Abstract

Studies often show that faith-based schools are effective at increasing student achievement. There are several hypotheses for these schools’ successes, but researchers rarely examine the value of the explicit religious component. Sceptics of faith-based education argue that, even when taking into account the benefits, religious instruction can facilitate intolerance. While there is prior research on the relationships between students receiving faith-based education and academic outcomes and tolerance, their causal relationships are not entirely understood. We conduct a laboratory experiment where 180 secondary students are randomly assigned to a priming task with one of three cues (religious, secular equivalents of religious, or neutral) to test these hypotheses. Our outcomes of interest are two self-regulatory capacities, gratification deference and persistence (resources positively associated with academic achievements) and political tolerance. We find that religious cues produce a greater ability to self-regulate in terms of deferring gratification but no differences in persistence. Our results also suggest that religious cues promote higher political tolerance than students who receive neutral cues. Secularized-equivalent cues produce statistically indistinguishable impacts compared to neutral priming. We believe these findings suggest that religious components to faith-based education have positive impacts on educational outcomes without necessarily the drawbacks of promoting political intolerance.
Introduction

Several studies show that students who attend faith-based schools have higher levels of academic achievement than counterparts who attend secular, publicly funded schools (Oldfield, Hartnett, & Bailey, 2013). In a comprehensive meta-analysis Jeynes (2012) finds that students attending religious schools in the United States perform significantly higher than traditional-public and charter school students on academic achievement measures. Educational researchers have developed hypotheses for the successes of these schools; some plausible explanations include mission cohesion, the development of greater social capital, response to more competition for students, and greater school autonomy (Chubb & Moe, 1990; Coleman & Hoffer, 1987). However, almost no attention is given to the specific role and value of the explicit religious component of these institutions (Bryk, Lee, & Holland, 1993).

Identifying the reasons for the successes of faith-based schools could carry important implications for determining the role of religious education in a pluralistic society. For example, if the explicitly religious aspect of faith-based schools provides educational benefits that are of public interest, then one could argue that allocating public funds to faith-based schools is justifiable (Boffetti, 2001). Conversely, if the effects of these schools are replicable in secular contexts, then making the case for subsidizing religious instruction could prove more challenging. Furthermore, if the application of faith-based curricula facilitates undesirable outcomes such as political intolerance, then religious schools could prove detrimental to the maintenance of civic values in communities with diverse populations (Gutmann, 1987).

---

1 In the United States traditional public schools are those both funded and operated by the state. Private faith-based schools are almost entirely autonomous. Charter schools are predominantly funded by the state but have certain limitations in autonomy that private schools do not (e.g. restrictions against incorporating faith-based curricula).
State policymakers are often required to make difficult decisions with regard to the provision of religious-based education. In 2001 the British government supported an increase in the public commitment to faith-based schools, a decision that received both strong praise and opposition (Short, 2002). In the United States over the past two decades policymakers in a majority of states have implemented legislation that has facilitated the expansion of charter schools and subsequently threatened faith-based, private school enrolments (Toma, Zimmer, & Jones, 2006).

A challenge with making an empirical case for publicly funding faith-based education is attributed to the fact that there are inherent selection biases associated with students who enrol into faith-based schools. It is not possible to completely account for these systematic differences by controlling for observable characteristics. Therefore, studies that are unable to adequately control for selection cannot be entirely certain about whom or what to credit for the successes of students attending religious schools. Although Jeynes’s (2012) conclusion that U.S. religious-school students outperform their charter school counterparts might suggest that religious instruction significantly contributes to higher achievement, researchers have not been able to isolate and determine the direct impacts that religion has on education-related outcomes. Ideally, randomized controlled field experiments would make it possible to determine the causal effects of religious instruction. However, restrictions founded upon research ethics and feasibility prevents the possibility of conducting such an experiment.

