

## Article

# Identity Styles and Readiness to Enter into Interreligious Dialogue: The Moderating Function of Religiosity

Elżbieta Rydz \* and Jakub Romaneczko

Faculty of Social Sciences, Institute of Psychology, The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, 20-950 Lublin, Poland

\* Correspondence: elzbieta.rydz@kul.pl

**Abstract:** The aim of the study was to research moderating function of religiosity in the relationship between identity styles and the readiness to enter into interreligious dialogue in people in early, middle, and late adulthood. The result of the identity integration processes is the achievement by an adult of a specific identity style, characterized by varying levels of openness to new information and experiences, including in the area of recognized values, especially religious ones. Previous studies have addressed the problem of the relationship between identity styles and religiosity, while a clear research gap can be noticed in the search for connections between identity styles and openness to religious diversity, religious tolerance and readiness to enter into interreligious dialogue. However, relationships between identity styles and personality openness to experience have been found, which refers to, inter alia, to tolerance and exploration of the unknown. It has been shown that the informational identity style is positively associated with openness to experience, as well as with caring, the need to know, and openness to ideas. Contemporary theoretical models emphasize that the religiosity of an individual can act as a contextual framework that gives meaning and directs the individual in their interpretation, understanding, and response to life experiences. In this paper, it was assumed that the religiosity of an individual may play a moderating role in the relationship between identity styles and the readiness to enter into interreligious dialogue. The study was conducted using the Test of readiness to enter into interreligious dialogue (TGDM), Identity Style Inventory (ISI-5) and The Duke University religion index (DUREL). The study involved 450 people in early, middle, and late adulthood, maintaining the gender ratio. Statistically significant positive correlations were obtained between informational identity style and all dimensions of readiness to enter interreligious dialogue and a negative correlation of this style with personal barriers to dialogue symmetry. The moderating function of religiosity for the relationship between identity styles and readiness to enter interreligious dialogue was confirmed for three relationships.



**Citation:** Rydz, Elżbieta, and Jakub Romaneczko. 2022. Identity Styles and Readiness to Enter into Interreligious Dialogue: The Moderating Function of Religiosity. *Religions* 13: 1046. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel13111046>

Academic Editor: Beata Zarzycka

Received: 30 September 2022

Accepted: 28 October 2022

Published: 2 November 2022

**Publisher's Note:** MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



**Copyright:** © 2022 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

**Keywords:** identity styles; interreligious dialogue; religiosity; adulthood

## 1. Introduction

Most members of Polish society declare that they are Catholic, which means that Polish society is, to a large extent, a monolithic religious community. At the same time, intensive socio-cultural transformations are taking place, such as progressive globalization, building information cyberspace, educational and economic migration, secularization, and in recent months the opening of the border for refugees from Ukraine and many others. Psychologists empirically find an important function of positive experiences in the field of intercultural social contacts in shaping interreligious openness. From the perspective of identity development—the effect of its integration processes is the achievement by an adult of a specific identity style (Berzonsky 2008, 2011), characterized by a different level of openness to new information and experiences, including in the area of recognized values. Such a socially significant value is religious tolerance and readiness to enter into dialogue with the followers of other religions. Meanwhile, theorists emphasize that the personal

religiosity of an individual can act as a contextual framework that gives meaning and directs the individual in their interpretation, understanding and reaction to life experiences (Pargament 1997; Park and Slattery 2013; Gall et al. 2005; Streib and Klein 2014).

The aim of our research is to find an answer to the question of whether religiosity plays a moderating role in the relationship between identity styles and the readiness to enter the interreligious dialogue.

### 1.1. Identity Styles

Research shows that people naturally make a more favorable impression on members of their own group than on members of other groups, and they favor people with whom they share a common cultural or group identity (Efferson et al. 2008). From the perspective of social identity theory, individuals prefer people with common identity traits, e.g., show more favorable attitudes or devote more resources to members of their own group than to members of an outside group (Rubin and Hewstone 1998).

From the perspective of the development of individual identity—the effect of the processes of its integration is the achievement by an adult of a specific identity style (Berzonsky 2011; Berzonsky et al. 2013), characterized by a different level of openness to new information and experiences, including in the area of recognized values. In order to describe the processual aspect of identity, Berzonsky refers to the categories of social-cognitive identity processing strategies, which are organized sets of more elementary cognitive and behavioral responses that an individual uses to process and deal with information and conflicts relating to identity (Berzonsky et al. 2013). Berzonsky et al. (2013) distinguish four styles of identity: informative, normative, and diffuse-avoidant. He also distinguishes commitment, providing the individual with a sense of purpose and direction. People with the dominant information style are self-reflective, actively seeking information related to the self; they explore, are critical, open to new information, and willing to check and possibly modify aspects of their identity. In studies of people with this identity style, there were connections between the information style, e.g., cognitive curiosity, a tendency to introspection, self-autonomy, high tolerance of discrepancies, consideration of alternative strategies, and openness to new information and new values (Crocetti et al. 2009; Krettenauer 2005). People with a predominant normative style take over expectations, values, and rules concerning effective and desirable forms of social behavior from significant people and implement lifestyles and values adopted from others without their prior exploration, and they are conformist. Normative style positively correlates with automatic thinking, ruminative focus on behavior resulting from the need for social acceptance, low tolerance of discrepancies, high need for cognitive closure, low need for self-reflection, and low cognitive curiosity (Berzonsky 2008; Teglasi and Epstein 1998; Kruglanski and Webster 1996). Diffusion-avoidance processing style is characterized by postponing decision-making, reluctance to confront problems, a reduced level of coping with unpleasant decision-making situations, personal problems and identity conflicts, a weakened sense of control, and the occurrence of chaotic, contradictory options hindering rational judgments and choices. On the basis of the research conducted so far, it can be concluded that, especially for the diffuse-avoidant style, the results are unsystematic. Positive correlations were obtained with the need for cognitive closure, low need for self-reflection, anxiety, and neuroticism (Berzonsky and Kuk 2005; Crocetti et al. 2009; Krettenauer 2005).

### 1.2. Interreligious Dialogue

The research conducted so far shows that an important starting point for the dialogue between particular social groups is the mutual interest in the interaction partner, the culture of other groups, its history, customs, and religion. Object-oriented interpersonal dialogue is an example of social dialogue. Gorsky and Caspi (2005, p. 140) defined this type of dialogue as “a discursive relationship between two participants characterized by thought-provoking activities such as hypothesizing, asking questions, interpreting, explaining, evaluating

and reconsidering issues or problems about which speech “, maintaining the attitude of acceptance of the dignity and freedom of every human being and his right to express his views (even if they are objectively wrong) due to, for example, ideological diversity, freedom of conscience or religion (Łukaszyk 1979).

