

**Original citation:**

Francis, Leslie J. and McKenna, Ursula. (2017) Assessing attitude toward religious diversity among Muslim adolescents in the UK : the effect of religious and theological factors. Journal of Beliefs and Values .

**Permanent WRAP URL:**

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/87580>

**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.

**Publisher's statement:**

The definitive publisher-authenticated version Francis, Leslie J. and McKenna, Ursula. (2017) Assessing attitude toward religious diversity among Muslim adolescents in the UK : the effect of religious and theological factors. Journal of Beliefs and Value. is available online at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13617672.2017.1317526>

**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: [wrap@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:wrap@warwick.ac.uk)

Assessing attitude toward religious diversity among Muslim adolescents in the UK: The  
effect of religious and theological factors

Leslie J Francis\*

University of Warwick

Ursula McKenna

University of Warwick

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](mailto:leslie.francis@warwick.ac.uk)

### **Abstract**

Understanding variations in public attitudes toward religious diversity is a matter of concern within both the social scientific study of religion (concerned with *religious* factors) and empirical theology (concerned with *theological* factors). Drawing on data provided by 335 13- to 15-year-old Muslim students from England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales, this study tests the power of religious factors and theological factors to explain variance within the Muslim Attitude toward Religious Diversity Index (MARDI). Regression analyses demonstrate that theological factors account for much more variance than religious factors in explaining individual differences in Muslim students' attitudes toward religious diversity. In this regard understanding Muslim students' theological identity is more important than understanding their religious practice.

*Keywords:* social scientific study of religion, empirical theology, religious diversity, social inclusivity.

## Introduction

The Young People's Attitudes toward Religious Diversity Project (funded within the ESRC/AHRC Religion and Society Programme) was set up to map the attitudes of 13- to 16-year-old students across the four nations of the UK, employing both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. The quantitative stream was shaped with a particular concern to explore the correlates, antecedents and consequences of individual difference in young people's attitudes toward religious diversity. In previous studies quantitative data generated by the Young People's Attitudes toward Religious Diversity Project has been employed to explore individual differences in attitudes toward religious diversity among the dominant 'religious' groups within the UK, namely those who self-identify as Christian or as religiously unaffiliated. The aim of the present study is to focus on the attitudes of Muslim students toward religious diversity and to do so through developing the new Muslim Attitude toward Religious Diversity Index (MARDI) in which the public face of religious diversity has been operationalised to include Buddhists, Christians, Hindus, Jews, and Sikhs.

The core purpose of the study is not only to operationalise and to discover the attitudes of Muslim students in the UK to religious diversity, but also to examine their personal religiosity. The difficulty with the formulation of the research question resides within the problematic matter of defining what is meant by 'religiosity'. The quantitative stream of the Young People's Attitude toward Religious Diversity Project was explicitly designed to deal with this problematic matter from the perspective of two scientific traditions: the social scientific study of religion and empirical theology.

The social scientific study of religion is rooted in the religious studies tradition of the academy and may be particularly skilled at identifying the public and visible features of religious traditions. This approach has been influenced by developments in the sociology of religion and in the psychology of religion. Concepts offered by the social scientific study of

religion for shaping a more nuanced understanding of religious people include the notion of self-assigned religious affiliation, public practice like worship attendance, private practice like personal prayer and reading sacred scripture, participation in religious groups, religious belief, and religious attitudes. Established research within the social scientific study of religion has refined and evaluated each of these concepts.

Empirical theology is rooted in the theological tradition of the academy, and may be particularly skilled at identifying the nuanced self-understanding of religious believers. This approach has been influenced by the insights of van der Ven in the Netherlands and by Francis in the UK (see Cartledge, 1999). Concepts offered by empirical theology for shaping a more nuanced understanding of religious people include the notion of the theology of religions, that is, the variety of ways in which religious traditions reflect on and express their self-understanding of their relationship with other religious traditions.

### **Theology of religions**

The theology of religions is concerned with the way religions understand and evaluate claims to special revelation and to truth within their own tradition, and the way religions understand and evaluate claims to special revelation and to truth within other traditions. The issue is not simply to do with how one religion (say Christianity) views another religion (say Islam), but also with how one strand within a religion (say Roman Catholicism) views another strand within the same religion (say Anglicanism).