In this study, we attempt to circumvent this limitation and peer into the black box of faith-based schooling by conducting a laboratory experiment where students are randomly assigned to being primed with religious, secularized equivalents, or neutral cues. We examine whether different cues produce significant impacts for students with regard to demonstrating
self-regulation and political tolerance. By conducting such an experiment, we hope to determine whether there is evidence for explicitly, religious contexts playing a substantial role in promoting non-cognitive, character skills without the negative consequence of facilitating exclusivity and intolerance. Moreover, we include secularized equivalents or religious words in order to test the hypothesis that the same results are replicable when attempting to remove overtly religious components.

Relative to participants in the control condition, the participants who were randomly assigned to the religious priming condition were twice as likely to exhibit the capacity to defer gratification and actually demonstrate significantly more political tolerance. Participants assigned to the secularized equivalents condition are neither different in their likelihood to defer gratification nor in their responses to political tolerance measures. We failed to reject the hypothesis that either priming condition of interest produced an impact on participant persistence. Taken together, these results suggest that overtly religious environments can have significant, positive influences on individuals’ non-cognitive and character skills that are not necessarily replicable in secular contexts. Since participants were assigned by chance to the three experimental conditions, regardless of religious background, we believe that these findings provide preliminary, empirical evidence for the case that faith-based curricula provide benefits that could be of value to the general public.

The remainder of the paper is divided into four sections. We begin by reviewing the literature on the effects of religiosity on self-regulatory behaviours and political tolerance. Next, we explain the methods used in conducting our experiment. Finally, we present our findings and conclude with a discussion that includes limitations and potential policy implications of our study.
Literature Review

Religion, Self-Regulation, and Academic Success

The ability to self-regulate is found to be important to academic success. Low self-regulatory capacities, often in the form of succumbing to immediate gratification, are negatively related to desirable life outcomes (Baumeister & Heatherton, 1996; Mischel, Shoda, & Rodriguez, 1989). Students who are better equipped at developing future-time perspectives fare better in school (Bembenutty & Karabenick, 2004). The inability to self-regulate can lead to poor performance throughout one’s formal education (Wulfert, Block, Santa Ana, Rodriguez, & Colsman, 2002). The ability to efficiently self-regulate can positively affect a student’s ability to more effectively take on more complex thinking tasks and assessments (Schmeichel, Vohs, & Baumeister, 2003). Moreover, although positively correlated to cognitive ability, self-regulatory ability appears to produce a positive impact on academic achievement that is independent of cognitive ability (Duckworth & Seligman, 2005; Heckman & Kautz, 2013).

Empirical findings in education research might suggest that schools with religious-based curricula are successful at improving certain self-regulatory capacities. Heckman and Rubinstein (2001) conclude that completing secondary school is regarded as a reflection of students having the persistence and determination to earn a diploma, independent of cognitive ability, and Coleman and Hoffer (1987) and Neal (1997) indicate that religious schools tend to be especially effective when it comes to increasing student academic attainment. However, the mechanisms by which these religious schools are able to produce these results are largely unknown. Coleman (1987) speculates that religious, parochial schools are successful because of the development of social capital that forms from regular interactions and shared mission amongst parents, students,
and school personnel. However, while Coleman’s explanation is plausible, it remains hypothetical.

Research from the field of social psychology provides additional explanations for religious school effects. Geyer and Baumeister (2005) posit that religious practice improves self-regulation because it presents individuals with clear and consistent standards (see also Fishbach, Friedman, & Kruglanski, 2003; Rachlin, 2000). Religion also provides individuals with strong motivations for adhering to set standards (e.g. the fear of punishment or hope for reward in the afterlife) (Bering & Johnson, 2005; Oner-Ozkan, 2007; Shariff & Norenzayan, 2007). In addition, religious practice facilitates frequent self-monitoring (e.g. examination of conscience) (Carter, McCullough, & Carver, 2012). From their review of the research on the relationship between religion and self-control, McCullough and Willoughby (2009) conclude that religious practices are indeed regular exercises of self-regulatory processes and that long-term religious involvement leads to substantial increases in self-regulatory strengths.