Previous studies have already formulated constructs with the content of a readiness to undertake interreligious dialogue, such as religious tolerance (e.g., Putnam et al. 2010; Van der Straten Waillet and Roskam 2013; Van Tongeren et al. 2016), ecumenism as the dimension of the seeking attitude (Beck and Jessup 2004), the attitude towards religious diversity (e.g., Francis et al. 2012; Gawali and Khattar 2016), xenosophia (Streib and Klein 2018); and prejudices in relationships interreligious (Eka Putra 2016; Hunsberger and Jackson 2005; Klein et al. 2018). Most of them, however, concern the global attitude towards the followers of other religions (religious other).

Starting from the psycholinguistic definition of dialogue (Clark 1996), Rydz and Bartczuk (Rydz et al. 2020) developed a definition of the construct of readiness to engage in interreligious dialogue, which means a person’s mental readiness to start a conversation on religious topics with a person of another religion. This definition covers four aspects of dialogue: (1) dyadicity, which implies a certain level of general interest in religion; (2) symmetry, which assumes an attitude of tolerance and respect for others, acceptance of one’s own and others’ right to have and express one’s views; (3) understanding, which implies interest in others, willingness to get to know them and understanding; (4) commitment, which is based on a positive motivation to cooperate with people of other religions and reflects the readiness to jointly pursue goals and take actions to reach an agreement (Rydz et al. 2020).

Research shows that openness to religious diversity is related to cognitive openness, cognitive need (Watson et al. 2015), mental openness (Gawali and Khattar 2016), and intellectual humility (Hook et al. 2017). Religious tolerance is positively correlated with openness to experience, imagination, artistic sensitivity, rich emotionality, cognitive curiosity, plasticity in behavior, and non-dogmatic nature (Kruglanski and Webster 1996; Altemeyer 1996; Van der Straten Waillet and Roskam 2013). The attitude towards religious otherness positively correlated with mental openness and plasticity (Gawali and Khattar 2016). Negative relations with religious openness, religious tolerance, and religious pluralism showed: cognitive closure, dogmatism, authoritarianism, submission to authority, general aggressiveness, and submission to social conventions (Kruglanski and Webster 1996; Altemeyer 1996; Van der Straten Waillet and Roskam 2013).

### 1.3. Religiosity

In contemporary theoretical models, factors related to spirituality and religiosity provide a contextual framework that guides an individual’s interpretation, comprehension, and response to life experiences (cf. Gall et al. 2005). Religiousness and spirituality can play a significant role in creating meaning in relation to attitudes and beliefs about the world, oneself, and others (Park 2005). The religious and spiritual process of giving meaning or searching for meaning in an event can involve all aspects of life, including work, interpersonal relationships, general philosophy of life, and attitudes to what a person’s “God” may be (Pargament 1997). Researchers emphasize that giving religious meaning depends, among others, on the level of religious maturity (Allport and Ross 1967; Allport 1988) or the centrality of religiosity in the system of personality constructs (Huber and Huber 2012). In Allport’s concept, external religious orientation is treated as an immature form of instrumental approach to religion aimed at satisfying the need for security, support, or social status, while internal religious orientation is a form of religiosity, characteristic of people who made faith the primary motive of their existence, binding all other areas of life (Allport and Ross 1967). Allport’s theory of religiosity underlies many modern conceptions of religiosity (Batson 1976; Huber and Huber 2012; Koenig and Büssing 2010, among others). Batson (1976) extended this concept to a seeking religious orientation that was intended to reflect aspects of religiosity such as complexity, temporality, and openness to the dilemmas

of faith. [Koenig and Büssing \(2010\)](#), referring to Allport's concept of internal and external religiosity, proposed an original model of the dimensions of religiosity, in which they distinguished: organizational religious activity, including public religious activity, such as participation in religious services or participation in other religious activities related to the group (prayer groups, Scripture study groups, etc.), non-organizational religious activity, including religious activities performed privately, such as praying, studying Scripture, watching religious television or listening to religious radio, as well as interior religiosity, described as a degree of personal religious commitment or motivation.

#### 1.4. Identity Styles vs. Religiosity

A review of the contemporary literature on the subject of the relationship of identity styles with religious openness and tolerance shows that most studies on identity styles concern their connections with religiosity itself, and the measurement of various dimensions of religiosity may indicate a different level of religious openness of the respondents.

It has been revealed that there is a relationship between identity styles and religiosity, namely the normative identity style is positively related to the dimension of religiosity only vs. inclusion of Transcendence, the informative style positively correlated with the literal vs. symbolic understanding of religious content, while the diffuse-avoidant identity style negatively correlated with the literal vs. symbolic understanding of religious content in youth research ([Duriez et al. 2004](#)). These researchers also found that the relationship between openness to experience and the dimension of literal vs. symbolic understanding of religious content was fully mediated by the informational style of identity ([Duriez et al. 2004](#)). According to the researchers, this means that young people who use the informational identity style tend to interpret religious content in a personal and symbolic way and are also able to critically assess whether certain religious content corresponds to their personal self-definition ([Berzonsky 1990](#)). Respondents who use the diffuse-avoidant identity style tend to interpret religious content literally and avoid questioning difficult and personal religious issues. People with a normative identity style are more religious, which is reflected in the correlation between exclusion and the inclusion of Transcendence, especially in the context of religious tradition. They also show a slight tendency to interpret religious phenomena literally. This confirms the theory of [Berzonsky \(1990\)](#), who claims that people using the normative style of identity are prone to adapt to the recommendations and norms of significant people, reference groups, authorities, and traditions. [Boogar and Haghparvar \(2014\)](#), searching for the predictive role of identity styles on the religious orientation of college students, revealed that the normative identity style and informational identity style had a significant role in predicting internal religious orientation, and the diffuse-avoidant identity style had a significant role in predicting external religious orientation.

In studies taking into account the age variable, it turned out that the general level of religiosity did not significantly differentiate the development groups of people in adolescence and early adulthood, but it was explained differently by identity styles at individual development stages. The results of moderation analyses suggest that in adolescence, the informational style strengthens, while the diffuse-avoidant style, on the contrary—reduces the intensity of religiosity, while the normative style strengthens religiosity in all respondents, with the strongest effect in early adulthood ([Gurba et al. 2022](#)).

Higher scores on the informational identity style were associated with stronger faith and higher scores on all measures of spiritual exploration ([Gebelt et al. 2009](#)). Higher normative style scores were associated with stronger faith and less value ascribed to religious doubts. Anxiety related to identity was associated with greater questioning of beliefs and waiting for them to change in the future ([Gebelt et al. 2009](#)). A correlation between the level of religiosity and the identity style was also found in students of Islam; the normative style was a positive one, and the diffuse-unique style was a negative predictor of their level of religiosity ([Grajales and Sommers 2016](#)).

