

AN EXAMINATION OF THE RELATION BETWEEN RELIGIOSITY AND DECISION
MAKING

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Psychology and Philosophy
Sam Houston State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

by

Danielle E. Dobyanski

December, 2018

AN EXAMINATION OF THE RELATION BETWEEN RELIGIOSITY AND DECISION
MAKING

by

Danielle E. Dobyanski

APPROVED:

Dr. Jamey Crosby, PhD
Thesis Co-Director

Dr. Courtney Banks, PhD
Thesis Co-Director

Dr. Donna Desforges, PhD
Committee Member

Dr. Jamey Crosby, PhD
Dean, College of Humanities and Social
Sciences

DEDICATION

With love, to those who loved and supported me.

ABSTRACT

Dobyanski, Danielle E., *An examination of the relation between Religiosity and decision making*. Master of Arts (General Psychology), December, 2018, Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas.

Research has indicated religiosity can influence decisions, daily actions and perceptions of others. Through previous research, religiosity has affected decision making when considering a drug usage and bombing. However, little research has explore how religiosity effects mock jury decision making, specifically when considering a homicide case. Therefore, the current study will examine how religiosity can influence Mock Jury's verdict on a murder trial. The following scales are te=he dependent variables: Religious Commitment Inventory, Quest Scale, Evangelism Scale, Devotionalism Scale, Revised Legal Attitudes Questionnaire, Dogmatism scale, the Openness to Experience and Judgment/Open-mindedness scale and Religious Fundamentalism Scale. The independent variable is a homicide case.

A Binary Logistic Regression was used to determine if religiosity predicts a guilt or non-guilty verdict. Results found that only Judgment significantly affected mock juror's decision making, such that as the participant's Judgement increased, the likelihood of a verdict of innocence decreased. These results hold implications for jury selection. In past research indicated that Religiosity plays a key role in decision making. However, these studies did not test the subjects with the Judgement scale. This could explain as to why the results favored more in Judgement than in Religiosity when considering a homicide.

Due to the current study's demographic patterns, a limitation is has been noticed. Like past research, the demographics favors white, Christian males. Therefore, future

research may want to explore a wider range of ethnicity and religious backgrounds. Specifically, future research may want to focus sampling on ethnic minorities, individuals with either more or no education, religious minorities, or those that are middle-aged or older to find if the dependent variables show differences in how punitive mock jurors can be.

The implication of this study is for jury selection. Especially in a homicide case, including abuse, the defense team should focus less on the possible juror's religiosity and more on their judgement. As seen in the current study, judgement and its accompanying variables, such as openness and objectivity, can be more important in determining whether the defendant is guilty.

KEY WORDS: Mock jury, Religion, Verdict

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	1
CHAPTER I.....	1
Introduction.....	1
CHAPTER II.....	11
Hypothesis.....	11
CHAPTER III.....	13
Methodology.....	13
I STATISTICAL ANALYSES.....	16
II RESULTS.....	17
III DISCUSSION.....	18
REFERENCES.....	21
APPENDIX A.....	26
APPENDIX B.....	27
APPENDIX C.....	28
APPENDIX D.....	29
VITA.....	30

CHAPTER I

Introduction

All over the world there are individuals who practice religion to seek guidance, wealth, and life after death. Miller (2008) expresses that religion is an impactful characteristic of society and an essential aspect of an individual's life. In a study done in 2015, approximately twice as many Americans report religion as 'extremely important' in everyday life as compared to Australia (18%), Canada (27%) and Germany (21%); (Pew Research Center, 2017). Religion tends to influence many Americans decision making in everyday life (Miller, 2008). Of particular interest of the current study, there is evidence religiosity impacts decision making as established by Miller (2006, 2008, & 2014).

To date, minimal research has explored the role of religion in jury decisions. However, with what little research that has been explored, Miller is at the forefront of it. Therefore, much of Miller's research will be considered. In 2006, Miller studied whether religion could be a deciding factor when the jury determines guilt or innocence. Furthermore, in 2008, Miller explores how each section of a trial can be affected by religion from jury selection to verdicts.

Miller (2008) states that jurors are to be the representatives of society. A suspect may be brought to trial to receive justice for acts that have broken the moral law. Therefore, since nearly 76% (Pew Research Center, 2017) of individuals in this world are familiar with religion, by practicing it or sharing it, it is suggested that those religious beliefs would spill over into the courtroom. Jurors, representatives of the population, will base their decisions on their religious beliefs (Miller, 2008).