Finally, Rounding, Lee, Jacobson, and Ji (2012) directly test the hypothesis that religion strengthens one’s self-regulatory capacities. They conclude that religious cues produce greater self-control as well as the ability to replenish depleted self-regulatory capacities. However, Harrison and McKay (2013) replicate the Rounding et al. study and find that religious primes have no significant impact. Therefore, while there are both theoretical and empirical grounds that help explain how religion affects self-regulation, the relationship is still ambiguous.

Religion and Political Tolerance

Even if faith-based instruction can increase the ability for students to self-regulate and, therefore, improve in their academic outcomes, encouraging religious schooling might bring about trade-offs that need to be considered in pluralistic societies. Specifically, political theorists
and pundits worry that religious schools and, in general, religiosity propagate intolerance (Gibson, 2010; Nunn, Crockett, & Williams, 1978; Wilcox & Jelen, 1990). Conversely, advocates of faith-based schools argue that religious instruction facilitates tolerance and justice. Therefore, the issue of whether religious institutions prove to be sources of, rather than solutions to, social incohesion is of vital concern (Cush, 2005; Jackson, 2003; Short, 2002; Walford, 2008).

Faith-based schools incorporate a particular worldview into their organizational mission and everyday operations. As a result, parents enrolling students in these schools have shared preferences for the curriculum that a particular school offers. Consequently, different religious schools tend to sort students by creed whether done so maliciously or not. It is conceivable that separation leads to political intolerance because students are not afforded interaction with those who have different views, whereas, secular schools ideally have more diverse enrolments, allowing students to learn how to coexist with others, develop political tolerance, and foster social cohesion (Balmer, 2006; Department of Education and Science, 1985; Gutmann 1987; Judge, 2001; Reich, 2002). Furthermore, religious schools may foster dogmatism by teaching a single, inflexible worldview which may discourage political tolerance (Eisenstein, 2008; Gibson, 2010; Sullivan, Pierson, & Marcus, 1982).

Conversely, there is also an argument for faith-based schooling promoting political tolerance. Sullivan et al. (1982) find that individuals who have experienced a higher degree of self-actualisation tend to exhibit more political tolerance. Individuals with a stronger sense of self tend to be less threatened by others who may hold contrary worldviews and therefore show greater political tolerance. Banks (2001) argues that students must have a positive view of themselves before they are able to have a positive view of others. Thus, religious instruction
potentially nurtures political tolerance by constructing a stronger sense of students’ personal identities (Short, 2002).

Religious values are also not always inherently misaligned with political tolerance. Bryk, Lee, and Holland (1993) find that Catholic schools have the objective to develop civic mindedness with their students. Eisenstein (2008) suggests that there are similar attitudes among Catholics as well as Protestant Christians. Wolf’s (2005) systematic review reveals that U.S. private-school students, including those attending faith-based schools, are at least as politically tolerant as nonsectarian school students. Nevertheless, no research known to us explicitly tests whether the religious nature of faith-based schools might impact political tolerance. Thus, in conjunction with our tests to see if religious cues affect self regulation, we test to see if religious cues affect political tolerance. In this study we analyse a particular component of tolerance, namely political tolerance. While the concept of tolerance can be very broad (Afdal, 2006; Thiessen, 2001), we use Sullivan, Pierson, and Marcus’s (1982) description of tolerance as the willingness to extend civil liberties to people who hold views with which one disagrees.

Methods

Procedure

Upon arrival to the laboratory, participants were randomly assigned to one of three treatment conditions: religious, secular, or neutral priming (control). All participants, regardless of assigned condition, completed three tasks in the following order: (1) priming task, (2) impossible task, and (3) general survey, which included items to collect participants’ responses on the political tolerance scale in addition to background demographics as well as measures testing the effectiveness of the priming task. To conceal the purpose of the study, we told
participants that they were completing verbal skills exercises, but informed participants of the intent of the study later with a debriefing.

