The Effects of Religion on Consumer Behavior: A Conceptual Framework

and Research Agenda

Daniele Mathras[a], Adam B. Cohen[b], Naomi Mandel[b], and David Glen Mick[c]

[a] Northeastern University, [b] Arizona State University, [c] University of Virginia

Author Note

Daniele Mathras is Assistant Professor of Marketing at the D'Amore-McKim School of

Business, Northeastern University, 360 Huntington Ave, 202D Hayden Hall, Boston, MA,

02115, USA; d.mathras@neu.edu, (617) 373-5744. Adam B. Cohen is Associate Professor of

Psychology at Arizona State University, Department of Psychology, P. O. Box 871104, 950 S.

McAllister Ave., Tempe, AZ 85287-1104, USA; adamcohen@asu.edu, (480) 965-7345. Naomi

Mandel is State Farm Professor of Marketing at Arizona State University, W. P. Carey School of

Business, Department of Marketing, P. O. Box 874106, Tempe, AZ 85287-4106, USA;

naomi.mandel@asu.edu, (480) 965-3621. David Glen Mick is the Robert Hill Carter Professor

of Commerce at the University of Virginia, McIntire School of Commerce, Department of

Marketing, P. O. Box 400173, Charlottesville, VA 22904, USA; dmick@virginia.edu, (434) 924-

3442. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Daniele Mathras at

d.mathras@neu.edu.

Abstract

This article provides a conceptual framework for studying the effects of religion on consumer behavior, with the goal of stimulating future research at the intersection of these two topics. Here, we delineate religion as a multidimensional construct and propose that religion affects consumer psychology and behavior through four dimensions—beliefs, rituals, values, and community. For each dimension of religion, we offer definitions and measures, integrate previous findings from research in the psychology, consumer behavior, marketing, and religion literatures, and propose testable future research directions. With this conceptual framework and research agenda, we challenge consumer researchers to ask deeper questions about why religious affiliation and level of religiosity may be driving previously established differences in consumer behavior and to uncover the psychological mechanisms underlying the effects. This framework complements and extends previous literature and provides a new, more delineated framework for considering research on the effects of religion on consumer behavior.

Keywords: religion, beliefs, rituals, values, community, conceptual framework

Contents

1. Introduction

Religion is an important part of life for most individuals, with 80% of people worldwide affiliating with a religion (Pew Forum, 2012) and over 70% of Americans reporting that their religious beliefs affect their daily behaviors (Pew Forum, 2008). Religion influences a variety of consumer behaviors, such as information seeking and product innovativeness (Hirschman, 1981). Studying the effects of religion on consumer behavior is important, among other reasons, because consumers communicate their religious identities to others and express the intensity of their beliefs through consumption choices (Minkler & Coşgel, 2004). Consumer researchers have become increasingly interested in the topic of religion. To quantify this trend, we identified every article in the *Journal of Consumer Psychology, Journal of Consumer Research, Journal of Marketing Research, Journal of Marketing,* and *Marketing Science* that mentioned "religion" in its text from 1992 to 2014 (*N* = 180 articles). Between 1992 and 2006, an average of five articles mentioning religion were published per year in these journals. This figure has grown to an average of over 13 articles per year since 2007. However, while mentions of religion are on the rise, still only a small percentage of articles feature religion as a main theoretical element.

Prominent psychologists have long noted the crucial importance of studying religion to understand human nature and functioning in daily life (e.g., James, 1902; Durkheim 1912/1995; Allport, 1950). In "The Varieties of Religious Experience," William James (1902) suggested that studying religious experience offers the potential for breakthroughs in understanding fundamental human psychology. To this day, few mainstream psychology researchers have taken up this suggestion (Cohen, 2015). Some consumer psychologists have noted the importance of religion in consumer behavior, but to date, most have only focused on the role of religiosity (the intensity to which an individual affiliates, participates, and believes in any

religion; see Bjarnason, 2007; Vitell, 2010) or the general notion of what constitutes the sacred in contemporary consumer life (e.g., Belk, Wallendorf, & Sherry 1989). Fewer scholars have addressed the effects of specific religious beliefs, rituals, values or community structures on consumer behavior, which is the central purpose of our review and research agenda.