On the other hand, some studies do not find a correlation between identity dimensions and indicators of religious maturity ([Parker 1985](#); [Markstrom 1999](#); [Puffer et al. 2008](#)), while

others report a lower level of religious orientation in adolescents with mature identity compared to their peers in diffuse identity status (Foster and Laforce 1999). The sources of the aforementioned inconsistencies include a significant diversity of both theoretical approaches and tools used in research on identity and religiosity, as well as the fact that these relations were tested in various stages of life.

### 1.5. Integration of Identity vs. Religious Openness

Research on the links between general integration of social identity and tolerance towards people with different views revealed that individuals with a higher level of general identity integration tend to have a higher interpersonal tolerance to perceive a higher level of individual and shared benefits, which, according to the author of the study, may signal greater trust and confidence and readiness to adopt the negotiating partner perspective (Huff 2019).

Until now, the links between identity styles and tolerance or openness to religious diversity have not been directly dealt with, but the relationships between religious tolerance and personality traits have been explored; the results obtained in this area of research illustrate important tendencies and analogies to the connections we are looking for.

Numerous studies have shown that the informational identity style is positively associated with personality openness to experience, which refers to tolerance and exploration of the unknown and the appreciation of new experiences for themselves (Collinger 1995; Duriez et al. 2004), as well as with caring, the need to know, and openness to ideas, values, and actions (Berzonsky and Sullivan 1992). In turn, the normative style is negatively associated with openness to experience (Berzonsky and Sullivan 1992; Collinger 1995) and positively with the need for cognitive structure and closure (Berzonsky and Adams 1999). Finally, the diffuse-avoidant style tends to be negatively associated with openness to experience (Berzonsky and Sullivan 1992). The informational style turned out to be a strong mediator of the relationship between openness to experience and the dimension of literal vs. symbolic understanding of religious content, while the negative relationship between openness to experience and inclusion vs. the exclusion of Transcendence was mediated by the normative style of identity, which suggests that the informational style, combined with openness to experience, strengthens the symbolic and universal understanding of religious content, while the normative style of identity favors a literal, literal perception of religious content (Duriez and Soenens 2006).

Research among Omani youth has revealed that religion is one of the most significant components of the identity of Oman high school students. Participants use religion to define their relationships with those who have different religious beliefs and to define their tolerance towards them (Al Sadia and Basit 2013). Data analysis revealed that there were statistically significant differences between the experimental group of respondents who participated in the activities devoted to clarifying the similarities between religions compared to those in the control group who did not participate in such activities. In turn, research by Schwabb, conducted in the USA, showed that when young adults considered the features of a good life more than any particular belief system, they valued the values of individualism, relativism, pluralism, and tolerance (Schwab 2016).

## 2. Religiousness vs. Religious Tolerance

Researchers pay attention to the contribution of positive experiences in the field of intercultural social contacts in shaping inter-religious openness. Ciftci et al. (2015) noticed that religious tolerance increases with the number of global contacts. On the other hand, in religiously monolithic communities, there may be difficulties in understanding and accepting different worldviews. In trying to explain these social processes, researchers refer to the Social Identification Theory, which says that we have a general tendency to favor members of our own group and to discriminate against an individual from outside the group (Tajfel and Turner 1986; Van der Straten Waillet and Roskam 2013). The religious commitment may reduce or intensify religious prejudices (Burch-Brown and Baker 2016).

The predictors of the attitude towards religious diversity were religiosity about the image of God as loving and merciful (Francis et al. 2012). The measurement of religious fundamentalism revealed its negative correlation with cognitive openness (Watson et al. 2015), while religious intolerance is associated with the dimension of religious orthodoxy (Powell and Clarke 2013).

The problem of xenosophy was taken up by Streib and Klein (2018) in his research. In his concept, the author refers to the model of religion-as-schema (religion-as-schema by McIntosh (1995)), which is the result of research on religious coping and religious meanings. A religious schema is defined as a cognitive pattern of seeking and preferring specific interpretations of past experiences and constructing interpretations of the events to be performed. In a study of adolescents on interreligious prejudices: anti-Islamic and anti-Semitic (Streib and Klein 2014), it was found that the religious dimension of the truth of texts and teaching is related to and is a predictor of anti-Islamic and anti-Semitic prejudices, while the xenosophia/interreligious dialogue dimension is related to and is a predictor of disagreement with interreligious prejudices.

To sum up, it can be stated that there is a need to conduct research looking for connections between identity styles and readiness to enter into interreligious dialogue in the context of the personal religiosity of the respondents.

### 3. Method

After analyzing the literature on the subject, a research problem was posed in the form of two questions:

- Are there connections between identity styles and the willingness to enter into interreligious dialogue?
- Is religiosity a moderator of the relationship between identity styles and the readiness to enter into interreligious dialogue?

*Research hypotheses:*

**H.1.** *There are associations between identity styles and readiness to enter into interreligious dialogue.*

**H.2.** *Religiousness is a moderator of the relationships between identity styles and readiness to enter into interreligious dialogue.*

*Instruments:*

The following measures were used:

#### 3.1. Test of Readiness to Enter into Interreligious Dialogue (TGDM)

Test of readiness to enter the interreligious dialogue (TGDM) by Rydz and Bartczuk (Rydz et al. 2020). It was created on the basis of the author's concept of interreligious dialogue. The test consists of 36 test items rated on a six-point scale: −3—definitely not, −2—no, −1—probably not, 1—probably yes, 2—yes, and 3—definitely yes. The test consists of four subscales: (1) readiness to exchange views on religious topics, (2) readiness to seek mutual understanding, (3) readiness to communicate with representatives of other religions, and (4) barriers to the symmetry of dialogue.

TGDM1 Readiness to communicate on religious topics includes: (a) engaging in conversations about religious topics, (b) a subjective sense of personal openness in a religious conversation, and (c) subjective feeling of ease/difficulty in sharing thoughts about faith.

TGDM2 Readiness to seek mutual understanding includes: (a) openness to understanding the religious views of another person, (b) respect for dissenting views, (c) ability to listen to the other person's position until the end, and (d) belief in the value of good communication (conversation) in resolving ambiguities, religious conflicts.

TGDM3 Readiness to communicate with representatives of other religions includes (a) ease of establishing contacts with people of other religious views, (b) interest in talking

to people of other religious views, and (c) ease of taking the perspective of a person of other religious views,

TGDM4 Barriers to the symmetry of dialogue—the scale includes: (a) a sense of difficulty in accepting different views, (b) a feeling of discomfort when confronted with a person with different religious views, (c) feeling anger when confronted with a person with different religious views, and (d) feeling of being dominant in a confrontation with a person of different religious views.

