	AS %	A %	NC %	D %	DS %
The state should protect women's rights to acquire and administer property	36	32	28	2	2
The state should protect women's rights to adequate job opportunities	35	36	25	3	2

Note: AS = agree strongly; A = agree; NC = not certain; D = disagree; DS = disagree strongly

Table 4

Scale properties

	N items	Alpha	Mean	SD
Women's Rights	2	.75	7.98	1.69
Religious Saliency Scale	4	.81	12.47	4.51
Interreligious Openness Scale	6	.79	17.91	4.61
Extraversion	6	.78	4.41	1.80
Neuroticism	6	.74	3.09	1.69
Psychoticism	6	.47	.80	1.06

Table 5

Religious Saliency Scale

	<i>r</i>	yes %
My religion or worldview is important to me	.49	60
My religion/worldview has great influence on my daily life	.80	34
If I have to take important decisions, my religion/worldview plays a major part in it	.82	34
My life would be quite different, had I not my religion/worldview	.77	39

Table 6

Interreligious Openness Scale

	<i>r</i>	yes %
Living life to the full can only be received through conversation between religions or worldviews	.46	20
Religions or worldviews are all equal, they are all directed to the truth	.63	26
Truth can only be found when religions or worldviews communicate with one another	.67	29
All religions or world views are equally valuable; they represent different ways to the truth	.64	33
The way to truth is only to be found when religions or worldviews have dialogue with one another	.70	22
There is no difference between religions or worldviews, they all stem from a longing for truth	.55	27

Table 7

Correlation matrix

	Sex	Age	Psy	Neu	Ext	Father's education	Mother's education	Politics	Religion	Father's worldview	Mother's worldview	Saliency	Openness	Christian	Muslim
Women's rights	.09**	.11***	.09**	.08**	-.06	.01	.01	.18***	.11***	-.03	.00	.09	.11***	-.03	-.02
Muslim	-.03	.09**	.10**	-.04	-.06	-.05	-.16***	.08	.46***	.48***	.46***	.49***	.19***	-.44***	
Christian	.09**	-.12***	-.17***	.03	.08**	.03	.07	-.08**	-.02	.04	.07	.06	.11***		
Openness	.07	-.02	-.08	.11***	-.04	-.03	.01	.10**	.16***	.23***	.21***	.32***			
Saliency	-.02	.03	-.07	-.02	-.02	.03	-.05	.18***	.56***	.52***	.51***				
Mother's worldview	-.02	-.04	-.06	-.01	.03	-.03	-.06	.09**	.44***	.79***					
Father's worldview	-.01	-.03	-.04	-.03	.03	.02	-.09**	.06	.40***						
Religion discussed	.03	.06	-.02	.01	.03	.05	.01	.32***							
Politics discussed	.00	.09**	-.05	.03	-.03	.14***	.08**								
Mother's education	-.05	-.15***	-.05	-.05	.00	.40***									
Father's education	-.12***	-.09**	-.11***	-.06	-.04										
Extraversion (Ext)	.15***	.03	.01	-.21***											
Neuroticism (Neu)	.18***	.01	-.02												
Psychoticism (Psy)	-.14***	.03													
Age	.17***														

Note: **, $p < .01$; ***, $p < .001$

Table 8

Regression models – dependent women's rights

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
<i>Personal factors</i>					
Sex	.08*	.06	.06	.06	.06
Age	.10**	.11**	.09*	.09**	.09*
<i>Psychological factors</i>					
Psychoticism		-.09**	-.08*	-.07*	-.07*
Neuroticism		.06	.05	.04	.04
Extraversion		-.06	-.05	-.05	-.05
<i>Home environment factors</i>					
Father's education			-.02	-.01	-.01
Mother's education			.01	.01	-.00
Politics discussed			.14***	.14***	.12***
Religion discussed			.09*	.06	.09*
Adopt father's worldview			-.07	-.09	-.07
Adopt mother's worldview			.01	-.01	.02
<i>Religious attitude</i>					
Saliency				-.06	.09*
Openness				.07*	.09*
<i>Religious affiliation</i>					
Christian					-.10*
Muslim					-.16**
Total r^2	.018	.033	.067	.075	0.86

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$