To date, the study of religion in consumer research has been largely qualitative and situated within the paradigmatic arena of Consumer Culture Theory (CCT). CCT researchers have investigated the religious-like aspects of consumer culture (e.g., Cult of Macintosh, Belk & Tumbat, 2005), the sacralization of consumption (Belk, Wallendorf, & Sherry, 1989), and the socializing role of religion in one's consumer identity development (McAlexander, DuFault, Martin, & Schouten, 2014). In marketing research, the study of religion has largely focused on the topic of segmentation, which involves dividing the market into segments based on religious affiliation or level of religiosity and serving those segments differently (e.g., Minton & Kahle, 2013). Examples would include avoiding marketing pork products to Jews or Muslims due to *kosher* and *halal* religious laws (e.g., Ahmad, Rustam, & Dent, 2011; Alserhan, 2010). However, studies of the effects of religion on consumer psychology and behavior are scattered and have yet to be systematized, and much more remains to be discovered and explained. Additional theory development and quantitative work are needed to enhance understanding of how religion influences consumption. In this paper, we present a new conceptual framework for conducting research on the effects of religion on consumer behavior, following the general goals of conceptual frameworks and propositional inventories that delineate a conceptual entity (MacInnis, 2011). While religion is often studied as religious affiliation or level of religiosity, we discuss how religion affects consumer psychology and behavior through four dimensions. We identify these dimensions of religion—beliefs, rituals, values, and community (building on

Saroglou, 2011)—by conducting a review of religion research in consumer behavior, marketing, psychology, and religious studies. We integrate findings from these diverse streams to illustrate how each religious dimension differentially affects consumer behavior outcomes, such as brand relationships, compensatory consumption, product choice, and pro-social behaviors. We take both a backward-looking (i.e., reviewing past literature) and forward-looking (i.e., developing propositions for future research) approach to delineate the multidimensional construct of religion and provide a roadmap for future research.

Our main premise is that religion affects consumer behavior through four dimensions (beliefs, rituals, values, community) and often interacts with various consumer states and conditions to affect consumption. As such, religion may disrupt or enhance (i.e., moderate) established relationships between consumer states and outcomes. With our framework, we suggest that researchers expand on the use of religious affiliation (e.g., Catholic vs. Protestant) and level of religiosity as key constructs, and additionally explore the psychological differences that arise between consumers as a result of religious beliefs, rituals, values, and community structures present in different religious groups and individual levels of religiosity. To illuminate our conceptual framework, we propose testable theoretical insights into the effects of religion on consumer behavior. We hope the framework and propositions will stimulate research on the effects of religion on consumer behavior, an area that is currently underrepresented in the literature but is experiencing a surge in recent activity (e.g., Cutright, 2012; Hyodo & Bolton, 2015; Kupor, Laurin, & Levav, in press; Shachar, Erdem, Cutright, & Fitzsimons, 2011).

Our research intends to forefront the importance of studying religion in consumer research. Most often in the consumer literature, religion has been implemented as a demographic control variable or as a moderator in studies (much like gender), but not featured as a main

theoretical construct. As Meyers-Levy and Loken (2015) have done for the study of gender in consumer research, our goal is to highlight the importance of religion as a focal construct for theory development in consumer research and to provide a roadmap for this future research. Like the gender space, the religion space is ripe for investigation and new theory development.

In the balance of this article, we: a) define religion and present our conceptual framework, b) provide definitions and measures for each dimension of religion and develop propositions for future research, and c) discuss methodological challenges and additional opportunities for conducting research on the effects of religion on consumer behavior.

2. Conceptual framework: Dimensions of religion

While religious scholars have attempted to develop a definition of religion that applies to all religions, many believe this task may not be possible (Atran & Norenzayan, 2004; Cohen, 2009; Hood, Hill, & Spilka, 2009). Most religious scholars agree that religion is a multidimensional construct (Vitell, 2010), and measures of religious dimensions are multitude (Minton & Kahle, 2013; Saroglou, 2011). Consistent with a multidimensional model of religion, we adopt Schmidt et al.'s (1999) definition of religion as "systems of meaning embodied in a pattern of life, a community of faith, and a worldview that articulate a view of the sacred and of what ultimately matters" (p. 10). This definition supports the notion that religions provide members with a unique set of beliefs ("systems of meaning" and "view of the sacred"), rituals ("pattern of life"), values ("worldview…of what ultimately matters"), and community ("community of faith").