In light of this, Miller (2008) states that Southern Baptists and Jewish individuals are more likely to extend punitive verdicts when compared to Catholics. In addition, lawyers benefit from the juror's religious beliefs by utilizing them to win the case. Miller's most recent study (2014) explores the religion of the mock jurors and the effects on subsequent verdicts on two, independent trials. The mock jurors in both trials were told a story about the trials they were asked to deliberate on. The first story is of a young man being accused of leaving a bomb on a trail, and the second story is about a pregnant mother smoking marijuana. In many cases, it is common for a defense attorney to use the client's religion to aid him or her in winning a case (Miller, 2008). Specifically, during jury selection, lawyers will address each potential juror religion belief and use this as an advantage for the case (Miller, 2008). For example, Jewish mock jurors were less likely to convict than christian jurors in a child molestation trial (Kerr, Hymes, Anderson, & Weather, 1995). Therefore, a lawyer may directly speak to the Jewish faith of the mock juror to persuade a death penalty for the accused. On the other hand, a lawyer may decide on the level of emphasis he or she will place on their client of a specific religion for the benefit of the outcome. However, Southern Baptist show more support for the death penalty than other christian groups, like Catholics (Uelmen, 2005). Miller (2014) states that Catholics tend to hold a concrete belief against death penalty, resulting in the defendant escaping death penalty if found guilty by the mock jury.

Defendants and Religion

In the courtroom, it is common for lawyers to use the defendant's religious beliefs as support for his or her innocence (Johnson, 2001). Voss (2005) confirms this assertion, stating that using a defendant's religiosity can be an effective way to persuade the mock

jurors to declare innocence. In fact, lawyers tend to determine which juror has a similar religion to the defendant emphasizing on this similarity to win the case (Miller, 2008). Likewise, lawyers often use a defendant's religious beliefs to dissuade the jury from the death penalty (Miller & Bornstien, 2006).

Miller (2006) states that if a defendant converts to a Christian faith, then he or she may be treated more mercifully. This is the type of behavior from the defendant. Miller (2006) posits that a defendant who is able to realize their mistakes, then develops religious beliefs as a response tends to be more likely to have positive outcomes from the jury.

While religion and mortality are not the same, they may both be components of a similar discussion. Further, if one has this moral foundation in place, then he or she knows right from wrong. Therefore, mock jurors tend to find it harder to forgive the defendant of their crime if the defendant is known to have religion (Miller et. al., 2006). Furthermore, a jury is more likely to find this defendant guilty if he or she is practicing a specific religion (Johnson, 2001; Miller et. al., 2006). Conversely, if the defendant is baptized or actively involved in a religion after his or her conviction, the mock jury may be more influenced to believe that the defendant has changed; this could lead the jurors to believe that the defendant is still has the ability to be 'good' (Miller, 2008). This belief was practice in Terry Nicholas's Oklahoma City bombing court case. A juror who participated in the trial stated that "[Nicholas] could do some good in prison because he found religion" (CNN, 2004). In the process of sentencing Nicholas, the jury was unable to agree upon the death penalty, resulting in sentencing Nicholas to a life sentence in prison.

Religiosity

Miller (2014) assess the following constructs and influence on decision making- Religious Commitment Inventory (Worthington, 2003), Quest Scale (Batson & Schoenrade, 1991), Evangelism Scale (Putney & Middleton, 1961), Devotionalism Scale (Putney & Middleton, 1961), Revised Legal Attitudes Questionnaire (Kravits, Cutler & Brock, 1993) and Religious Fundamentalism Scale (Putney & Middleton, 1961). Miller (2014) used these scales to determine the relationship between mock jurors religious beliefs and their verdict.

The Dogmatism scale (Altemeyr, 1996) and the Openness to Experience and Judgment/Open-mindedness scale (Goldberg, 1999) was added to further study the mock jury's attitudes towards the homicide case based on their scores. These scales inclusions are explained below.

Dogmatism

Those who score high in dogmatism believe that their world is a "just" world, meaning one will get what he or she deserves (Adrono, Frekel-Brunswick, Levison & Sanford, 1950). However, those who score high in dogmatism but relate to the defendant and recognized the defendant to be similar to themselves will be less punitive to the decedent when considering a verdict (Shaffer, Plummer, & Hammock, 1986). Further, jurors who are highly dogmatic are more punitive (inflicting punishment) to the defendant if he or she is member of an out group (Shaffer, Plummer, & Hammock, 1986).

However, if the dogmatic mock jurors notice that the defendant regrets committing the crime and is grieving, he or she is more sympathetic towards the

defendant and tends to “go easy” on the defendant (Kalven & Ziesel, 1966; Shaffer, et. al., 1982). Rumsey (1976) states that a defendant that shows remorse in the court room has a higher chance of receiving a shorter sentence due to his or her obvious remorse. Correspondingly, those who have apparent physical injuries from the crime are also more likely to receive a shorter sentence (Austin, Walster & Utne, 1976). Therefore, if one shows emotional or physical suffering receive shorter sentencing if found guilty.

Moreover, dogmatism plays an instrumental role in the death penalty. For those who believe in a “just” world, also believe that if one were to commit homicide, then the guilty should face the same consequence- death. It is evident that those who believe in a “just” world not only wants to continue believing this, but want to adhere to keeping a “just” world.

Religious Commitment

In Religious Commitment, Worthington (1988) recommend a model that would address positive and negative religious effects on particular conditions. Religious Commitment is defined as the standard to which an individual upholds his or her religious beliefs, values and practices in their daily life (Worthington, 1988).