In a series of empirical studies mainly conducted among adolescents, Ziebertz (2012) has distinguished between four positions that characterise the ways in which religious traditions may view one another. He describes these positions as exclusivism, inclusivism, multireligiosity, and interreligiosity. Exclusivism is based on the conviction that God can only be experienced in, and salvation can only be accessed through, one's own religious tradition. Other traditions have no access to God. Inclusivism is also based on the assumption

that God can only be fully experienced and salvation can only be fully accessed through one's own tradition, but accepts the idea that other traditions may have partial access to God. Multireligiosity accepts all religions as equal and does not see the difference between them as being of real importance. Interreligiosity also sees all religions as equal, but takes the differences between religions seriously.

Reviewing the Ziebertz model, Astley and Francis (2016) suggested four issues that deserved further investigation. First, on conceptual grounds, they wished to distinguish more clearly between the two core themes within the theology of religions, concerning truth and concerning salvation. Second, also on conceptual grounds, they suggested that the four positions identified by the Ziebertz model did not adequately allow for non-religious positions, arguing for the addition of two further positions shaped to recognise atheism and agnosticism. Third, on empirical grounds, they wished to challenge the value of attempting to measure complex constructs, like exclusivism, inclusivism, multireligiosity and interreligiosity, by scales of only three or four items. They argued that well-designed single item measures may be just as effective, although less effective than longer scales designed to access more fully developed constructs. Fourth, they questioned the sophistication of adolescent theological literacy to distinguish clearly between such nuanced statements offered independently. They argued that a well-designed multiple-choice question may force greater clarity in the adolescent mind. Flowing from their critique of the Ziebertz model, Astley and Francis (2016) proposed a multiple-choice question inviting participants to choose the one of the seven statements that comes closest to their own belief. These seven items operationalise exclusivism, inclusivism, interreligious perspective, atheism and agnosticism with one item, while pluralism is operationalised by two items in order to distinguish varieties of pluralism.

**Assessing attitude toward religious diversity**

Building on the foundation laid by the Outgroup Prejudice Project (Brockett, Village, & Francis, 2009), Francis, Croft, Pyke and Robbins (2012) drew on the notion of 'social distance' (Bogardus, 1959) to construct the 11-item Attitude toward Religious Diversity Index (ARDI). This index combined seven items directly concerned with social distance and four items that embraced a wider view of an affective response to religious diversity. In a pilot study of 2,578 13- to 15-year-old students this scale generated an alpha coefficient of .89. The present study needs to develop a comparable measure appropriate for use among Muslim students.

While the present analysis has been set up to explore the connection between attitude toward religious diversity and religious factors (as conceptualised both by the social scientific study of religion and by empirical theology), the previous studies have demonstrated that it would be misleading to examine these associations in a theoretical vacuum that ignored the potentially contaminating effects of personal and psychological factors. Certain research traditions within the psychology of religion draw attention to the importance of sex and age (see Francis & Penny, 2014) as two core personal factors, and to personality as a core psychological factor (see Francis, 1992). Particularly fruitful in this latter respect, has been the dimensional model of personality proposed by Eysenck and Eysenck (1991).

### **Research aims**

Against this background, the present study set out to address four research aims. The first research aim was to develop a new measure of attitude toward religious diversity appropriate for use among Muslim students that would complement the Attitude toward Religious Diversity Index (ARDI: Francis, Croft, Pyke, & Robbins, 2012). The second research aim was to explore the predictive power of two personal variables (sex and age) and three psychological variables (extraversion, neuroticism and psychoticism) in predicting individual differences in the attitudes of Muslim students toward religious diversity. The third

research aim was to explore the predictive power of seven religious variables (religious attendance, personal prayer, scripture reading, belief in God, religious identity, attitude toward religion, and religious classes outside school) in predicting individual difference in the attitudes of Muslim students toward religious diversity, when the personal variables and the psychological variables were also in the model. The fourth research aim was to explore the predictive power of the Astley-Francis Theology of Religions Index (operationalising exclusivism, inclusivism, two forms of pluralism, interreligious perspective, atheism and agnosticism) in predicting individual differences in the attitudes of Muslim students toward religious diversity, when the personal variables, the psychological variables and the religious variables were also in the model.