The test is theoretically accurate. The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient is: for TGDM1,  $\alpha = 0.91$ ; for TGDM2,  $\alpha = 0.89$ ; for TGDM3,  $\alpha = 0.80$ ; for TGDM4,  $\alpha = 0.82$  (Rydz et al. 2020). Reliability was also measured for the group of respondents surveyed in this study ( $N = 450$ ); the following reliability indicators were obtained: for TGDM1,  $\alpha = 0.86$ ; for TGDM2,  $\alpha = 0.89$ ; for TGDM3,  $\alpha = 0.82$ ; for TGDM4,  $\alpha = 0.80$ .

### 3.2. Identity Style Inventory (ISI-5)

Identity Style Inventory (ISI-5) by Berzonsky et al. (2013) in the Polish adaptation by A. Senejko and Z.Łoś was used to measure identity. The questionnaire contains 36 diagnostic items, divided into three scales: the information identity style (SI), the normative identity style (SN), the diffuse-avoidant identity style (SDU) (each scale includes 9 items), and the scale of involvement (nine items). The answers are given on a five-point scale, where 1 is assigned the answer "definitely does not suit me", and 5 "definitely describes me" (Senejko and Łoś 2015). Examples of items on the information style scale include: „14. I spend a lot of time reading and talking to others, trying to develop my own value system., "Normative Style Scale: „7. I strive to achieve the goals that my family and friends set for me.", The Diffuse-Avoidant Style Scale: „16. I do not think about my future at all because it is distant for me. " And the scale of my involvement: „1. In fact, I know what my beliefs are". The questionnaire has satisfactory psychometric properties and reliability of the scales: information,  $\alpha = 0.77$ ; diffusive-avoidant,  $\alpha = 0.71$ ; normative,  $\alpha = 0.68$ ; involvement,  $\alpha = 0.80$ .

### 3.3. The Duke University Religion Index (DUREL)

The Duke University Religion Index (DUREL) is a five-item measure of religious commitment. The questionnaire assesses three main dimensions of religiosity: organizational religious activity, non-organizational religious activity, and internal religiosity. Organizational religious activity includes public religious activity such as attending church services or participating in other group-related religious activities (prayer groups, Scripture study groups, etc.). Unorganized religious activity includes religious activities performed privately, such as praying, studying the Scriptures, watching religious television, or listening to religious radio. Internal religiosity describes the degree of personal religious commitment or religious motivation. The scale has satisfactory validity and reliability indicators (Cronbach's alpha  $\alpha = 0.78$ – $0.91$ ).

## 4. Participants

A total of 450 individuals aged from 20 to 79 years were surveyed, maintaining a proper balance between genders. The survey was conducted online via the survey panel, in line with psychological testing standards.

## 5. Results

In the first stage of the analysis, the first hypothesis was tested. All analyses refer to the intensity level of the variable. Pearson's correlation ( $r$ ) between the variables was calculated (Table 1).

**Table 1.** Kolmogorov–Smirnov test and Pearson’s r correlation matrix between religiosity (DUREL), identity styles (ISI-5), and readiness to enter interreligious dialogue (TGDM).

	DKR	DOZ	DIR	DB	SI	SN	SDU	Z	RW	RZ	RNZ	K-S (df = 483)	
												D	p
DKR	-											0.046	0.015
DOZ	0.447 **	-										0.123	<0.001
DIR	0.792 **	0.631 **	-									0.074	<0.001
DB	0.310 **	-0.241 **	0.141 **	-								0.131	<0.001
SI	0.360 **	0.533 **	0.398 **	-0.091 *	-							0.061	<0.001
SN	0.160 **	-0.028	0.065	0.377 **	0.294 **	-						0.073	<0.001
SDU	0.089	-0.200 **	0.014	0.515 **	-0.146 **	0.385 **	-					0.080	<0.001
Z	0.166 **	0.294 **	0.166 **	-0.235 **	0.574 **	0.194 **	-0.488 **	-				0.102	<0.001
RW	0.300 **	0.036	0.142 **	0.200 **	0.119 **	0.280 **	-0.002	0.191 **	-			0.095	<0.001
RZ	0.236 **	-0.024	0.078	0.226 **	0.070	0.343 **	0.080	0.114 *	0.689 **	-		0.174	<0.001
RNZ	0.247 **	0.105 *	0.140 **	0.106 *	0.140 **	0.233 **	-0.039	0.155 **	0.631 **	0.607 **	-	0.289	<0.001

DKR—readiness to communicate on religious topics, DOZ—readiness to seek mutual understanding, DIR—readiness to communicate with followers of other religions, DB—personal barriers to the symmetry of dialogue; SI—information identity style, SN—normative identity style, SDU—diffuse-avoidance identity style, Z—commitment; RW—internal religiosity; RZ—organized religiosity, RNZ—disorganized religiosity; K-S—Kolmogorov–Smirnov; \*  $p < 0.05$ ; \*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

The distribution of all study variables was significantly different from normal, as indicated by the results of the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test. However, the sample size justifies the use of Pearson’s r correlation coefficient. Statistically significant positive correlations were obtained between the information identity style (SI) and readiness to communicate on religious topics (DKR), readiness to seek mutual understanding (DOZ), and readiness to communicate with followers of other religions (DIR), and a negative correlation of the information style with personal barriers for dialogue symmetry (DB).

Analyzing the results, we can see a weak, positive correlation between the normative style (SN) and the readiness to communicate on religious topics (DKR) and a positive correlation between the normative style and personal barriers to the symmetry of dialogue (DB). Similarly, a weak negative correlation of the diffuse-avoidant style of identity with the readiness to seek mutual agreement (DOZ) and a statistically significant positive correlation of the diffuse-avoidant style with personal barriers to dialogue symmetry (DB) was obtained. Likewise, the involvement dimension (Z) correlates positively with all scales of readiness to enter interreligious dialogue (DKR, DOZ, and DIR) and negatively with personal barriers to the symmetry of dialogue (DB).

In addition, the links between the dimensions of religiosity and the dimensions of readiness to enter into interreligious dialogue and identity styles were examined. We obtained weak, positive correlations of internal religiosity and disorganized religiosity with readiness to communicate on religious topics (DKR), readiness to communicate with followers of other religions (DIR), and personal barriers to the symmetry of dialogue (DB). We also notice a weak positive correlation of organized religiosity with readiness to communicate on religious topics (DKR) and personal barriers to the symmetry of dialogue (DB). It is worth mentioning that internal (RW) and disorganized religiosity (RNZ) correlate poorly with the information identity style (SI), normative identity style (SN), and commitment (Z). Organized religiosity (RZ) correlates as well with the normative identity style (SN) and the tendency to positively associate external religiosity with commitment (Z).