Traditionally, research on the effects of religion on consumer behavior has often considered what consumption differences exist between individuals from different religious

affiliations (e.g., Protestants vs. Catholics) and between individuals with different levels of religiosity (the centrality of one's religious beliefs, affiliation, and participation; Cutright, 2012; Pace, 2013; Shachar et al., 2011; Vitell, 2010). In our new, delineated framework, we propose that religious affiliation shapes consumers' religious beliefs, rituals, values, and community constructs, which drive differences in consumer behavior between groups. For example, rather than solely determining what Protestants do differently from Catholics, our framework seeks to understand why Protestants behave differently from Catholics. With this framework, we complement and extend the existing literature, while providing a foundation for conducting new research on the effects of religion on consumer behavior.

While we focus on the effects of religious affiliation on consumer behavior, we also suggest that a consumer's level of religiosity likely predicts the centrality of a certain set of religious beliefs, rituals, values, and community in his or her life. Therefore, we propose that religiosity has the potential to moderate (e.g., strengthen) the relationship between an individual's religious affiliation and his or her religious beliefs, rituals, values, and community structures. However, because each religious group has a unique set of these four religious constructs, we would not expect religiosity to always affect consumer behavior in the same manner across religious groups. Therefore, when considering level of religiosity, we recommend researchers always consider the religious composition (i.e., affiliations) of their sample and ask specific questions about which beliefs, rituals, values, and community constructs may be driving the effects between religiosity and consumer behavior for those groups.

With our framework, we also account for the large and growing portion of the population with no formal religion (i.e., no religious affiliation) or no certainty in a supreme being (e.g., Atheism, Agnosticism) (Pew Research Center 2015). It is likely that these individuals will score

low on many of the religious beliefs, rituals, values, and community constructs that we propose

as drivers of consumer behavior (e.g., belief in a loving and controlling God), and that they

would also score low on religiosity. We acknowledge that non-religious consumers are not a

homogenous group. Our framework allows researchers to conduct more granular research on

non-religious consumers by comparing beliefs, rituals, values, and community across different

non-religious designations (e.g., Atheist, Agnostic) as well.

3. Beliefs

3.1. Definitions and measures

Each religion maintains a set of shared beliefs and commonly held sacred symbols (Atran

& Norenzayan, 2004; Durkheim, 1912/1995) which form broader shared cultural ideologies

(Johnson, Hill, & Cohen, 2011; Saroglou, 2011). Shared beliefs include cognitive concepts such

as transcendent God concepts, supernatural agents, and divine principles, which help individuals

seek the truths in their worlds through a meaning-making process (Park, 2005). For example,

Catholics share beliefs about the resurrection of Jesus Christ, the presence of Original Sin, and

the existence of Heaven and Hell. Alternatively, Buddhists share beliefs about the

impermanence of reality, the absence of a discrete personal self, and the role of clinging and

attachment as the proximal causes of human suffering (Harris, 1998). Such beliefs help

individuals in their search for meaning and control by defining, explaining, and parameterizing

the world in which they live (Hood et al., 2009).

Researchers interested in studying the effect of religious beliefs on consumer behavior

might utilize scales that capture an individual's endorsement of particular beliefs, such as Jesus'

divinity, beliefs about the afterlife, and belief in Heaven and Hell (see Hill & Hood, 1999).

Specific belief measures include the Spiritual Belief Scale (Schaler, 1996), the Loving and Controlling God Scale (Benson & Spilka, 1973), God as a Causal Agent (Ritzema & Young, 1983), belief items from the Religious Commitment Inventory (Worthington et al., 2003), and the doctrinal knowledge subscale of the Buddhism Measure (Pace, 2013). Additionally, scales exist to measure one's beliefs and feelings about death and the afterlife, including the Death Acceptance Scale (Ray & Najman, 1974), the Death Anxiety Scale (Templer, 1970), the Death Transcendence Scale (Hood & Morris, 1983), and the Existential Well-being subscale of the Spiritual Well-being Scale (Paloutzian & Ellison, 1982). In the balance of this section, we develop two research propositions that explore the effects of religious beliefs on consumer behavior.