Worthington (1988) states that the key to this model is actually religious commitment in itself. Worthington (1988) believed that, based off of this Religious Commitment construct, individuals who tend to be increasingly religious and committed to their beliefs tend to view their world based on ‘religious dimensions’ founded upon their ‘religious values.’ Thus, it is suggested that highly religious individuals will assess the world around them through a religious lens and therefore, will incorporate their

religion in their daily life. These are important characteristics because it gives an inside look of why one participates in religion.

Openness to Experience and Judgment/Open-mindedness

Openness to experience is characterized by how much an individual is receptive to other's lifestyles and beliefs. Costa (1993) states that individuals who are open encourage new life experiences and are more extraverted due to their experience. In a study done by Marcus, Lyons and Guyton (2000) found that those who score high on Openness tend to not be influenced by their fellow mock jurors when deciding on a verdict. Instead, he or she will form their own opinion through their own analysis (Marcus et. al., 2000). In addition, Trapnell (1994) found that those who high in openness are less likely to be influenced by authority figures; resulting in low scores in authoritarianism. Those high in this construct may be more likely to forgive (e.g. extramarital infidelity; Jones, Dobyanski, & Deforges, 2017).

Quest

Miller (2014) suggests that Quest is often defined as individuals who do not internalize religion as a practice but accepts and acknowledging others' religion. This construct informs the researcher whether participants know for certain if there is a higher power, and whether they have come to terms that he or she may never know (Batson & Shoenrade, 1991). The Quest scores are negatively correlated with punitive jury sentences, authoritarianism, and fundamentalism (Altermeyer & Hunsberger, 1992; Miller, 2014). This may result in a mock juror who scores high on the Quest Scale less likely to support punitive ideals. It is important to consider Quest because some mock jurors are not active in religion, which affects their verdict as they are not influenced by

the same principles as those who believe in a higher power. For instance, if a mock juror does not follow a certain religion, his or her morals and beliefs may be different from another mock juror who does follow a religion. This could result in different opinions and verdicts.

Evangelism

Miller (2014) defines Evangelism as the need to convert others to christianity. Miller (2006) suggests that those who are evangelistic would rather convert a defendant to religion than sentence him or her to death. In doing this, a life is saved rather than lost. Thus, the more one desires to evangelize the less likely they are to support the death penalty (Young, 1992; Miller, 2006; Miller & Hayward, 2008) due to the inability to convert the defendant if the he or she is on death row (Young, 1992).

Devotionalism

The devotionalism measures how important religion is to someone (Miller, 2014). Miller (2014) reports that the more one is devoted to their religion, the greater the likelihood that he or she will not favor the death penalty. Thus, if an individual's religious beliefs are highly influential this may result in an opinion when considering punishment for homicide. Young (1992) describes devotionalism as how much one prays, reads the Bible, and attends church services. Furthermore, those who recite the Bible verbatim are considered to be more supportive of capital punishment and look to the death penalty as a means of punishment (Leiber and Woodrick, 1997; Miller, 2006; Young, 1992). However, those who make it a point to participate in church services are less likely to favor the death penalty (Baumer, Messner, & Rosenfeld, 2003). Furthermore, Applegate, Cullen, Fisher and Vander Ven (2000) found that there

is no relation between devotionism and punitive beliefs. Also, those who score high on the devotionism are less likely to give negative verdicts (Miller, 2006; Miller & Hayward, 2008). Therefore, there is a difference in the expression of devotionism (i.e. how devotionism is involved in one's daily life) and the belief of the death penalty (i.e. the beliefs one adheres to when faced with the decision of imposing the death penalty).

Past research (Miller, 2006; Miller & Hayward, 2008) has not found a relationship between devotionism and a mock jury's verdict. On the contrary, a single study has concluded that devotionism is related to more punitive actions. Particularly, mock jurors who have experienced child abuse and active in church services are more likely to be more punitive than those who do not attend church. However, Johnson (1985) found that those who do not attend church are judged more punitively by those who do attend church regularly. Hence if a defendant is judged more punitively, devotionism could be the reasoning behind the decision. In this case, the juror may be more devotional, while the defendant is not, leading to a harsh punishment.

Authoritarianism

Adrono, Frekel-Brunswick, Levison & Sanford (1950) states that the individuals who scores high on the authoritarianism scale are more likely to be bias in favor of authority, more likely to discriminate out groups and highly encourage punitive verdicts to those who do not maintain the law. For the authoritarian juror, authority figures can persuade them to punish out groups in the courtroom. Particularly, authoritarians conform to police beliefs and ideas, seeing the police as a legitimate authority figure. In addition, Altemeyer (1988) claims authoritarian attitudes can be developed through social learning. For example, a parent or guardian can influence a child to have authoritative

attitudes. Interestingly, even non-authoritarianist that have high levels of authoritarianism attitudes when threatened (Altemeyer, 1988). For example, if an individual who scored low on authoritarianism were threatened by another person (e.g., a gun is pointed at the victim while being robbed) then he or she will hold more of an authoritarian attitude when working with authority figures to bring justice to the situation.