## **Method**

### **Procedure**

The Young People's Attitude to Religious Diversity Project set out to obtain responses from at least 2,000 13- to 15-year-old students attending state-maintained schools in each of five parts of the UK: England, Northern Ireland, Scotland, Wales *and* London. In each nation half of the students were recruited from schools with a religious character (Anglican, Catholic, or joint Anglican and Catholic) and half from schools without a religious character. Within the participating schools, questionnaires were administered by religious education teachers under examination-like conditions. Students were assured of anonymity and confidentiality and given the option not to participate in the project. All told 11,809 students participated in the project.

### **Participants**

The present analyses were conducted on the sub-sample from the Young People's Attitude to Religious Diversity Project of the 335 participants who self-identified as Muslim



and who also self-identified as male or female. In terms of sex and age, 47% were male and 53% were female; 57% were in year nine and 43% were in year ten.

### Measures

*Attitude toward religious diversity* was assessed by the 12-item Muslim Attitude toward Religious Diversity Index (MARDI) developed specifically for this study. Each item was assessed on the five-point Likert scale: disagree strongly (1), disagree (2), not certain (3), agree (4), and agree strongly (5).

*Personality* was assessed by the abbreviated version of the Junior Eysenck Personality Questionnaire Revised (JEPQR-A) developed by Francis (1996).

*Sex and age* were recorded as dichotomous variables: male (1) and female (2); year nine (1) and year ten (2).

*Religious identity* was assessed by the question ‘My religious identity is important to me’. Responses were assessed on the five-point Likert scale.

*Religious attendance* was assessed by the question ‘Apart from special occasions (like weddings) how often do you attend a religious worship service (e.g. at a church, mosque or synagogue)?’. Responses were recorded on a seven-point scale: never (1), sometimes (2), at least once a year (3), at least six times a year (4), at least once a month (5), nearly every week (6), and several times a week (7).

*Personal prayer* was assessed by the question ‘How often do you pray in your home or by yourself?’. Responses were recorded on a five-point scale: never (1), occasionally (2), and at least once a month (3), at least once a week (4), and nearly every day (5).

*Scripture reading* was assessed by the question ‘How often do you read holy scripture (e.g. The Bible, Qur’an, Torah)?’. Responses were recorded on a five-point scale: never (1), occasionally (2), at least once a month (3), at least once a week (4), and nearly every day (5).

*Attendance at religious classes* was assessed by the question ‘Have you attended any religious classes outside school (like Sunday School or Madrasah)?’. Responses were recorded as a dichotomous variable: no (1), yes (2).

*Belief in God* was assessed by the statement ‘I believe in God’. Responses were recorded on the five-point Likert scale.

*Attitude toward religion* was assessed by the seven-item Astley-Francis Scale of Attitude toward Theistic Faith (Astley, Francis, & Robbins, 2012). Responses to each item were recorded on the five-point Likert scale.

*Theology of religions* was assessed by the Astley-Francis Theology of Religions Index (AFTRI: Astley & Francis, 2016). The participants were invited to ‘tick the *one* statement that comes closest to’ their own belief. Within the environment of regression analysis, inclusiveness is taken as the base-line variable and each of the other six approaches is shaped as a dummy variable: present (1), absent (0).

### **Analysis**

The data were analysed using the SPSS statistical package, drawing on the frequency, correlation, factor, reliability and regression routines. The regression routine employed fixed order entry so that the four sets of variables (personal, psychological, religious, and theological) were structured *incrementally* in such a way that personal variables are taken into account first, followed by psychological variables. This sequence allows the *additional* effects of religious variables (entered at step three) to be observed. Theological variables are entered last at step four to allow the *additional* effect of theological variables to be observed.