In order to verify the second hypothesis concerning the relationship between identity styles and the readiness to enter into interreligious dialogue, taking into account such moderators as religiosity (including internal religiosity of the RW, unorganized religiosity of the RNZ, and organized religiosity of the RZ) as well as the age (W) and gender of the respondents, moderation analysis using the Process macro (Hayes 2018). To estimate the effects, a regression model with 5000 bootstrapping sampling and a 95% confidence interval was used. Models were tested by analyzing the interaction between identity styles (explanatory variable) and the readiness to enter interreligious dialogue (explained variable) with the introduction of religiosity as a moderator (Tables 2–4).



**Table 2.** Internal religiousness as a moderator of the relationships between identity styles and readiness to enter into interreligious dialogue.

Explanatory Variable (X)	Explained Variable (Y)	b (SE)	t	p	R <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup> Change	F(df)	95% CI
Normative identity style (SN)	Readiness to exchange views on religious topics (DKR)	0.18 (0.08)	2.23	0.026	0.11	0.009	4.98 (1.479)	0.0218; 0.3421

**Table 3.** Organized religiousness as a moderator of the relationships between identity styles and readiness to enter into interreligious dialogue.

Explanatory Variable (X)	Explained Variable (Y)	b (SE)	t	p	R <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup> Change	F(df)	95% CI
Normative identity style (SN)	Readiness to exchange views on religious topics (DKR)	0.13 (0.07)	1.99	0.047	0.07	0.008	3.97 (1.479)	0.0018; 0.2676

**Table 4.** Organized religiousness as a moderator of the relationships between identity styles and readiness to enter into interreligious dialogue.

Explanatory Variable (X)	Explained Variable (Y)	b (SE)	t	p	R <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup> Change	F(df)	95% CI
Information identity style (SI)	Readiness to seek mutual understanding (DOZ)	−0.1 (0.05)	−2.08	0.038	0.29	0.006	4.34 (1.479)	−0.1919; −0.0056
Commitment (Z)	Readiness to exchange views on religious topics (DKR)	0.11 (0.05)	2.08	0.038	0.09	0.008	4.32 (1.479)	0.0061; 0.2194

Intrinsic religiosity proved to be a positive moderator of the relationship between normative style (SN) and willingness to communicate on religious topics (DKR) ( $b = 0.18$ ,  $p < 0.05$ , 95% CI from 0.0218 to 0.3421,  $R^2 = 0.11$ ), the moderator improving the association of the explained variable with the explanatory variable by 1%.

Statistical analysis revealed that organized religiosity is a positive moderator of the relationship between normative identity style (SN) and willingness to communicate about religious topics (DKR) ( $b = 0.13$ ,  $p < 0.05$ , 95% CI from 0.0018 to 0.2676,  $R^2 = 0.07$ ), the moderator improves the association of the explained variable with the explanatory variable by 1%.

Analysis of the moderating function of unorganized religiosity in the relationship between information identity style and readiness to seek mutual agreement (DOZ) shows a negative moderating effect ( $b = -0.1$ ,  $p < 0.05$ , 95% CI from −0.1919 to −0.0056,  $R^2 = 0.29$ ), the moderator decreases the association of the explained variable with the explanatory variable by 1%.

In contrast, unorganized religiosity appears as a positive moderator of the relationship between commitment and willingness to communicate about religious topics ( $b = 0.11$ ,  $p < 0.05$ , 95% CI from 0.0061 to 0.2194,  $R^2 = 0.09$ ); the moderator improves the association of the explained variable with the explanatory variable by 1%.

## 6. Results and Discussion

The aim of the study was to research moderating function of religiosity in the relationship between identity styles and the readiness to enter into interreligious dialogue in people in early, middle, and late adulthood. The research is based on the concept of Berzonsky's identity styles (Berzonsky 2011), the concept of interreligious dialogue by Rydz and Bartczuk (Rydz et al. 2020), and the concept of religiosity by Koenig and Büssing (2010), derived from Allport's theory of mature religious sense (Allport and Ross 1967).

The obtained results confirmed the validity of the first hypothesis, assuming the existence of relationships between identity styles and the dimensions of readiness to enter an interreligious dialogue. In accordance with the assumptions of the theory of identity styles and the results of previous research, different patterns of connections were obtained depending on the identity style.

The most positive associations with readiness to enter interreligious dialogue were obtained by respondents with an information identity style—positive correlations were obtained between the information identity style (SI) and readiness to communicate on religious topics (DKR), readiness to seek mutual understanding (DOZ) and readiness to communicate with followers of other religions (DIR). Moreover, this identity style (SI) negatively correlated with personal barriers to dialogue symmetry (DB). This means that people with an information identity style, characterized, according to the author of the concept, by high self-reflection, active searching for new information, healthy criticism and openness to modifying their own views, high openness to new ideas and experiences, show a tendency to engage in conversations on religious topics with people of their faith and other faiths, with a tendency to maintain symmetry and with a commitment to seeking mutual understanding.

The normative style of identity turned out to be less favorable for an individual's readiness to enter into interreligious dialogue: a weak, positive correlation was obtained between the normative style (SN) and the readiness to communicate on religious topics (DKR), and a positive correlation between the normative style and personal barriers to the symmetry of dialogue (DB). This means that people with a normative style of identity, which, according to the author of the concept, are characterized by the adoption of values, principles, lifestyles, conformism, and a low level of individual exploration from people who are significant to them, may engage in conversations on religious topics with people of the same religion, (DKR), while they may feel barriers in conversing with a person of another religion (DB) on religious topics.

The results revealed that the diffuse-avoidant style (SDU) turned out to be the least favorable for undertaking interreligious dialogue: a weak, negative SDU correlation with the readiness to seek mutual agreement (DOZ) was obtained and a statistically significant positive correlation between the diffuse-avoidant style and personal barriers to the symmetry of the dialogue (DB). According to Berzonsky (2008), the diffuse-avoidant style is characterized by an individual's tendency to postpone decision-making, reluctance to confront problems, a reduced level of coping with difficult situations, and the presence of chaotic, opposing options hindering rational judgments and choices. In our research, this type of identity coexists with a reduced readiness to seek mutual understanding in a conversation with a follower of another religion and a subjective sense of personal barriers to the symmetry of interreligious dialogue.

In the dimension of commitment, providing the individual with a sense of purpose and direction (Z), weak positive correlations were obtained with all scales of readiness to enter interreligious dialogue (DKR, DOZ, DIR) and negative with personal barriers to the symmetry of dialogue (DB), which indicates that this dimension can play an important role in readiness to enter into interreligious dialogue. These results are worth further scientific exploration.

The obtained results are consistent with the assumptions of Berzonsky's (1990, 2008) socio-cognitive concepts of identity processing strategies, according to which the effect of identity consolidation processes is the achievement by an adult of a specific identity

style, characterized by a different level of openness to new information and experiences, including in the area of recognized values. The information style is characterized by the highest degree of openness to new experiences, also in the area of religious values, which, in the light of the results obtained by us, gives the greatest cognitive and social opportunities to enter into interreligious dialogue with a person of another religion. The two remaining styles are characterized by lower openness to new information: normative and diffuse-avoidant, which in the light of the results obtained by us, is expressed in a tendency towards a lower readiness to undertake interreligious dialogue (cf. [Berzonsky 1990, 2008](#)).