3.2. Religious beliefs about the afterlife

According to Becker (1973), most humans have a fundamental fear of dying. Religions provide several alternative strategies with which to cope with the problem of one's inevitable mortality. Perhaps the most direct coping strategy is a belief in the afterlife, which "solves the problem of death" by reducing uncertainty about what will happen after death (Becker, 1973, p. 203; Cohen, Pierce, et al., 2005). As such, religious (vs. non-religious) individuals are likely to experience lower levels of death anxiety, but perhaps due to different underlying beliefs about the afterlife. For example, Buddhists emphasize the impermanence of all things and they often meditate on the inevitability of death to motivate present-centered living and compassion for all. Alternatively, Hindus believe in reincarnation (that upon death, the soul begins a new life in a new body), which may shape consumer behavior in the current life to improve one's standing in the next life.

Individuals may attempt to cope with a fear of death by convincing themselves that will live on symbolically by affiliating themselves with valued cultural ideals (Greenberg et al., 1990), such as high-status brands. Indeed, the American ideals of affluence and materialism offer the promise of secular immortality (Hirschman, 1990). Supporting this idea, consumers who received a mortality threat showed a higher preference for high status brands such as Lexus or Rolex (Heine, Harihara, & Niiya, 2002; Mandel & Heine, 1999), demonstrated more materialism and greed in a resource-sharing game (Kasser & Sheldon, 2000), and strengthened their connections with brands (Rindfleisch, Burroughs, & Wong, 2009). Thus, individuals may use consumption as an alternative means to religion to cope with death anxiety.

Religion serves as a buffer for previously established mortality salience effects. For example, participants who scored low on religiosity responded to mortality salience by defending the predominant cultural standards, whereas those who scored high on religiosity showed no such defense (Jonas & Fischer, 2006; Norenzayan, Dar-Nimrod, Hansen, & Proulx, 2009). In these examples, religiosity might serve as a proxy for the strength of one's religiously-informed beliefs about the afterlife that serve to calm death anxiety in religious individuals. However, little is known about whether religious beliefs buffer the effects of mortality salience on consumption choices. We argue that religion and consumption offer alternative means to buffer the terror associated with thoughts of death. Therefore, we propose that the strength of one's religious beliefs about the afterlife will moderate the previously established effects of mortality salience on status-seeking (Heine, Harihara, & Niiya, 2002; Mandel & Heine, 1999), materialism (Kasser & Sheldon, 2000), and self-brand connections (Rindfleisch, Burroughs, & Wong, 2009).

Proposition 1: Religious beliefs about the afterlife (e.g., existence of Heaven,

reincarnation, acceptance of impermanence) will dampen the effects of mortality salience

on status-seeking, materialism, and self-brand connections.

It is important to note (in this and subsequent propositions) that different religious

affiliations should produce stronger or weaker moderating effects, depending on the beliefs

offered by each affiliation. For example, because Jews are less likely to believe in an afterlife,

they exhibit greater death anxiety than do Protestants (Cohen & Hall, 2009), and thus might be

more likely to cope with a mortality threat via compensatory consumption. In addition (in this

and subsequent propositions), a higher level of religiosity should provide a stronger moderating

effect than a lower level of religiosity, because people who score low on religiosity should have

weaker beliefs about the afterlife than those who score high on religiosity. The religious

composition of the sample (e.g., majority Christian vs. majority Buddhist) will help researchers

determine the specific beliefs about the afterlife that affect consumer behavior. Taken together,

we recommend future research about how various religious affiliations shape specific beliefs

about the afterlife, and how those beliefs affect death anxiety and compensatory consumption.