### **Results and discussion**

The religious and theological variables included in the survey offer a thorough profile of the religiosity of the participants. In terms of frequency of worship attendance, 12% reported never attending, 42% attended less than six times a year, 8% at least six times a year,

10% at least once a month, and 18% every week and 10% several times a week. In terms of frequency of personal prayer, 10% reported never praying, 22% occasionally, 5% at least once a month, 8% at least once a week, and 56% every day. In terms of frequency of reading holy scripture, 10% reported never doing so, 30% occasionally, 8% at least once a month, 26% at least once a week, and 26% every day. In terms of attendance at religious classes outside school, 74% reported having done so, and 27% as never having done so. In terms of belief in God, 89% agreed or agreed strongly that they believed in God, 8% were not certain whether they believed in God, and 4% disagreed or disagreed strongly that they believed in God. In terms of religious identity, 55% agreed strongly that their religious identity was important to them, 29% agreed, 8% were uncertain, 3% disagreed, and 5% disagreed strongly. The Theology of Religions Index demonstrated a distribution of participants across all seven positions: 17% agreed that only one religion is really true and all others are totally false (exclusivism); 29% agreed that only one religion is really true but at least one other is partly true (inclusivism); 9% agreed that all religions are equally true (pluralism A); 34% agreed that all religions express the same truth in different ways (pluralism B); 5% agreed that real truth comes from listening to all religions (interreligious perspective); 2% agreed that all religions are totally false (atheism); and 4% agreed that they do not know what to believe about religions (agnosticism).

The first step in data analysis explored the scale properties of the Attitude toward Religious Diversity Index in terms of the correlations between the individual items and the sum of the other items, and in terms of the item endorsement on the sum of the 'agree' and 'agree strongly' responses. These data, presented in Table 1, demonstrate a good level of internal consistency reliability with an alpha coefficient of .89. The percentage endorsement of the individual items demonstrate a high level of acceptance of religious diversity among these Muslim adolescents.

- insert table 1 about here -

The second step in data analysis explored the scale properties of the five scales employed in the analyses in terms of the alpha coefficient (Cronbach, 1951) and in terms of the means and standard deviations. Table 2 demonstrates that the Scale of Attitude toward Theistic Faith, like the Attitude toward Religious Diversity Index, achieved a high level of internal consistency reliability with an alpha coefficient of .90. The neuroticism scale achieved an alpha coefficient in excess of the threshold of .65 proposed by DeVellis (2003). Lower alpha coefficients were achieved by the psychoticism scale and the extraversion scale.

- insert table 2 about here -

The third step in data analysis explored the correlations between both personal factors (sex and age) and psychological factors (psychoticism, neuroticism and extraversion) and the religious variables, the theological variables, and the measure of attitude toward religious diversity employed in the analyses. These data are presented in Table 3.

Regarding sex differences, these data demonstrate that among Muslim youth, males are more likely than females to attend religious worship, to engage in personal prayer, and to attend religious classes outside school. This is quite distinct from the general finding in Christian and post-Christian contexts in which woman report higher levels of religiosity than men (Francis & Penny, 2014). On the other hand, there were no significant sex differences reported in respect of frequency of scripture reading, belief in God, attitude toward theistic faith, or importance of religious identity. In terms of the theological variables, female students were more likely than male students to endorse the position of pluralism B (All religions express the same truth in different ways). Regarding age differences, these data demonstrate no significant correlations with the theological variables and only one significant correlation with the religious variables. Compared with year-nine students, year-ten students are reading scriptures less frequently.

The correlations with personality variables presented in Table 3 demonstrate that in terms of the religious variables, psychoticism provides stronger prediction of individual differences than either extraversion or neuroticism. This finding is consistent with the general conclusion within the psychology of religion, as recorded historically by Francis (1992). In terms of religious variables there are significant negative correlations between psychoticism scores and belief in God, attitude toward theistic faith and importance of religious identity. In terms of theological variables there is a significant negative correlation between psychoticism scores and pluralism B (All religions express the same truth in different ways) and a significant positive correlation between psychoticism scores and atheism. Extraversion scores predict individual differences in respect of three of the religious variables but none of the theological variables. Introverts record significantly higher scores of personal prayer, belief in God and importance of religious identity. There were no significant associations between neuroticism scores and any of the religious or theological variables.

Finally, table 3 demonstrates that personal and psychological variables are implicated with individual differences in attitude toward religious diversity. A more positive attitude toward religious diversity is associated with being female, with being younger, and with recording lower scores on the psychoticism scale. On the other hand, there was no significant correlation between attitude toward religious diversity and either extraversion score or neuroticism score.