We adopted a priming task that has been used for similar experiments (e.g. Shariff & Norenzayan, 2007; Toburen & Meier, 2010). The priming task consisted of ten scrambled, five-word sentences. Participants were instructed to eliminate one word and rearrange the four remaining to form a coherent sentence. There were three different versions of this priming task, one for each treatment condition. For the religious-prime group, five of the sentences contained religious words: worship, preacher, heaven, devotion, and commandments. The secular-prime group received the same activity except the religious words were replaced with approximate, secular equivalents: honour, leader, success, commitment, and expectations. The corresponding words for those in the neutral-prime group were eat, path, man, cabbage, and numerous.

After completing the priming task, participants would notify the researcher that they completed the task. The researcher then logged the amount of time spent on this task and then gave permission to the participant to begin the next section. The next section was the impossible task that consisted of ten scrambled words. Participants were asked to unscramble them into actual English words. The first four of these words could be unscrambled into English words (tnkoe/token, yncfa/fancy, ruchs/crush, drnba/brand), but the remaining six could not (padus, alavt, dbhoc, vaofea, kylix, malaе) (Smith, Kass, Rotunda, & Scheider, 2006). When participants decided to no longer attempt this task, they would notify the researcher. The researcher logged the amount of time spent on this task and then gave permission to the participant to start the next section. If the participant attempted the impossible task for 30 minutes, the researcher instructed the student to stop and proceed to the next section and documented that the student exhausted the

---

2 The secular equivalents were intended to be synonymous words and concepts that are regularly used and incorporated in these students’ nonsectarian school environment (i.e. words that are commonly found in their school mission statement, handbook, and rules).
time provided for this task. The amount of time each participant worked on the impossible task is our measure of persistence.

For the last section, participants completed a general survey which included a political tolerance scale developed by Sullivan et al. (1982). This section first presents a list of social and political groups “whose beliefs some people oppose” (examples provided include atheists, Muslims, people who are against abortion, people who support abortion, etc.). Participants were asked to select the group that they liked the least, or, if they could think of another group that they opposed more, to write down the name of that group instead. Participants then answered six Likert-type items measuring their willingness to extend various civil liberties to their least-liked group. These items assess participants’ willingness to extend free speech, the right to put on public demonstrations, hold political office, etc. to members of their least-liked group. Responses for each item on the political tolerance scale were standardized to have an average of zero and standard deviation of one. The standardized scores for each item were averaged by participant. Participants’ average standardized scores were then standardized, providing a political tolerance scale score that allows the interpretation of results in terms of standard deviations.

Participants provided demographic information as well as responses to questions that serve as measures of the effectiveness of the priming treatments. They were asked to indicate their gender, grade level, and race/ethnic background. Despite being randomly assigned to a treatment condition, these observable characteristics could have significant influences on our outcome measures of interest, so these data provide us with some control variables. Participants also completed survey items that served as a self-assessment of their self-sense of religiosity.

Since participants experienced the priming task prior to completing the survey, responses to

---

3 Participants were not told in advance that there was a time limit for any of the tasks.
these items serve as measures for whether the priming had the intended consequence affecting one’s sense of religiosity.

The final portion of the survey thanked participants for participating in the study. They were then presented with two choices of compensation: immediately receiving $5 upon exiting the study or $6 in the mail the following week. The decision to receive $5 or $6 was our measure of delayed gratification, where students who chose $6 are considered to have demonstrated a greater willingness to defer gratification (e.g. Rounding et al., 2012). Finally, we asked two follow-up questions to probe for whether any participants were aware of the purpose of our study.4

Participants

The participants for this study were students attending a state-funded secondary boarding school. In part, we chose a boarding school because its arrangements made conducting the experiment more feasible than it would have taken place in a traditional public or even private school. For example, we could administer the experiment after regular school hours because the students lived on campus. We also wanted a group of older students who would be of appropriate age for the behavioural tasks and completing the political tolerance survey items.