3.3. Religious beliefs about external sources of control

Religious beliefs can also serve as a means to cope with threats unrelated to dying. For

example, when people feel a lack of personal control in their lives, they turn to external sources

of control (such as religion or government) in order to relieve their anxiety (Kay, Gaucher,

Napier, Callan, & Laurin, 2008). Individuals may also turn to consumption as a way to cope

with a perceived lack of control. For example, when consumers sense a lack of order or control

in their lives, they demonstrate a stronger preference for products that seem "bounded" (such as

framed vs. unframed pictures; Cutright, 2012), high-effort products that require the consumer to work harder (Cutright & Samper, 2014), and products that are advertised as either blessed or fused with religious symbols (Shepherd, Kay, & Eibach, 2015).

Building on this prior research, we propose that religious beliefs about external control (e.g., beliefs in a loving or controlling God; Benson & Spilka, 1973) will moderate many of the previously established findings in which individuals use their consumption choices to cope with a variety of self-threats such as lack of power (Rucker & Galinsky, 2008), lack of personal freedom (Levav & Zhu, 2009), and lack of personal control (Cutright, 2012). For example, Rucker and Galinsky (2008) demonstrate that, like mortality salient consumers, consumers who feel low (vs. high) in power are more likely to desire luxury brands. Furthermore, Levav and Zhu (2009) show that when people feel that their personal freedom is threatened (e.g., by shopping in narrow supermarket aisles), they attempt to reassert their freedom by purchasing a larger variety of products.

We propose that many of these previously established effects will be weaker for consumers from religions with a strong belief in a supreme being (e.g., Christianity, Islam, other monotheistic religions), as these beliefs provide comforting thoughts that "someone" (i.e., God) is in control, thereby rendering personal control less necessary. We do not expect the effects on consumer preference for consumers from religions and worldviews with weak or no beliefs in a supreme being (e.g., Buddhists). As a step in this direction, Cutright (2012) demonstrated that religiosity dampened the effect of low control on a preference for bounded products. Building on these findings, we predict that an individual's religious affiliation shapes his or her beliefs about a controlling supreme being, and these beliefs will moderate previously established effects in this literature stream.

Proposition 2: Religious beliefs about external control (e.g., belief in a controlling God) will mitigate the effects of a perceived lack of power, freedom, or personal control on preference for high-effort products, luxury products, and/or variety seeking.

4. Rituals

4.1. Definitions and measures

The religious ritual is another dimension of religion that affects consumer behavior. Rituals are repeated behaviors that have symbolic meaning and typically follow a formal script, which are performed in the same manner and order every time (Rook, 1985). Religious rituals include practices as diverse as regular public and private prayer, *Holy Communion* in Catholicism, the Passover *seder* in Judaism, the *hadj* pilgrimage in Islam, the *puja* early morning offering in Hinduism, and daily meditation in Buddhism. Participation in the ritual practices of one's religion is for many a key aspect of religiosity (Cohen, Siegel, & Rozin, 2003), which creates an emotional bond between members of a religion (Saroglou, 2011), and can promote trust within and across religious lines (Hall, Cohen, Meyer, Varley, & Brewer, in press).

Measures of participation in religious rituals and traditions are scarce, but there are many measures that tap ritual aspects of religion, such as the practice of prayer and meditation. Using primarily God-centric items, Poloma and Pendleton (1989) identified four types of prayer: meditative prayer (e.g., "quietly reflecting about God"), ritualist prayer (e.g., "recite prayers to God"), petitionary prayer (e.g., "ask God for material things"), and colloquial prayer (e.g., "ask God to provide guidance"). For religions without a God concept, the prayer fulfillment sub-scale of the Spiritual Transcendence Scale (Piedmont, 1999) is more applicable. Many measures of religiosity also include items that relate to participation in religious rituals, such as one's

engagement in religious prayer and reflection (e.g., Religious Commitment Inventory;

Worthington et al., 2003). In this section, we develop two propositions that highlight potential

research avenues on the effects of religious rituals on consumer behavior.

4.2. Religious cleansing rituals

Cleansing rituals are examples of religious rituals that may affect consumer behavior.