- insert table 3 about here -

The fourth step in data analysis explored the interconnection between attitude toward religious diversity, and the seven religious variables. These data, presented in Table 4, demonstrate two main points. First, all seven variables proposed within the framework of the social scientific study of religion are significantly intercorrelated. For example, within this context personal prayer predicts greater levels of worship attendance, scripture reading and

attendance at religious classes outside school, higher levels of belief in God, greater importance attributed to religious identity and more positive attitudes toward religion. Similarly, a positive attitude toward theistic faith predicts greater levels of worship attendance, personal prayer, scripture reading, and attendance at religious classes outside school, higher levels of belief in God, and greater importance attributed to religious identity. Second, five of the seven variables proposed within the framework of the social scientific study of religion function as significant predictors of a positive attitude toward religious diversity. Students who give greater importance to their religious identity, who hold a positive attitude toward theistic faith, who practise personal prayer, who engage in reading scripture, and who believe in God hold a more positive attitude toward religious diversity than those who do not embrace these religious characteristics. On the other hand, neither worship attendance, nor attendance at religious classes outside school are correlated with attitude toward religious diversity.

- insert table 4 about here -

The fifth step in data analysis explored the intercorrelations between the seven theological positions and the seven religious variables and attitudes toward religious diversity. These data, presented in Table 5, demonstrate two main points. First, three of the seven theological positions are significantly correlated with attitude toward religious diversity. A more positive attitude toward religious diversity is associated with one theological position: pluralism B. A less positive attitude toward religious diversity is associated with two theological positions: atheism, and exclusivism. Second, there are many significant correlations between the seven variables proposed within the framework of the social scientific study of religion and the seven theological positions.

- insert table 5 about here -

In view of these complex patterns of intercorrelations between the variables, the sixth step in data analysis proposes a sequence of regression models that take attitude toward religious diversity as the dependent variable. Model one examines the effect of the personal factors (sex and age) on attitude toward religious diversity. The beta weights confirm the significant effect of sex (females hold a more positive attitude) and the non-significance of age.

Model two adds the psychological factors (psychoticism, neuroticism, and extraversion). The beta weights confirm that psychoticism scores exert the largest effect (with low scores being associated with a more positive attitude toward religious diversity). Neither neuroticism scores nor extraversion scores are significantly associated with scores of attitude toward religious diversity. When the psychological variables are in the model, the effect of sex is reduced. This highlights that some of the effect of sex differences reflected in model one have been mediated through personality in model two, with females tending to record lower scores on psychoticism.

- insert table 6 about here -

Model three adds the religious factors offered within the framework of the social scientific study of religion. The beta weights show that only the importance of religious identity is significantly associated with attitude toward religious diversity. Young Muslims who emphasise the importance of their religious identity also hold a more positive attitude toward religious diversity.

Model four adds the theological factors offered within the framework of empirical theology. The theological factors have been added as a sequence of dummy variables with inclusivism taken as the reference point. The increase in total  $r^2$  between models three and four demonstrates that the theological factors account for significant additional variance after the religious factors have been taken into account. The beta weights confirm that the

theological position styled pluralism B predicts a significantly more positive attitude toward religious diversity, while the theological positions styled exclusivism and atheism predict a significantly less positive attitude toward religious diversity. When the theological factors are in the model, the small significant positive association with importance of religious identity identified in model three has disappeared.

### **Conclusion**

The present study set out to explore the role of religion itself in shaping attitudes toward religious diversity among Muslim students between the ages of 13 and 15 years attending state-maintained schools within the four nations of the UK. This objective was reached through a sequential series of four research aims.

The first research aim was to develop a new measure of attitude toward religious diversity appropriate for use among Muslim students that would complement the Attitude toward Religious Diversity Index (ARDI: Francis, Croft, Pyke & Robbins, 2012). This aim led to the development of the Muslim Attitude toward Religious Diversity Index (MARDI), a 12-item Likert-type instrument that achieved an alpha coefficient of .89. The scale can be commended for further use on the grounds of having a high level of internal consistency, reliability and good face validity. The scores recorded on the Muslim Attitude toward Religious Diversity Index demonstrate an overall positive attitude toward religious diversity among this sample of Muslim students. Nine out of every ten wish to respect all religions; eight out of every ten find having people from different religious backgrounds makes their school or college an interesting place; and seven out of every ten find learning about different religions in school interesting.