Students were made aware in advance of the opportunity to participate in a university-sponsored study; that it would take approximately forty-five minutes of their time; that they would ultimately receive some financial compensation; and that their participation was completely voluntary. Upon arrival to the laboratory, students were welcomed, given a brief set

4 There were 16 participants (9% of the students) whose responses reflected a reasonable degree of suspicion in the purpose of the tasks. While a participant’s knowledge of the purpose of the study could influence their responses, the direction of the bias is uncertain. The results presented are those for the entire sample. We have also run all analyses while excluding participants who had a sense of the purpose of the study. Excluding these students has a modest effect on estimates. Excluding suspicious participants increases the estimated impact for the religious prime condition on deferred payout ($p = 0.03$) but decreases the finding with regard to demonstrating political tolerance ($p = 0.26$).
of instructions to re-review the general experiment information that had been provided in advance, and then randomly assigned to different stations that would determine the experimental condition.

In total, 180 students opted to participate in this study. The majority of participants were female (52%). The vast majority of students are white (73%). Table 1 provides the descriptive statistics of these participants as well as shows the effectiveness of the randomization procedure for achieving comparable balances across conditions on observable characteristics. While there are modest differences in the characteristics across the three treatment conditions, none of them are statistically significant.

<<Table 1 Here>>

Analytical Strategy

We use ordinary least squares estimates to determine whether priming conditions affect persistence and political tolerance. We estimate two separate models, specified as follows, for each of these outcomes:

\[ Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 R_i + \beta_2 S_i + \beta_3 X_i + \epsilon_i, \tag{1} \]

where \( Y_i \) is either time spent on the impossible task or the political-tolerance scale score for participant \( i \). \( R_i \) is an indicator variable equalling 1 if participant \( i \) was in the religious prime group and 0 otherwise. \( S_i \) is an indicator variable equalling 1 if the participant was in the secular prime group and 0 otherwise. \( X_i \) is a vector of demographic control variables. \( \beta_1 \) and \( \beta_2 \), are our covariates of interest that estimate the differences in political tolerance and persistence between participants in the in the control group and participants in the religious-prime or secular-prime group, respectively.
Because our measure for delayed gratification is a binary variable, we estimate the following logistic model:

$$D_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 R_i + \beta_2 S_i + \beta_2 X_i + \nu_i,$$

where $D_i$ is a binary variable equalling 1 if participant $i$ took the $6 payout or 0 if he took the $5 payout. The other variables in this model are identical to those in model (1).^5

**Results**

Table 2 presents our results. First, in order to test the impact of the different priming conditions, we examine participants’ responses to questions about the frequency of their religious observance as well as the extent to which their faith influences their choices.\textsuperscript{6} Responses were standardized, averaged, and then standardized again in order to create a religiosity index with an average of zero and standard deviation of one. As expected, religious priming significantly increases participants’ sense of religiosity by 53 percent of a standard deviation ($p < 0.01$). The secularized priming also impacts participants’ sense of religiosity, implying that these moral, nonsectarian cues still influence one’s religious sense. Participants in the secular priming condition experience a 31 percent of a standard deviation increase in religiosity ($p = 0.09$) (Column 1). Therefore, it seems as though the secularized primes have a modest impact on religiosity, but these effects are substantially weaker than those found with the participants in the religious priming condition.

<<Table 2 Here>>

---

^5 For all estimates, we cluster our standard errors by researcher and time of day. Data collection occurred at different sessions throughout the day and was administered by nine different researchers to groups of three to four participants. Participants who completed the experimental procedures during a given time with a given researcher cannot necessarily be considered wholly independent observations in our dataset. Clustering enables us to make more valid statistical inferences.