According to Werner, Kagehiro and Stube (1982), Authoritarians are great consumers of information. Once an individual who scores high on authoritarianism is presented with information about the case, he or she is less likely to forget the facts about the case compared to those who do not score high on authoritarianism. In addition, Werner et al. (1982) states that those who are high in authoritarianism will more than likely form their own opinions and will not be influenced by their mock juror peers. Due to the authoritarians ability to be influenced by authority and having the capability to remember all facts of the case at hand results in an authoritarian bias to the defendant (Werner et al., 1982)

By using this scale, the experimenter will be able to tell which mock jurors are influenced by the law to rationalize his or her decision of stating whether the defendant is guilty or innocent.

Fundamentalism

Fundamentalists support the idea that any type of crime or immoral act committed is the outcome of sin (Applegate et al., 2000; Ellison & Sherkat, 1993; Miller, 2008; & Young, 1992). Essentially, this sin needs to be punished and the individual should take responsibility for their actions. Correspondingly, fundamentalist have more support for the death penalty (Grasmick, Davenport, Chamli, & Bursik, 1992) because these jurors

are going to lean more towards punishing a defendant than letting the defendant get away with the crime (Grasmick et al., 1992; Miller & Hayward, 2008; Vogel, 2003). Miller (2014) claims that fundamentalism individuals are less likely to be punitive when compared to non-fundamentalist individuals. In fact, those who attend a fundamentalist church tend to be more punitive than those who attend other churches (Young, 1992).

Present Study

This study will explore the eight scales on a “homicide case.” The case explains the murder of an abusive man by his wife who is suffering from Battered Woman Syndrome. The mock jurors are assumed to be either empathetic or scornful, deciding on a verdict of guilt or innocence, respectively. Past research has explored mock jury decision making related to religion in drug and weapon cases. To date, there have been no studies examining homicide cases in respects to religion; thus, this study will aid in understanding how religion influences mock jury decision making in homicide cases.

CHAPTER II

Hypothesis

Over all, the main hypothesis for this study is for those who practice his or her religion more often will judge the defendant's crime more punitive than those who do not practice their religion as consistently. In addition, there are eight specific hypothesis contributing to each predictor variable.

Hypothesis 1: Scores on the Dogmatism scale will tend to predict participants' verdict in that higher scores will yield a guilty verdict.

Hypothesis 2: Scores on the Intrinsic scale from the Religious Commitment Inventory will tend to predict participants' verdict in that higher scores will yield a not guilty verdict. However, score on the Extrinsic scale from the Religious Commitment Inventory will tend to predict participants' verdict in that higher scores will yield a guilty verdict.

Hypothesis 3: Scores on the Openness to Experience and Judgment/Open-mindedness scale will tend to predict participants' verdict in that higher scores will yield a not guilty verdict.

Hypothesis 4: Scores on the Quest scale will tend to predict participants' verdict in that higher scores will yield a not guilty verdict.

Hypothesis 5: Scores on the Evangelism scale will tend to predict participants' verdict in that higher scores will yield a not guilty verdict.

Hypothesis 6: Scores on the Devotionalism scale will tend to predict participants' verdict in that higher scores will yield a not guilty verdict.

Hypothesis 7: Scores on the Revised Legal Attitudes Questionnaire scale tend to predict participants' verdict in that higher scores will yield a guilty verdict.

Hypothesis 8: Scores on the Religious Fundamentalism scale tend to predict participants' verdict in that higher scores will yield a guilty verdict.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

Participants

Three hundred and ninety nine participants were sampled through Mechanical Turk on a Sona System Survey. The study took approximately one hour to complete, resulting in the participant gaining \$0.50. There were 196 males and 175 females participating in the current study (See Appendix B for demographics). Of these participants, a large sum of participants determined that the defendant in the study was guilty ($n = 234$). Only a small group of participants believed that the defendant was innocent ($n = 39$).

Procedure

Participants were sampled via Mechanical Turk, an online survey forum, meaning that only those with a Mechanical Turk account were able to participate. Upon beginning the study, participants were presented the homicide case in the form of a vignette (See Appendix A). After reviewing the case, the participant gave his/her verdict of the defendant. Once finished, the participant answered questionnaires over Dogmatism, Religious Commitment Inventory, Openness to Experience and Judgment, Quest, Evangelism, Devotionalism, Legal Attitudes and Religious Fundamentalism and Religious Orientation-Revised.

Materials

Dogmatism. The Dogmatism Scale was used to measure the subject's level of dogmatism. The Dogmatism Scale was developed by Altemeyer in 1996 to measure whether individuals believe in a "just" world. This is a 20-item scale varying from

“strongly disagree” to “neutral” to “strongly agree.” The final score was derived by adding the individual scores. This is a short scale that has consistent reliability with an alpha coefficient of .90 (Altemeyer, 2002). For the current study, the Cronbach’s Alpha was .840.