So far, the links between the level of identity integration and religious tolerance have not been dealt with directly, but the relationships between religious tolerance and personality traits have been explored. A review of research in this field allows for the observation of analogies in the obtained results. In our results, the highest rates of readiness to enter into interreligious dialogue were achieved by the information style, characterized by the greatest cognitive openness. Similarly, in the study of personality traits, researchers obtained positive associations of religious tolerance with cognitive openness, cognitive need ([Watson et al. 2015](#)), and mental openness ([Gawali and Khattar 2016](#)), and intellectual humility ([Hook et al. 2017](#)), openness to experience, cognitive curiosity, plasticity in behavior and non-dogmatic nature ([Kruglanski and Webster 1996](#); [Altemeyer 1996](#); [Van der Straten Waillet and Roskam 2013](#)).

In our research, the normative style and the diffuse-avoidant style, characterized by a higher closure to new information and experiences, showed insignificant or negative relations with selected dimensions of readiness to enter an interreligious dialogue. Analogous studies of personality traits in relation to religious openness, religious tolerance, and religious pluralism revealed their correlation with cognitive closure, authoritarianism, submission to authority, and submission to social conventions (cf. [Kruglanski and Webster 1996](#); [Altemeyer 1996](#); [Van der Straten Waillet and Roskam 2013](#)).

Additionally, the relationship between religiosity and the dimensions of readiness to enter into interreligious dialogue and with identity styles was analyzed.

We obtained weak, positive correlations of internal religiosity and disorganized religiosity with readiness to communicate on religious topics (DKR), readiness to communicate with followers of other religions (DIR), and personal barriers to the symmetry of dialogue (DB), which means that people with a high degree of personal religious commitment or religious motivation (RW) and those who display a high level of religious activities in private, such as praying, studying the scriptures, watching religious TV or listening to religious radio (RNZ) are highly open to talking about religion, also with people of other faiths, but they see personal barriers to the symmetry of this dialogue, i.e., a greater need to convey content from the area of their own religion than to be open to listening to the religious content of people of another religion. The observed tendencies are also visible in people with organized religiosity: the results revealed weak positive correlations of organized religiosity with a readiness to communicate on religious topics (DKR) and with personal barriers to the symmetry of dialogue (DB), while there are no links with the dimensions of dialogue indicating the need to communicate with people of another religion.

Previous studies show that religious commitment can reduce or intensify religious prejudices ([Burch-Brown and Baker 2016](#)), the dimension of religious orthodoxy has been shown to be associated with religious intolerance ([Powell and Clarke 2013](#)), and the dimension of literal understanding of religious content and doctrines (the truth of texts and teaching) was related to and was a predictor of religious prejudices in adolescents ([Streib and Klein 2014](#)). The results of our research, assuming the multidimensionality of the phenomenon of readiness to enter into interreligious dialogue, reveal possible internal mechanisms of this process in the context of an individual's personal religiosity, namely with internal and disorganized religiosity; there may appear tendencies to an asymmetrical dialogue with a person of another religion, consisting in sharing one's own religious experience, in the absence of interest in the religious experience of a person of another religion.

The analysis of the relationships between identity styles and religiosity revealed that internal (RW) and disorganized (RNZ) religiosity slightly positively correlated with the information style (SI), normative style (SN), and commitment (Z), while organized religiosity (RZ) correlated only with the normative style (SN) and poorly with commitment (Z). These results, in line with the results of previous research on the relationship between identity styles and religiosity, should be treated as trends worth further exploration.

The results obtained by us are consistent with the results of previous research. In the research of [Boogar and Haghparvar \(2014\)](#), a predictive function of identity styles on religious orientation was detected, namely the normative and informative identity style played a significant role in predicting internal religious orientation, and the diffuse-avoidant identity style was a predictor of external religious orientation. Similar conclusions were drawn by [Duriez et al. 2004](#), revealing that young people who use an informational identity style tend to interpret religious content in a personal and symbolic way; people with a normative identity style are more religious, especially in the context of religious tradition and show a tendency to interpret religious phenomena literally, while respondents with a diffuse-avoidant identity style tend to interpret religious content in a literal way and to avoid questioning difficult and personal religious issues (cf. also: [Gurba et al. 2022](#)).

The second hypothesis tested the moderating function of religiosity in the relationship between identity styles and the readiness to enter into interreligious dialogue. Significant moderation of religiosity for the relationship between identity styles and readiness to enter interreligious dialogue was obtained for three relationships.

Intrinsic religiosity was found to be a positive moderator of the relationship between normative style (SN) and willingness to communicate on religious topics (DKR), meaning that intrinsic religiosity, described as the degree of personal religious commitment or motivation in people with a normative identity style, improves the relationship between identity style and willingness to communicate on religious topics, especially with people of one's own religion.

Organized religiosity is a positive moderator of the relationship between normative identity style (SN) and readiness to communicate on religious topics (DKR), meaning that organized religiosity, i.e., attending worship services or participating in other group-related religious activities in people with normative identity style, improves the strength of the relationship between normative identity style and readiness to communicate on religious topics, especially with people of one's own religion.

An analysis of the moderating function of unorganized religiosity in the relationship between informational identity style (SI) and readiness to seek mutual understanding (DOZ) reveals a negative moderating effect, unorganized religiosity, described as religious activities performed privately, such as praying, studying Scripture, watching religious television or listening to religious radio, introduced as a moderator reduces the strength of the relationship.

Disorganized religiosity appears as a positive moderator of the relationship between respondents' commitment (Z) and their readiness to communicate on religious topics (DKR).

The hypothesis about the moderating function of religiosity in linking the style of individual identity with the readiness to enter into interreligious dialogue resulted from theoretical models of religiosity, assuming that factors related to religiosity and spirituality appear and function as contextual frameworks that guide the individual in its interpretation, understanding, and response on life experiences (cf. [Gall et al. 2005](#)). [Park \(2005\)](#) concludes that religiosity and spirituality can play a significant role in creating meaning in relation to attitudes and beliefs about the world, oneself, and others. The religious and spiritual process of giving meaning or searching for meaning in an event can involve all aspects of life, including work, interpersonal relationships, general philosophy of life, and attitudes to what a person's "God" may be ([Pargament 1997](#)). Researchers emphasize that giving religious meaning depends, among others, on the level of religious maturity ([Allport 1988](#)). The results of our study confirm that involvement in both internal religiosity and unorganized and organized religiosity, to some extent, may moderate the relationship between

identity styles and the readiness to enter an interreligious dialogue. The direction of these moderations is different: for the normative identity style, intrinsic and organized religiosity may serve a function that strengthens the link between identity style and openness to religious conversations, while for the informational identity style, unorganized religiosity as a moderator causes a weakening of the link between identity style and respondents' openness to seek understanding with followers of other religions.