^6 Participants responded to these survey items after the priming task in order to reduce their suspicion about its purpose.
Columns 2 and 3 show the results with regard to two measures of participants’ self-regulation. The religious priming condition appears to have a significant impact on participants’ willingness to delay gratification and receive a higher payout. These participants were twice as likely to defer gratification ($p = 0.08$). The secularized condition does not have a statistically significant influence on the likelihood of delaying gratification. However, both the religious and secular priming conditions have no impact on persistence as measured by the amount of time participants spent on an impossible task.

Finally, we find some evidence that religious priming may significantly increase political tolerance. As shown in column 4, our estimates indicate that participants who received religious cues score nearly 30 percent of a standard deviation higher on the political tolerance scale than participants who received neutral cues, though the result is marginally significant ($p = 0.09$). Participants who received secular cues are not statistically distinguishable from those who received neutral cues and those who received religious cues.

**Discussion and Conclusion**

These results suggest that religious cues produce increases in the likelihood to delay gratification, but there is no significant effect on task persistence. Our findings also suggest that religious cues could have a slight, positive impact on political tolerance and, minimally, do not appear to directly facilitate intolerance. Secular equivalents of religious cues do not significantly impact participants’ responses and performances for these three outcome measures. Since participants were randomly assigned to one of three treatment conditions, our results make us fairly confident that these impacts are indeed causal.

Our finding that these religious contexts increase the ability to delay gratification provides additional evidence supporting the claim that religion enhances self-regulatory
capacities (e.g. Geyer & Baumeister, 2005; McCullough & Willoughby, 2009). However, our results fail to reject the hypothesis that religious cues have no impact on task persistence, a finding that could conflict with Rounding et al. (2012) and support Harrison and McKay (2013). However, it is worthwhile to note that Rounding et al. (2012) and Harrison and McKay (2013) test whether religious cues replenish persistence after depleting self-regulatory resources. We simply investigate whether religious cues affect task persistence sans depletion. Nonetheless, the finding that religious cues do not increase task persistence while increasing the ability to delay gratification warrants further exploration. Perhaps task persistence and delayed gratification, though often lumped together under the term self-regulation, are distinct constructs that are unevenly influenced by religious cues. In fact, this finding corroborates with the psychological literature on self-regulation (e.g. Roberts, Lejuez, Krueger, Richards, & Hill, 2012).

Our results also possibly provide a more nuanced understanding of the claim that religion diminishes political tolerance (e.g. Nunn et al., 1978; Wilcox & Jelen, 1990). We find that religious cues do not increase intolerance and might even promote political tolerance. These results support Eisenstein’s (2008) work which concludes that neither increased religious commitment nor greater doctrinal orthodoxy directly leads to more political intolerance. Rather, factors such as perceived threat and degree of self-actualization mediate the links from religious commitment and doctrinal orthodoxy to political tolerance. While Gibson (2010) finds that greater religiosity is positively correlated with political intolerance, he acknowledges that other antecedent factors may explain the increased political intolerance. Our findings suggest that explicit religious cues themselves do not lead to greater political intolerance. However, we cannot rule out the possibility that other factors associated with religious practice and institutions can have this negative consequence. For instance, religious school students having less diverse
peer groups might increase intolerance, though there are theoretical reasons refuting such claims (e.g. Banks, 2001; Short, 2002).

Limitations

Conducting our experiment in a highly-controlled, laboratory setting lends confidence that the results are directly caused by the differences in treatment conditions. However, it is unclear to what extent these findings can be generalized. Researchers have questioned whether results from laboratory experiments can be “extrapolated to the world beyond” (Levitt & List, 2007, p. 153). This limited external validity is particularly relevant to our research aim to determine whether the religious aspect of religious schooling enhances non-cognitive skills. There are numerous aspects constitutive to faith-based schooling, besides the cultivation of self-regulation, e.g. the development of social capital, which may lead to improved educational outcomes (Coleman, 1987; Coleman & Hoffer, 1987). While we confidently demonstrate the potential for religious cues to enhance self-regulation abilities, we cannot be certain that religious cues are always the reason for improved self-regulation and educational outcomes in all religious schools. Our study does not address how other aspects of religious schools may improve their students’ outcomes. We hope that subsequent research can inform this important issue.