For example, confession is a religious ritual that helps followers achieve moral cleansing after a

moral lapse has occurred. Confession is the remorseful acknowledgment of one's wrongdoings

and the public or private disclosure of these wrongdoings in an attempt to rectify transgressions

and reestablish the moral self. After committing sins, confessions and other forms of cleansing

rituals can lead to better health and well-being outcomes. For example, confiding in others about

a traumatic life event increases tension in the short-term, but enhances physical health in the long

run (Pennebaker & Beall, 1986).

Different religious affiliations take somewhat different approaches to moral cleansing

rituals (Hymer, 1995; Murray-Swank, McConnell, & Pargament, 2007). For example, Catholics

engage in Reconciliation after committing sins and they also baptize infants and converts to

purify them from Original Sin. Muslims physically wash their hands and feet prior to entering a

Mosque or handling the *Koran,* and Jews confess their individual and collective sins on *Yom*

Kippur and repent by abstaining from eating, drinking, and sex on that day.

Religious cleansing rituals can also affect the process and outcome of confessions in the

consumer domain. Preliminary research on consumer confessions about sins against the

environment finds that Catholics demonstrate more environmentally friendly behaviors after

making a green confession (vs. merely reflecting about one's green transgressions), likely due to

the Catholic ritual of penance (e.g., deeds to make amends for sins) following a confession

(Mathras, Mandel, & Cohen, 2015). After confessing about one's green transgressions,

Catholics increase their preference for green, but not conventional, products. This effect is not

present for Non-Catholics, who may not be familiar with or endorse the notion of a need for

penance following confession. These results replicate for individuals with more (vs. less)

practice of penance of rituals, but not for individuals with strong (vs. weak) religiosity,

suggesting that there is something specific about the religious practice of confession and penance

rituals that drives compensatory consumption after confession. Following these preliminary

findings on consumer confession, future research on consumer cleansing rituals could explore

the effects of different religious cleansing rituals (e.g., penance rituals, public/private rituals,

physical cleansing rituals) on behaviors that help the consumer get back on track with their

consumption goals after a transgression.

> *Proposition 3:* Religious practice of cleansing rituals (e.g., penance, physical cleansing)
>
> will moderate the effects of making a confession about a past consumer transgression (vs.
>
> not confessing) on subsequent amends-making behaviors (e.g., dieting, environmentally-
>
> friendly behaviors).

4.3. Religious rituals and time orientation

Another function of religious rituals is to mark the passage of time. Time orientations

and timestyles differ between religious groups, likely due to the practice of different religious

rituals, such as sacraments and holidays (Paglieri, Borghi, Colzato, Hommel, & Scorolli, 2013)

and other temporal landmarks that represent collective goals or desired end-states (e.g., Sabbath;

Jonas & Huguet, 2008). Religious ritual schedules tend to differ based on whether the religions

are Eastern or Western, which is a more macro religious affiliation distinction. Western, monotheistic religions, including Christianity, Judaism, and Islam, tend to mark time according to key religious historical events (e.g., Exodus [Judaism], Crucifixion [Christianity], Night of Power [Islam]). They also mark time linearly in terms of successive seasons, the order of holidays and rituals, and the hands of a clock. For example, in Catholicism there is a linear progression of sacraments performed throughout one's life, from Baptism at birth or time of conversion, Holy Eucharist in adolescence, Reconciliation, Confirmation, and Marriage in adulthood, and Anointing of the Sick at the end of life (AmericanCatholic.org, 2014). In contrast, many Eastern and polytheistic religions view time as cyclical (e.g., reincarnation, cycle of nature and seasons), and more like a swirling ocean, serving as life's source, destination, and its eternity in present conditions. Individuals from Eastern religions who internalize the concept of *karma* (the manner in which present actions influence the future) tend to take a longer-term view of life rather than a shorter-term time orientation (Kopalle, Lehmann, & Farley, 2010).