Religious Commitment Inventory. Worthington, along with many other scholars, show support in the idea that religion has a positive influence on mental health (Worthington, 2003). This scale is a 10-item assessment to measure one's commitment to his or her religion utilizing a 5-point Likert rating scale ranging from 1 (not at all true to me) to 5 (totally true to me). Worthington et al., 2003 reported an alpha coefficient of .93. For the current study, the Cronbach’s Alpha for Intrapersonal was .937 and the Cronbach’s Alpha for Interpersonal was .937.

Openness to Experience and Judgment/Open-mindedness. The Openness to Experience scale measures the subject’s range of openness. This is a 10-item scale. The total score was derived by adding the individual scores. The items noted were reversed scored: a score of one was interpreted as “very accurate,” two was interpreted as “somewhat accurate,” three was interpreted as “neither inaccurate or accurate,” four was interpreted as “somewhat inaccurate,” and five was interpreted as “very inaccurate.” Half of the scales reversed scores helped to correlate with a five-factor scale ($\alpha=.82$). The Judgment/Open-mindedness scale is a 9-item scale that measures open-mindedness ($\alpha=.80$). Both scales have a 5 point Likert-type scale varying from 1 (very inaccurate) to 5 (very accurate). For the current study, the Cronbach’s Alpha for Openness was .915 and Judgement was .787.

Quest Scale. After viewing Allport's religious orientation taxonomy, Batson and Schoernarde sought to explain another category of religious involvement. Quest explains those individuals who are more open to all religions and do not claim to be a part of a particular religion because he or she is unsure of the truth of religion (Miller, 2014). This scale is a 12-item self-report measure. It includes a 7-point Likert-type scale extending from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." The total score was derived by adding the individual scores. According to Neyrinck (2010) reported an alpha coefficient of .73. For the current study, the Cronbach's Alpha was .823.

Evangelism Scale. Evangelism is the aspiration to persuade others to conform to christianity, according to Miller (2014). This measurement is 6-item Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (Not all true of me) to 5 (Totally true of me). The total score was derived by adding the individual scores. Putney et. al. (1961) reported an alpha coefficient of .91. For the current study, the Cronbach's Alpha was .897.

Devotionalism Scale. Putney and Middleton (1961) made this scale to measure how much one is devoted to his or her religion. This measurement is a 5-item Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (Not all true of me) to 5 (Totally true of me). The total score was derived by adding the individual scores. According to Nelson & Dynes (1976) reported an alpha coefficient of .93. For the current study, the Cronbach's Alpha was .637.

Revised Legal Attitudes Questionnaire. Those who previously scored high in authoritarianism express that their religious experiences and beliefs have resulted in respect for authority, a strong sense to reject sinners, and a heavy reinforcement to uphold rules of proper behavior (Altermeyer & Hunsberger, 1992). This scale is a 23-item measurement that has a scale varying from 1 (Nota at all true for me) to 5 (Totally true of

me). The total score was derived by adding the individual scores. This scale has reported an internal validity of .71 according to Kravits et. al. (1993). For the current study, the Cronbach's Alpha was .914.

Religious Fundamentalism Scale. This scale is able to place punishment if punishment is due to a sinful act. This measurement is a 12-item Likert-type scale varying from 1 (Not at all true of me) to 5 (Totally true of me). The total score was derived by adding the individual scores. Altemeyer and Hunsberger (2000) reported a correlation for this scale is .37 with a reliability of .68. For the current study, the Cronbach's Alpha was .672.

Statistical Analyses

To examine the relationship between the independent variable (religions influence on decision making) and the dependent variable (a homicide verdict: guilty versus innocent), a binary logistic regression was utilized. A binary logistic regression is employed when an independent variable predicts a dichotomous dependent variable (Statistical Solution, 2016).

Binary logistic regression analyses are known to have a "line of best fit" that has better control when compared to a linear regression when considering dichotomous variables (Statistical Solution, 2016). The assumption is that the dependent variable is dichotomous, logistic regression does not conclude a linear relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable, the independent variable does not need to be an interval, linearly related, normally distributed, nor of equal variance within each category; also, a case in a category has to be limited to only one category, and a greater sample would be required for a linear regression (Burns & Burns, 2008).

For this study, the independent variables or predictors are Dogmatism, Extrinsic and Intrinsic Inventories, Openness, Quest, Evangelism, Devotionalism, Legal Attitudes and Religious Fundamentalism. The outcome variable is a guilty or innocent verdict of a battered wife drugging her abusive husband to death.

Results

A binary logistic regression was performed to predict whether an individual would assume guilt or innocence in the defendant based on a presented homicide case; dependent variables included Dogmatism, Extrinsic and Intrinsic Inventories, Openness, Quest, Evangelism, Devotionalism, Legal attitudes, and Religious Fundamentalism. The independent variable was a guilt or innocence decision on the case. SPSS (2015) was used to interpret the results, indicating that the model tested in this study was, overall, a poor fit. This signified that the dependent variables did not predict the decision of guilt or innocence. The Nagelkerke *R* Square indicated that 18% of variance of deciding guilt or innocence was explained by the variables presented; thus 82% of variance remains unexplained by the dependent variables, meaning that the researchers need more variables to better explain the participant's verdict of guilt or innocence. However, the Hosmer and Lemeshow Test ($p > .05$) indicated that some of the variables contributed marginally to the model. Using Wald statistic ($W = 5.225$), the independent variable judgement makes a significant contribution to the model, $p = .022$. Moreover, since $\text{Exp}(B)$ is marginally less than one ($b^2 = .909$), this indicates that if the individuals exercise more judgement, they are .9 times less likely to decide if the defendant is innocence in a homicide case involving a history of domestic abuse (See Appendix D).