The second research aim was to explore the predictive power of two personal variables (sex and age) and three psychological variables (extraversion, neuroticism, and psychoticism) in predicting individual differences in the attitude of Muslim students toward



religious diversity. Three main findings are worthy of commentary. First, when only personal factors were in the equation, the data found that female Muslim students recorded a more positive attitude toward religious diversity than male students. However, when psychological variables were introduced in model two this significant sex difference disappeared. This finding is consistent with the research finding of Penny, Francis and Robbins (2015) that apparent sex differences in religiosity are a consequence of the different personality profiles of males and females. Second, no significant association between age and attitude toward religious diversity was found among this sample. Third, among the psychological variables, psychoticism scores remained a significant predictor of attitude toward religious diversity, both before and after religious and theological variables were entered into the model. This is consistent both with the view that low psychoticism scores predict higher levels of religiosity (Francis, 1992) and with the view that tenderminded social attitudes more generally are associated with lower psychoticism scores (Eysenck, 1975).

The third research aim was to explore the predictive power of seven religious variables (religious attendance, personal prayer, scripture reading, belief in God, religious identity, attitude toward religion, and religious classes outside school) in predicting individual difference in the attitude of Muslim students toward religious diversity, when the personal variables were also in the model. While bivariate correlational analysis indicated a positive association between attitude toward religious diversity and five of the seven religious variables (importance of religious identity, personal prayer, scripture reading, belief in God, and attitude to theistic faith, but not worship attendance or attendance at religious classes outside school), regression analysis indicated that only importance of religious identity emerged as statistically significant when the two personal factors, the three psychological factors and all seven religious factors were included in the model. The beta weight indicates

that those students who gave greater weight to their identity as a Muslim also displayed a more positive attitude toward religious diversity.

The fourth research aim was to explore the predictive power of the Astley-Francis Theology of Religions Index (operationalising exclusivism, inclusivism, two forms of religious pluralism, interreligious perspective, atheism and agnosticism) in predicting individual differences in the attitude of Muslim students toward religious diversity, when the personal variables, the psychological variables and the religious variables were also in the model. The bivariate correlational analyses indicated significant negative associations between two theological positions and attitude toward religious diversity (exclusivism and atheism) and a significant positive association between one theological position and attitude toward religious diversity (pluralism B). The bivariate correlations also indicated an almost zero correlation between inclusivism and attitude toward religious diversity. For this research the regression model accepted inclusivism as the reference point and entered the other six theological positions as dummy variables in model four. Model four demonstrate that exclusivism and atheism continue to predict a less positive attitude toward religious diversity and pluralism B continues to predict a more positive attitude toward religious diversity when all the other variables are in the regression model. At the same time, once the theological variables have been entered the one religious variable to display statistical significance in model three (importance of religious identity) drops into insignificance.

The main conclusion to emerge from the analyses is that an understanding of the connection between personal religiosity and attitude toward religious diversity among Muslim students needs to pay more attention to their theological understanding than to their religious practices, beliefs and attitudes. In other words, the research tradition informed by the approach of empirical theology may have more to offer to this research question than the research tradition informed by the approach of the social scientific study of religion.

This close attention given to the student's position in terms of the theology of religion identifies three clear conclusions. First, the most unfavourable attitude toward religious diversity is found not among religious Muslims but among thoroughly secularised Muslims who espoused the atheistic position identified by the Astley-Francis Theology of Religions Index and who agreed with the statement that all religions are totally false. Just two of the total sample of Muslim students adopted this atheistic position. Second, a less favourable attitude toward religious diversity was also found among Muslim students who espoused the exclusivism position identified by the Astley-Francis Theology of Religion Index and who agreed with the statement that only one religion is really true and all others are totally false. One in every six of the total sample of Muslim students adopted this exclusivism position (17%). Third, the most favourable attitude toward religious diversity was found among Muslim students who espoused the pluralism position identified by the Astley-Francis Theology of Religions Index and who agreed with the statement that all religions express the same truth in different ways. One in every three of the total sample of Muslim students adopted this pluralism position (34%).

Two implications follow from these empirical findings. The first implication concerns the trajectory for future research concerned with understanding the correlates (and possibly the antecedents) of individual differences in attitude toward religious diversity among Muslim students. While it would be misleading for such research not to take religious variables into account, it would be even more misleading for future research not to embrace the perspectives and insights of empirical theology alongside those of the social scientific study of religion. Theology also has a contribution to make to this core matter of public concern within contemporary societies.