The results open up new perspectives for further research into the subjective determinants of readiness to enter interreligious dialogue and the function of religious commitment, both internal, unorganized religious commitment, such as prayer or other personal religious practices, and organized religiosity, in which practices are communal and institutional in nature.

The study reported in this paper has some limitations. First of all, it was carried out in the correlation paradigm, which allows for the analysis of relationships but does not provide the possibility of cause-and-effect inference. Future research should be supplemented with research of the experimental or qualitative type. In addition, some connections obtained low correlation indicators, which inform us about clear trends in the field of the connections sought and inspire us to further research in this area.

Moreover, further research should take into account additional variables: personality or sociodemographics, e.g., long-term daily contact with people of other faiths.

The research was conducted in the Polish population; in the future, the group of respondents should be enlarged by people of other nationalities, cultures, and religions. The moderation research should be supplemented with longitudinal research, which would help in the search for developmental regularities and mechanisms of shaping different patterns of connections between the studied variables in people with different resources of accumulated life experience.

**Author Contributions:** Conceptualization, E.R.; methodology, E.R.; software, J.R.; validation, E.R. and J.R.; formal analysis, E.R. and J.R.; investigation, E.R.; resources, E.R.; data curation, E.R.; writing—original draft preparation, E.R.; writing—review and editing, E.R.; visualization, J.R.; supervision, E.R.; project administration, E.R. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

**Funding:** This research received no external funding.

**Institutional Review Board Statement:** The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by Ethics Committee for Scientific Research, Institute Psychology of The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, protocol code: KEBN\_25/2020, date of approval: 22 June 2020.

**Informed Consent Statement:** Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

**Data Availability Statement:** Data supporting reported results are available in the Institutional Repository of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin at the link <http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12153/3844>.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## References

- Allport, Gordon W. 1988. *The Individual and His Religion/Osobowość i Religia*. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy PAX.
- Allport, Gordon W., and J. Michael Ross. 1967. Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 5: 432–43. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
- Al Sadia, Fatma H., and Tehmina N. Basit. 2013. Religious tolerance in Oman: Addressing religious prejudice through educational intervention. *British Educational Research Journal* 39: 447–72. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Altemeyer, Bob. 1996. *The Authoritarian Specter*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Batson, C. Daniel. 1976. Religion as prosocial: Agent or double agent? *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 15: 29–45. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Beck, Richard, and Ryan K. Jessup. 2004. The multidimensional nature of quest motivation. *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 32: 283–94. [[CrossRef](#)]
- Berzonsky, Michael D. 1990. Self-construction over the life-span: A process perspective on identity formation. *Advances in Personal Construct Psychology* 1: 155–86.

- Berzonsky, Michael D. 2008. Identity formation: The role of identity processing style and cognitive processes. *Personality and Individual Differences* 44: 643–53. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Berzonsky, Michael D. 2011. A social-cognitive perspective on identity construction. In *Handbook of Identity Theory and Research*. Edited by S. J. Schwartz, K. Luyckx and V. L. Vignoles. Berlin and Heidelberg: Springer Science + Business Media, pp. 55–76. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Berzonsky, Michael D., and Gerald R. Adams. 1999. Reevaluating the identity status paradigm: Still useful after 35 years. *Developmental Review* 19: 557–90. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Berzonsky, Michael D., and Linda S. Kuk. 2005. Identity style, psychosocial maturity, and academic performance. *Personality and Individual Differences* 39: 235–47. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Berzonsky, Michael D., Bart Soenens, Koen Luyckx, Ilse Smits, Dennis R. Papini, and Luc Goossens. 2013. Development and validation of the revised Identity Style Inventory (ISI-5): Factor structure, reliability, and validity. *Psychological Assessment* 25: 893–904. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Berzonsky, Michael D., and Colleen Sullivan. 1992. Social-cognitive aspects of identity style: Need for cognition, experiential openness, and introspection. *Journal of Adolescence Research* 7: 140–55. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Boogar, Isaac Rahimian, and Maliheh Haghpavar. 2014. Predictive role of identity styles on religious orientation in college students. *Psychological Research* 16: 27–41.
- Burch-Brown, Joanna, and William Baker. 2016. Religion and reducing prejudice. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations* 19: 784–807. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Ciftci, S., M. Asif Nawaz, and T. Sydiq. 2015. Globalization, Contact, and Religious Identity: A Cross-National Analysis of Interreligious Favorability. *Social Science Quarterly by the Southwestern Social Science Association* 97: 271–92. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Clark, H. H. 1996. *Using Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Crocetti, Elisabetta, Monica Rubini, Michael D. Berzonsky, and Wim Meeus. 2009. Brief report: The Identity Style Inventory—Validation in Italian adolescents and college students. *Journal of Adolescence* 32: 425–33. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Collinger, Stephanie M. Clancy. 1995. Identity styles and the five-factor model of personality. *Journal of Research in Personality* 29: 475–79. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Duriez, Bart, Bart Soenens, and Wim Beyers. 2004. Personality, Identity Styles, and Religiosity: An Integrative Study Among Late Adolescents in Flanders (Belgium). *Journal of Personality* 72: 877–908. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
- Duriez, Bart, and Bart Soenens. 2006. Personality, identity styles, and religiosity: An integrative study among late and middle adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence* 29: 119–35. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
- Eka Putra, Idhamsyah. 2016. Taking seriously ingroup self-evaluation, meta-prejudice, and prejudice in analyzing interreligious relations. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology* 19: 1–9. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Efferson, Charles, Rafael Lalive, and Ernst Fehr. 2008. The coevolution of cultural groups and ingroup favoritism. *Science* 321: 1844–49. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Foster, James D., and Beth Laforce. 1999. A Longitudinal Study of Moral, Religious, and Identity Development in a Christian Liberal Arts Environment. *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 27: 52–68. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Francis, Leslie J., Jennifer S. Croft, Alice Pyke, and Mandy Robbins. 2012. Young people’s attitudes to religious diversity: Quantitative approaches from social psychology and empirical theology. *Journal of Beliefs & Values* 33: 279–92. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Gall, Terry Lynn, Claire Charbonneau, Neil Henry Clarke, Karen Grant, Anjali Joseph, and Lisa Shouldice. 2005. Understanding the Nature and Role of Spirituality in Relation to Coping and Health: A Conceptual Framework. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie canadienne* 46: 88–104. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Gawali, Gautam, and Trinjhna Khattar. 2016. The influence of multicultural personality on attitude towards religious diversity among youth. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology* 42: 114–23.
- Gebelt, Janet L., Sara K. Thompson, and Kristine A. Miele. 2009. Identity style and spirituality in a collegiate context. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research* 9: 219–32. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Gorsky, Paul, and Avner Caspi. 2005. Dialogue: A theoretical framework for distance education instructional systems. *British Journal of Educational Technology* 36: 137–44. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Grajales, Tevni E., and Brittany Sommers. 2016. Identity styles and religiosity: Examining the role of identity commitment. *Journal of Research on Christian Education* 25: 188–202. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Gurba, Ewa, Dorota Czyżowska, Ewa Topolewska-Siedzik, and Jan Ciecuch. 2022. The Importance of Identity Style for the Level of Religiosity in Different Developmental Periods. *Religions* 13: 157. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Hayes, A. F. 2018. *Introduction to Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process Analysis: A Regression-Based Approach (Methodology in the Social Sciences)*, 2nd ed. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Huber, Stefan, and Odilo Huber. 2012. The Centrality of Religiosity Scale (CRS). *Religions* 3: 710–24. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Huff, Sara T. 2019. *Identity and Tolerance: How Integrating Multiple Selves Can Be Beneficial for Interpersonal and Intergroup Relations*. Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering 80 (5-B)(E). ProQuest Information & Learning. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms.
- Hook, Joshua N., Jennifer E. Farrell, Kathryn A. Johnson, Daryl R. Van Tongeren, Don E. Davis, and Jamie D. Aten. 2017. Intellectual humility and religious tolerance. *The Journal of Positive Psychology* 12: 29–35. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Hunsberger, Bruce, and Lynne M. Jackson. 2005. Religion, meaning, and prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues* 61: 807–26. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