Discussion

The findings are contrary to results in previous studies on factors implicating decision making in the court room. Whereas previous studies found that Quest, Evangelism, Devotionalism, Revised Legal Attitudes, and Religious Fundamentalism do significantly affect decision making (Miller, 2014), the current study did not follow this pattern. Instead, the only independent variable that significantly predicted a mock juror's verdict was judgement. The current researcher added Dogmatism, Openness to Experience and Judgement/Open-Mindedness to the current study; however these scales were not included based on Miller's (2014) past research. The researcher included these dependent variables to see if they would also affect how punitive a mock juror tends to be when making a decision on a verdict. However, according to the current study none of these variables enhanced the current research as expected. In fact, as mentioned previously, Judgement was the only significant predictor variable in the current study that impacted the verdict, including scales from past research.

The finding in the current study that increased Judgement leads to a guilty verdict, although small, is consistent with literature on the influence of judgement on decision making. Ward and King (2018) suggest that intuition guides judgment, and, according to the authors, those who trust their intuition, tend to use it to aid in more punitive judgement. Moreover, the individual who incorporates judgement in their decision will adopt an automatic thinking style that is quick and unconscious, without much consideration for the consequences of their actions (Epstien, 1994). Enhancing this point, Suter and Hertwig (2011) have stated that if the participant has been allotted a short period of time to consider the case, then this too will affect his or her judgement,

resulting in decisions influenced by emotions. In the case of the current study, the participants were only allotted an hour to review the case and make a decision on whether the defendant was guilty or innocent, thus, they may have used more emotions in the decision since they needed to make the verdict quickly. Hence, in the current study this could be why judgement is significant: because it is an important aspect of decision making. Although not thoroughly documented, it may be the case that judgment outweighs religiosity for the current study, which could explain the lack of significance found in the other independent variables (Ward and King, 2018). Indeed, Miller did not research this variable; therefore, this could explain the differing trends found in the current study. This could also be an area of opportunity for future research. Moreover, seeing as this is first study to use a homicide case as its vignette, participants in the current study may be utilizing different personal features for decision making, resulting in judgement being more important than religiosity in a homicide case. Thus, future research should explore this possibility.

This study should be considered in light of its limitations. First, the participants were recruited from an online participant system. It is likely that participants who have an account with this system may present similar styles in thinking about religiosity and cases. Second, the current study is a cross sectional study rather than a longitudinal study. Therefore, this study was only able to observe a momentary judgement decision, rather than a cause-and-effect relationship. In future studies, a longitudinal study may show some benefit to the decision making process in court related judgement. Lastly, as determined through the demographics of the current study, the participants were identified as Caucasians, Some College Experience, identified mainly as Catholic or

Christian (Nondenominational), and were in their twenties or thirties. Miller's (2007, 2014) previous research has also shown demographics that favors white males and christian religiosity. Due to these patterns, a limitation is placed on these demographics. Future research may want to explore a wider range of ethnicity and religious backgrounds. Specifically, future research may want to focus sampling on ethnic minorities, individuals with either more or no education, religious minorities, or those that are middle-aged or older to find if the dependent variables show differences in how punitive mock jurors can be.

The implication of this study is for jury selection. Especially in a homicide case, including abuse, the defense team should focus less on the possible juror's religiosity and more on their judgement. As seen in the current study, judgement and its accompanying variables, such as openness and objectivity, can be more important in determining whether the defendant is guilty.

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswick, E., Levinson, D.J., & Stanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Haper & Row.
- Allport, G. W., & Ross J. M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5, 432-443.
- Altemeyer, B., & Hunsbereger, B. (1992). Authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, quest, and prejudice. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 2(2), 113-133.
- Altemeyer, B., & Hunsbereger, B. (2000). A revised religious fundamentalism scale: the short and sweet of it. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 14(1), 47-54.
- Altemeyer, B. (2002). Dogmatic Behavior Among Students: Testing a New Measure of Dogmatism. *Journals of Social Psychology*, 142(6), 713-721.
- Altemeyer, R. A. (1988). *Enemies of freedom: Understanding right-wing authoritarianism*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Applegate, B. K., Cullen, F.T., Fisher, B. S., & Vander Ven, T. (2000). Forgiveness and fundamentalism: Reconsidering the relationship between correctional attitudes and religion. *Criminology*, 38, 719-754. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9125.2000.tb00904.x
- CNN. (2004, June 15). *Juror: Sympathy spared Nichols*. Retrieved April 18, 2018, from <http://www.cnn.com/2004/LAW/06/12/nichols.react/index.html>.
- Costa, Paul T. Jr. & McCrae, Robert R. (1992). Normal personality assessment in clinical practice: The NEO personality inventory, *Psychological Assessment* 4(1):5-13.