The second implication concerns the role of religious education within publicly funded schools within contemporary societies. The data suggest that there are two groups of

Muslim students who, on theological grounds, adopt a significantly less positive attitude toward religious diversity and who may as a consequence display lower levels of tolerance to other religious groups. These are the young people who adopt the position of atheism (saying that all religions are totally false) and the young people who adopt the position of exclusivism (saying that only one religion is really true and all others are totally false). Religious educators may wish to be better equipped to deal with the theological issues underpinning such sentiments.

### References

- Astley, J., & Francis, L. J. (2016). Introducing the Astley-Francis Theology of Religions Index (AFTRI): Construct validity among 13- to 15-year-old students. *Journal of Beliefs and Values, 37*, 29-39. doi.org/10.1080/13617672.2016.1141527
- Astley, J., Francis, L.J., & Robbins, M. (2012). Assessing attitude towards religion: The Astley-Francis Scale of Attitude toward Theistic Belief. *British Journal of Religious Education, 34*, 183-193. doi.org/10.1080/01416200.2011.614735
- Bogardus, E.S. (1959). *Social distance*. Yellow Springs, OH: Antioch Press.
- Brockett, A., Village, A., & Francis, L. J. (2009). Internal consistency reliability and construct validity of the Attitude toward Muslim Proximity Index (AMPI): A measure of social distance. *British Journal of Religious Education, 31*, 241-249. doi.org/10.1080/01416200903112417
- Cartledge, M. J. (1999). Empirical theology: Inter- or intra- disciplinary? *Journal of Beliefs and Values, 20*, 98-104. doi.org/10.1080/1361767990200109
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16*, 297-334. doi.org/10.1007/BF02310555
- DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. London: Sage.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1975). The structure of social attitudes. *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 14*, 323-331. doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8260.1975.tb00188.x
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1991). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Scales*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Francis, L. J. (1992). Is psychoticism really a dimension of personality fundamental to religiosity? *Personality and Individual Differences, 13*, 645-652. doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(92)90235-H

- Francis, L. J. (1996). The development of an abbreviated form of the Revised Junior Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (JEPQR-A) among 13- to 15-year-olds. *Personality and Individual Differences, 21*, 835-844. doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(96)00159-6
- Francis, L. J., Croft, J., Pyke, A., & Robbins, M. (2012). Young people's attitudes to religious diversity: Quantitative approaches from social psychology and empirical theology. *Journal of Beliefs and Values, 33*, 279-292.  
doi.org/10.1080/13617672.2012.732808
- Francis, L. J., & Penny, G. (2014). Gender differences in religion. In V. Saroglou (Ed.), *Religion, personality and social behaviour* (pp. 191-209). New York: Psychology Press.
- Penny, G., Francis, L. J., & Robbins, M. (2015). Why are women more religious than men? Testing the explanatory power of personality theory among undergraduate students in Wales. *Mental Health, Religion and Culture, 18*, 492-502.  
doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2015.1079603
- Ziebertz, H.-G. (2012). The Catholic view of religious pluralism in empirical perspective. In J. Astley, L. J. Francis, M. Robbins and M. Selçuk (Eds.), *Teaching religion, teaching truth: Theoretical and empirical perspectives* (pp. 155-184). Bern: Peter Lang.

Table 1

*Muslim Attitude toward Religious Diversity Index (MARDI): Scale properties*

	<i>r</i>	%
I am interested in finding out more about Buddhists	.73	44
I am interested in finding out more about Christians	.67	50
I am interested in finding out more about Hindus	.73	42
I am interested in finding out more about Jews	.75	43
I am interested in finding out more about Sikhs	.76	42
Learning about different religions in school is interesting	.55	74
All religious groups in Britain should have equal rights	.38	87
We must respect all religions	.39	91
Having people from different religious backgrounds makes my school/college an interesting place	.44	80
People from different religious backgrounds make where I live an interesting place	.46	64
People who come from different countries make where I live an interesting place	.53	65
People who come from different countries make my school/college an interesting place	.60	70
Alpha coefficient	.89	