Religious differences in time orientation (past- vs. present- vs. future-focused) and timestyles (linear vs. cyclical) might affect consumer behavior in the areas of saving (Anong & Fisher, 2013), shopping patterns and heuristics (Cotte, Ratneshwar, & Mick, 2004), delayed gratification (Paglieri, et al., 2013), and customer expectations and satisfaction (Kopalle, Lehmann, & Farley, 2010). Consistent with this idea, researchers have shown that encouraging consumers to think of time as cyclical (vs. linear) significantly increases their personal rates of financial saving (Tam & Dholakia, 2014). However, further examination of the religious-based effects of time orientation on consumer behavior is needed. To start, we propose:

Proposition 4: The practice of religious rituals that presume a more cyclical (vs. linear),

future-focused (vs. past- or present-focused) time orientation will increase consumer

behaviors aimed at improving one's future (e.g., sustainability, financial saving, and investment).

5. Values

5.1. Definitions and measures

Values are another important dimension of religion (Saroglou, 2011) and provide normative guidance to adherents about what is desirable to consume, how much to consume, and when to consume it. Religions shepherd the development of values in many areas of life, including self-respect, security, and sense of belonging, to name a few (List of Values; Kahle, Beatty, & Homer, 1986). Religious values also shape consumer reciprocity and altruism (Graham & Haidt, 2010; Saroglou, Delpierre, & Dernelle, 2004), economic savviness (Sood & Nasu, 1995), self-control, and impulsiveness (McCullough & Willoughby, 2009). Additionally, individuals who report higher (vs. lower) religiosity are more likely to give time and material resources (Peifer, 2007; Regnerus, Smith, & Sikkink, 1998), donate blood (Burnett, 1981), tithe or give charity to their own religious organizations (Hoge, 1994; Scheepers & Te Grotenhuis, 2005; Smith & Emerson, 2008), volunteer both within and outside of their religious organizations (Penner, Dovidio, Piliavin, & Schroeder, 2005). Additionally, Christians primed with benevolent Bible verses (vs. control) are more likely to help individuals from religious out-groups (Johnson, Memon, Alladin, Cohen, & Okun, 2015). Religious values also inform preference for value-laden products. Buddhists (vs. all other religions) are most likely to purchase fair trade products (Doran & Natale, 2011), which can be attributed to universalistic Buddhist values of caring for humankind.

Researchers can measure value differences between religions using the Moral Foundations Questionnaire (Haidt, 2007), the Schwartz Values Survey (Schwartz, 1994), or the aforementioned List of Values (Kahle et al., 1986). Haidt's (2007) questionnaire identifies five categories of morals: harm/care, fairness/reciprocity, ingroup/loyalty, authority/respect, and purity/sanctity. These values may differ between and within religious groups, thus affecting consumer behavior. For example, individuals from religions that score high (vs. low) on authority/respect may more strictly follow religious-based consumption restrictions, while individuals from religions that score high (vs. low) on ingroup/loyalty may be more likely to engage in helping behaviors towards members of the same religion or house of worship.

Religion may also affect consumer behavior by assigning different importance weights to values like those in Schwartz's (1994) Values Survey (SVS): self-direction, stimulation, hedonism, achievement, power, security, conformity, tradition, benevolence, and universalism. Hedonism is the SVS dimension most negatively correlated with religiosity (Schwartz & Huismans, 1995), suggesting that religious individuals across religions may be driven less by hedonic motivation compared to less religious or non-religious individuals. Additionally, although Buddhists and Christians score similarly on universalism, Buddhists tend to express this value through pro-social behaviors (due to valuing compassion) while some Christians may express this value through pro-environmental behaviors (due to the value placed on environmental stewardship in the Bible). Additional research is needed to tease out the underlying drivers of value-based consumer behavior between and within religions. Here, we develop two propositions to explore the effects of religious values on consumer self-control and forgiveness.

5.2. Religious values and self-control

Adhering to one's religious-based values, such as conformity or purity/sanctity, may aid or impair self-control across multiple tasks. Certain religious values specifically dictate moral guidelines regarding what consumption behaviors are allowed versus forbidden. For example, The Ten Commandments play an important role in setting guidelines for behavior in Judaism and Christianity (e.g., avoid stealing and coveting, keep the Sabbath holy). Additionally, Jewish *kosher* laws prohibit eating pork, shellfish, and dishes containing both meat and dairy products (Klein, 1979), and Islamic moral code (s*haria*) differentiates between *halal* (permissible) and *haram* (prohibited) products, where *haram* products include pork, alcoholic beverages, and interest-earning banking products (Ahmad et al., 2011; Alserhan, 2010). Additionally, the Hindu and Buddhist value of *karma* (the sum of one's actions in the present life will decide one's future fate) shepherds adherents to behave morally and to avoid moral transgressions.