Development, refinement and validation of a brief scale for research and counseling.

Journal of Counseling Psychology, 50(1), 84-96, doi:10.1037/0022-0167.50.1.84

Ellison, C. G.; & Sherkat, D. E. (1993). Conservative protestantism and support for corporal punishment. *American Sociological Review*, 58, 131-144. doi:

10.2307/2096222

Epstein, S. (1990). Cognitive-Experiential Self-Theory. *Handbook Personality Theory & Research*, NY: Guilfords Press.

Epstein, S. (1994). Integration of the Cognitive and the Psychodynamic Unconscious.

American Psychologist, 49, 709-724.

Epstein, S., Pacini, R., Denes-Raj, V., & Heier, H. (1996). Individual differences in intuitive-experimental and analytical-rational thinking styles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 390-405.

Grasmick, H. G., Davenport, E., Chamlin, M. G., & Bursik, R. J. Jr. (1992). Protestant fundamentalism and the retributive doctrine of punishment. *Criminology*, 30, 21-46. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9125.1992.tb01092.

Haidt, J. & Hersh, M. A. (2001). Sexual morality: The cultures and emotions of conservatives and liberals. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 31, 191-221.

Haney, C. (2004). Condemning the other in death penalty trials: Biographical racism, structural mitigation, and customers. *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*, 7, 173-190.

Johnson, S. D. (1985). Religion as a defense in mock-trial. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 125(2), 213-220.

- Johnson, S. D. (2001). Religion as a defense in a mock-jury trial. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 125*(2), 213-220
- Jones, B., Dobyanski, D. & Desforges, D. (2016). *Religious Orientation and Moral Foundation*. Huntsville, Texas: Sam Houston State University.
- Kerr, N. L., Hymes, R. W., Anderson, A. B., & Weathers, J. E. (1995). Defendants-juror similarity and mock juror judgments. *Law and Human Behavior, 19*, 545-567.
- Kravitz, D. A., Cutler, B. L. (1993). Reliability and validity of the original and revised legal attitudes questionnaire. *Law and Human Behavior, 17*, 661-677
- Leiber, M. J., & woodrick, A. C. (1997). Religious beliefs, attributional styles, and adherence to correctional orientations. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 24*, 495-511
- Marcus, D. K., Lyons, P. M., & Guyton, M. R. (2000). Studying perceptions of juror influence in vivo. A social relations analysis. *Law and Human Behavior. Vol. 24, No. 2*
- Miller, M. K. & Bronstein, B. H. (2006). The use of religion in death sentencing trials. *Law Human Behavior, 30*: 675-684. DOI 10.1007/s10979-006-9056-6
- Miller, M. K. & Hayward R. D. (2008). Religious characteristics and the death penalty. *Law and Human Behavior, 32*, 113-123. doi:10.1007/s10979-007-9090-z
- Miller, M. K., Singer, J. A. & Jehle, A. (2008). Identification of circumstances under which religion affects each stage of the trial process. *Applied Psychology on Criminal Justice, 4*(1), 135-171
- Neyrinck, B. (2010). Updating Alport's and Batson's Framework of Religious Orientation: A Reevaluation from the Perspective of Self-Determination Theory

- and Wulff's Social Cognition Model. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 49(3), 425-438.
- Pew Research Center. (2017, September 3). Retrieved from <http://www.pewforum.org/religious-landscape-study/>
- Putney S., & Middleton, R. (1961). Dimensions and correlates of religious ideologies. *Social Forces*, 39, 4, 285-290.
- Shaffer, D. R., & Case, T. (1982). On the decision to testify on one's own behalf. Effects of withheld evidence, defendant's sexual preferences and juror dogmatism on juridical decisions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42, 335-346.
- Statistics Solutions. (2016). Data analysis plan: Binary Logistic Regression [WWW Document]. Retrieved from <http://www.statisticssolutions.com/membership-resources/member-profile/data-analysis-plan-templates/binary-logistic-regression/>
- Vogel, B. (2003). Support for life in prison without the possibility of parole among death penalty proponents. *American Journal Criminal Justice*, 27, 263-275. doi: 10.1007/BF02886807
- Voss, J. (2005). The Science of Persuasion: An Exploration of Advocacy and the Science Behind the Art of Persuasion in the Courtroom. *Law & Psychology Review*, 29, 301-327
- Uelmen, G.F. (2005). Catholic jurors and the death penalty. *Journal of Catholic Legal Studies*, 44, 355-378.
- Ward, S. J., & King, L. A. (2018). Individual differences in reliance on intuition predict harsher moral judgements. *Journal of Psychology and Social Psychology*, 114, 5, 825-849.

Worthington, E. L., Jr., Berry, J. T., Hsu, K., Gowda, K. K., Bleach, E., & Bursley, K. H.

(1989, October). *Measuring religious values: Factor analytic study of the religious values survey*. Paper presented at the semi-annual meeting of the Virginia Psychological Association, Richmond.