Note: % = sum of agree and agree strongly responses

*r* = correlation between individual item and sum of other ten items

Table 2

*Scale Properties*

	N Items	$\alpha$	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Low	High
Attitude toward Religious Diversity	12	.89	43.84	9.39	12	60
Attitude toward Theistic Faith	7	.90	29.30	5.92	7	35
Extraversion	6	.57	4.63	1.48	0	6
Neuroticism	6	.68	3.23	1.80	0	6
Psychoticism	6	.63	1.05	1.32	0	6



Table 3

*Correlations with personal and psychological variables*

	Sex	Age	P	N	E
<i>Religious variables</i>					
Religious worship	-.28***	.01	.02	-.01	-.11
Personal prayer	-.13**	-.05	-.07	-.05	-.16**
Scripture reading	-.09	-.19***	-.10	-.03	-.09
Belief in God	.02	-.03	-.28***	.01	-.15**
Attitude toward Theistic Faith	.01	-.04	-.28***	.06	-.11
Religious classes	-.18***	.00	.02	.00	-.07
Importance of religious identity	-.05	-.01	-.22***	.07	-.16**
<i>Theological variables</i>					
Exclusivism	-.10	.04	.10	.03	-.10
Inclusivism	-.07	-.07	.03	.03	-.03
Pluralism A	.01	-.05	.05	-.06	-.03
Pluralism B	.17**	-.00	-.19***	-.02	.09
Interreligious perspective	-.01	.03	.00	.01	-.03
Atheism	-.08	.07	.21***	.02	.07
Agnosticism	-.01	.09	-.02	.01	.06
<i>Religious diversity</i>					
MARDI	.18**	-.13*	-.36***	.09	.00

Note: \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$

Table 4

*Correlation matrix for religious variables and attitude toward religious diversity*

	RI	WA	PP	SR	BG	AT	RC
Religious diversity	.29***	.05	.19***	.19***	.26***	.28***	.03
Religious classes	.17**	.29***	.27***	.35***	.13**	.14**	
Theistic faith	.57***	.28***	.41***	.43***	.52***		
Belief in God	.50***	.16**	.32***	.30***			
Scripture reading	.37***	.42***	.61***				
Personal prayer	.40***	.42***					
Worship attendance	.27***						

Note: RC = Religious classes; AT = Attitude toward theistic faith; BG = Belief in God; SR = Scripture reading; PP = Personal prayer; WA = Worship attendance; RI = Importance of religious identity

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

Table 5

*Correlation matrix for theological variables with religious variables and religious diversity*

	RI	WA	PP	SR	BG	AT	RC	DIV
Exclusivism	.08	.05	.13*	.02	.02	-.00	.05	-.19***
Inclusivism	.19***	.12*	.21***	.19***	.14**	.22***	.12*	-.01
Pluralism A	-.18**	-.02	-.08	-.09	-.05	-.13*	-.12*	-.06
Pluralism B	.03	-.13*	-.16**	-.08	-.01	.02	-.06	.29***
Interreligious	.02	.05	.03	.04	-.02	-.01	-.03	.10
Atheism	-.16**	.03	-.13*	-.01	-.12*	-.12*	-.02	-.35***
Agnosticism	-.31***	-.09	-.18***	-.18***	-.18***	-.25***	-.05	-.11

Note: RI = Religious identity; WA = Worship attendance; PP = Personal prayer; SR = Scripture reading; BG = Belief in God; AT = Attitude toward theistic faith; RC = Religious classes; DIV = Attitude toward religious diversity

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

Table 6

*Regression models on attitude to religious diversity*

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
<i>Personal factors</i>				
Sex	.14*	.06	.11	.06
Age	-.08	-.07	-.04	-.02
<i>Psychological factors</i>				
Extraversion		.05	.10	.08
Neuroticism		.07	.06	.08
Psychoticism		-.32***	-.25**	-.16**
<i>Religious factors</i>				
Religious identity			.15*	.11
Worship attendance			-.04	-.02
Scripture reading			.06	.08
Personal prayer			.11	.11
Belief in God			.06	.10
Attitude toward Theistic Faith			.03	.02
Religious classes			.01	.04
<i>Theological factors</i>				
Exclusivism				-.14*
Pluralism A				.04
Pluralism B				.21***
Interreligious				.11
Atheism				-.29***
Agnostic				-.01
Total $r^2$	.025	.121	.200	.363

Note: \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$