- Klein, Constantin, Matthias Lühr, and Heinz Streib. 2018. Extant empirical research on religiosity and prejudice. In *Xenosophia and Religion: Biographical and Statistical Paths for a Culture of Welcome*. Edited by H. Streib and C. Klein. Cham: Springer, pp. 23–84. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Koenig, Harold G., and Arndt Büssing. 2010. The Duke University Religion Index (DUREL): A Five-Item Measure for Use in Epidemiological Studies. *Religions* 1: 78–85. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Krettenauer, Tobias. 2005. The Role of Epistemic Cognition in Adolescent Identity Formation: Further Evidence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 34: 185–98. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Kruglanski, Arie W., and Donna M. Webster. 1996. Motivated closing of the mind: “Seizing” and “freezing”. *Psychological Review* 103: 263–83. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
- Łukaszuk, Romuald. 1979. *Dialog, Encyklopedia Katolicka/Dialogue, The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Lublin: RW KUL, pp. 1258–91.
- Markstrom, Carol A. 1999. Religious involvement and adolescent psychosocial development. *Journal of Adolescence* 22: 205–21. [\[CrossRef\]](#) [\[PubMed\]](#)
- McIntosh, Daniel. 1995. Religion-as-Schema, With Implications for the Relation Between Religion and Coping. *International Journal for The Psychology of Religion* 5: 1–16. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Pargament, Kenneth Ira. 1997. *The Psychology of Religion and Coping: Theory, Research, Practice*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Park, Crystal L. 2005. Religion as a meaning-making framework in coping with life stress. *Journal of Social Issues* 61: 707–29. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Park, Crystal L., and Jeanne M. Slattery. 2013. Religion, spirituality, and mental health. In *Handbook of the Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*. Edited by Raymond F. Paloutzian and Crystal L. Park. New York: The Guilford Press, pp. 540–59.
- Parker, Mitchell S. 1985. Identity and the development of religious thinking. *New Directions for Child Development* 30: 43–60. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Powell, Russell, and Steve Clarke. 2013. Religion, tolerance, and intolerance: Views from across the disciplines. In *Religion, Intolerance, and Conflict: A Scientific and Conceptual Investigation*. Edited by Steve Clarke, Russell Powell and Julian Savulescu. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 1–36. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Puffer, Keith A., Kris G. Pence, T. Martin Graverson, Michael Wolfe, Ellen Pate, and Stacy Clegg. 2008. Religious doubt and identity formation: Salient predictors of adolescent religious doubt. *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 36: 270–84. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Putnam, Robert D., David E. Campbell, and Shaylyn Romney Garrett. 2010. *American Grace: How Religion Divides and Unites Us*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Rubin, Mark, and Miles Hewstone. 1998. Social identity theory’s self-esteem hypothesis: A review and some suggestions for clarification. *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 2: 40–62. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Rydz, Elżbieta, Rafał P. Bartczuk, Beata Zarzycka, and Anna Wieradzka-Pilarczyk. 2020. Readiness to Engage in Interreligious Dialogue Test—Internal structure, reliability and validity. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture* 23: 458–76. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Schwab, Joseph R. 2016. *The Narrative Construction of Identity in Emerging Adults: Reflection on the Good Life*. Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, Vol 77(3-B)(E). Ann Arbor: ProQuest Information & Learning.
- Senejko, Alicja, and Zbigniew Łoś. 2015. The characteristics of the Polish adaptation of Michael Berzonsky and co-authors’ Identity Style Inventory (ISI-5). *Psychologia Rozwojowa/Developmental Psychology* 20: 91–104.
- Streib, Heinz, and Constantin Klein. 2014. Religious styles predict interreligious prejudice: A study of German adolescents with the Religious Schema Scale. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion* 24: 151–63. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Streib, Heinz, and Constantin Klein. 2018. *Xenosophia and Religion: Biographical and Statistical Paths for a Culture of Welcome*. Cham: Springer.
- Tajfel, Henri, and John C. Turner. 1986. The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior. In *Psychology of Intergroup Relation*. Edited by Stephen Worchel and William G. Austin. London: Hall Publishers, pp. 7–24.
- Teglasi, Hedwig, and Seymour Epstein. 1998. Temperament and personality theory: The perspective of cognitive-experiential self-theory. *School Psychology Review* 27: 534–50. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Van der Straten Waillet, Nastasya, and Isabelle Roskam. 2013. Are religious tolerance and pluralism reachable ideals? A psychological perspective. *Religious Education* 108: 69–87. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Van Tongeren, Daryl R., Sabrina Hakim, Joshua N. Hook, Kathryn A. Johnson, Jeffrey D. Green, Timothy L. Hulsey, and Don E. Davis. 2016. Toward an understanding of religious tolerance: Quest religiousness and positive attitudes toward religiously dissimilar others. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion* 26: 212–24. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Watson, Paul J., Zhuo Chen, Nima Ghorbani, and Meghedi Vartanian. 2015. Religious openness hypothesis: I. religious reflection, schemas, and orientations within religious fundamentalist and biblical foundationalist ideological surrounds. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity* 34: 99–113.