Worthington, E. J., Wade, N. G., Hight, T. L., Ripley, J. S., McCullough, M. E., Berry, J.

W., &... O'Connor, L. (2003). The Religious Commitment Inventory—10:

Young, R. L. (1992). Religious orientation, race and support for the death penalty.

Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 31, 76-87. doi:10.2307/1386833

APPENDIX A

Vignette

A 32 year old man was reported dead on December 13, 2016. His 28-year old wife, BT, was reported missing that same day. On December 14, 2016 police filed a missing person's report. BT voluntarily came to the police on December 14th, 2016 and was involuntarily arrested for the murder of her husband.

BT was employed as a nurse at the local hospital and was well respected and admired. However, her co-workers claim to know little about her and describe her as “a loner” and “quiet.” BT could not give an emergency number of a family member while filling out paperwork at the police station and was not able to name a companion or friend that she would like to alert of her circumstances. BT claims that her “...husband preferred her to be available to him at all times, therefore she did not have time for family nor fiends.”

After hiring a lawyer and proceeding to court, BT's defense attorney stated that she is a victim of abuse from her husband, therefore BT drugged her husband to death to save her own life. She successfully killed her husband by using the drugs from the hospital medications made available to her. Every night for 6 month BT placed the drugs in his dinner. Eventually he overdosed and was pronounced dead in his bed on December 13, 2016.

Based on your review of the case, is the defendant guilty or innocent?

Guilty= 0

Innocent= 1

APPENDIX B

Demographic Table

		Frequencies	Percentages
Gender	Male	196	49.1
	Female	175	43.8
Age	18-19	5	1.3
	21-29	136	34.4
	30-39	132	33.3
	40-49	81	13.8
	50-59	54	7.0
	60-69	14	3.6
	70-72	2	.3
Ethnicity	American Indian or Alaskan Native	69	19.0
	Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	15	534.1
	Bi-racial	26	117.1
	Caucasian	207	457.0
	Multi-racial	29	7.0
Education	Some Education	1	.2
	GED	5	1.4
	Some College	158	45.4
	Some Graduate School	84	24.1
	Master's Degree	88	25.2
	Doctoral Degree	3	.8

APPENDIX C

Religiosity Table

Religion	Frequencies	Percentages
Agnostic	49	12.6
Assembly of God	4	1.0
Atheist	25	6.4
Baptist	21	5.4
Buddhism	21	5.4
Catholic (Roman catholic)	68	17.5
Church of Christ	11	2.8
Christian (non-Denominational)	68	17.5
Eastern Orthodox	1	.2
Episcopal	1	.2
Hindu	63	16.2
Islam	16	4.1
Jehovah's Witness	1	.2
Judaism	3	.7
Latter Day Saints	4	1.0
Lutheran	2	.5
Methodist	5	1.2
Pentecostal	3	.7
Seventh Day Adventist	1	.2
Other	20	5.1

APPENDIX D

Variables in the Equation

	B	S.E	Wald	df	P	Exp(B)	95% CI	95% CI
							Lower	Upper
Quest	.002	.011	.019	1	.891	.002	.977	1.111
Evangelism	.035	.065	.283	1	.595	1.035	.906	1.171
Devotionalism	.039	.054	.525	1	.469	1.040	.938	1.158
Revised Legal	.036	.020	3.353	1	.67	1.036	.997	1.076
Dog	.015	.016	.890	1	.345	1.015	.986	1.050
Intrapersonal	-.014	.041	.118	1	.731	.986	.795	1.093
Interpersonal	-.073	.078	.880	1	.348	.929	.893	1.079
Openness	-.007	.034	.046	1	.830	.993	.939	1.081
Judgement	-.085	.041	4.361	1	.037	.918	.838	.987
Constant	-2.685	2.011	1.782	1	.182	.068		

VITA

Danielle Elizabeth Dobyanski

EDUCATION

Masters of Arts student in General Psychology at Sam Houston State University, August 2016- present. Thesis title: “An Examination of the Relation between Religiosity and Decision Making”

Bachelors of Science in Psychology at Sam Houston State University

ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT

August 2016 – present, Graduate Assistant
Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, TX 77340

Duties:

Assist with course grading and student interaction in, History of Psychology (4 semester), Human Sexuality (2 semesters) and Close Relations (2 semesters), Psychology and Law (2 semester)

Respond to student questions

Provide assistance with course planning and assignments

Guest lecturer for History of Psychology over Aggression.

Trained new graduate assistants in course management, grading techniques and time management

PUBLICATIONS

Jones, B., Dobyanski, D. & Desforges, D. (2016). Religious Orientation and Moral Foundation. Huntsville, Texas: Sam Houston State University

Chumchal, M. & Dobyanski, D. (In preogress). Psychopathy and Gratitude. Huntsville, Texas: Sam Houston State University

Langley, H., Chumchal, M., Billeiter, K. B., Smith, M., & Dobyanski, D. (In progress). How do race/ethnicity and privilege differences predict parents’ ideas about children’s gratitude.