Conclusion

We believe that these results are valuable for understanding how a central component of religious schools directly affects its students. There is something unique about the religious nature of religious schools that explains their outcomes, and our findings provide empirical evidence that support the argument that some influences could be challenging to replicate in more secular institutions. Overall, these results could carry policy implications with regard to the roles of faith-based schools in pluralistic societies. In particular, the evidence from this study
suggests that religious schools may provide environments especially conducive to students developing capacities for deferring gratification that secular contexts may have difficulty replicating. In conjunction with the benefits to faith-based schooling, there may be societal negative consequences, but our results suggest that increased political intolerance is not necessarily one of these tradeoffs. It is however still possible that other aspects of faith-based schooling promote intolerance. Finally, although policy debates with regard to public provision or subsidization of religious education are typically more theoretical in nature, we believe that providing empirical evidence for a causal impact of religion could help inform such discussions in evaluating potential tradeoffs.
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Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Study Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Religious Priming</th>
<th>Secular Priming</th>
<th>Neutral Priming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleventh Grader</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Background*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A Kruskal-Wallis test fails to reject the hypothesis that there were no differences in observables across the three experimental conditions. *Numbers for racial background do not sum to the total for overall number of participants in conditions where participants chose to omit an indication for self-identified race/ethnicity. Percentages represent the percentage of those with non-missing values.
Table 2: Effects of Religious and Secular Priming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) Religiosity</th>
<th>(2) Persistence</th>
<th>(3) Delayed Gratification</th>
<th>(4) Political Tolerance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious Priming</td>
<td>0.529***</td>
<td>-110.0</td>
<td>2.045*</td>
<td>0.278*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.189)</td>
<td>(75.11)</td>
<td>(0.831)</td>
<td>(0.159)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secular Priming</td>
<td>0.310*</td>
<td>-27.09</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>0.0351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.184)</td>
<td>(56.14)</td>
<td>(0.333)</td>
<td>(0.150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>-79.57</td>
<td>2.508</td>
<td>0.822***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.532)</td>
<td>(116.5)</td>
<td>(2.509)</td>
<td>(0.124)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1.297***</td>
<td>-248.8***</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
<td>-0.787***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.180)</td>
<td>(71.95)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.159)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>-0.0735</td>
<td>86.15</td>
<td>1.388</td>
<td>-0.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.430)</td>
<td>(138.3)</td>
<td>(0.663)</td>
<td>(0.515)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>114.6</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>-0.396**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.193)</td>
<td>(83.67)</td>
<td>(0.477)</td>
<td>(0.152)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-0.301</td>
<td>10.08</td>
<td>-0.650</td>
<td>0.669**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.264)</td>
<td>(139.2)</td>
<td>(0.681)</td>
<td>(0.314)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-0.352**</td>
<td>-1.480</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.222*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.164)</td>
<td>(62.46)</td>
<td>(0.324)</td>
<td>(0.132)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelfth Grader</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>-109.6*</td>
<td>-0.972***</td>
<td>-0.0285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.140)</td>
<td>(60.28)</td>
<td>(0.311)</td>
<td>(0.152)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Threat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.345***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0585)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.244</td>
<td>785.8***</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>0.664***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.172)</td>
<td>(73.56)</td>
<td>(0.330)</td>
<td>(0.162)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: ***p < 0.01; **p < 0.05, *p < 0.10. There was only one participant who identified himself as American Indian, so we are unable to obtain a coefficient estimate for this covariate.