Many religious behaviors, such as fasting, meditation, almsgiving, and long periods of prayer, require high levels of self-control and self-regulatory strength (McCullough & Willoughby, 2009). Some research on self-control follows a resource-based energy depletion model, such that engaging in tasks that require self-control deplete one's self-regulatory "muscle," leading to self-control failure in subsequent tasks (Muraven, Tice, & Baumeister, 1998). Alternative self-control models suggest that exerting self-control in a primary task shifts one's motivation and attention from "have to" tasks to "want to" tasks, which undermines his or her self-control in a subsequent task (Inzlicht & Schmeichel, 2012; Inzlicht, Schmeichel, & Macrae, 2014). Using one's mental capacities to perform a difficult task causes individuals to prioritize subsequent behaviors of the greatest net value (i.e., enjoyment) (Kurzban, Duckworth, Kable, & Myers, 2013). Taken together, when consumers use self-control in a primary task, they

are likely to seek out more enjoyable, "want to" options in a subsequent task. Therefore, adhering to strict religious values may require a high level of regulatory strength, thereby exhausting self-regulatory strength for use in other subsequent tasks.

On the other hand, religious values may help individuals with their self-control efforts by limiting the burden of choice, controlling selfish impulses, reducing one's impulsivity by focusing on long-term goals (e.g., Heaven as ultimate goal; Baumeister, Bauer, & Lloyd, 2010), and promoting constant monitoring of goals (see McCullough & Willoughby, 2009). Additionally, religious values may promote impulse control by helping adherents engage in affective forecasting about the repercussions of potential self-control failure (MacInnis & Patrick, 2006), especially about instances where self-control failure would be counter to one's religious values. Religious values may also promote consistent focus on "have to" tasks (e.g., always eating *kosher*) and reduce the desirability of "want to" tasks (e.g., eating bacon). Additionally, it is likely that religious values reduce perceived costs (i.e., effort) associated with performing required tasks that are valued by the religion (e.g., hard work, personal achievement, restraint), thus reducing one's need to shift focus to more enjoyable tasks. Together, we propose:

> *Proposition 5*: Strict (vs. lenient vs. no) religious consumption values will moderate the effects of exhibiting self-control in a primary task (e.g., avoiding temptation) on self-control during a secondary task (e.g., food indulgence, impulsive purchases), as a result of self-regulatory strength and a focus on chronic, long-term goals.

5.3. Religious values and forgiveness

Forgiveness is another value shaped by religion that is likely to affect consumer behavior. Interpersonal forgiveness is relevant in consumer contexts because it extends to consumers'

forgiveness of brands following service failure and recovery (Chung & Beverland, 2006) and

firms' moral transgressions (such as the use of sweatshops, e.g., Aaker, Fournier, & Brasel,

2004). Many consumers view certain companies as evil or immoral, such as Monsanto (due to

GMOs and lawsuits against farmers), British Petroleum (due to polluting the environment), Wal-

Mart (due to labor practices), and McDonald's (due to unhealthy food offerings) (Sheets, 2013).

Additionally, some Muslims believe that global brands such as Nestlé, McDonald's, and Coca-

Cola are "infidels" because they cause immoral behavior among Muslim consumers and "are a

menace to the virtues of the ideal Islamic society" (Izberk-Bilgin, 2012, p. 664). However, when

service providers go above and beyond to make amends after a service failure, consumers may

forgive by increasing their perceptions of justice, satisfaction ratings, purchase intent, and

favorable word-of-mouth (Maxham & Netemeyer, 2003). Organizations have many different

styles for addressing consumers' concerns (e.g., coupon for next visit, apology). The most

effective path to achieving forgiveness after a service failure or moral transgression may be

informed by the consumer's religious values (Hill, Exline, & Cohen, 2005), because religions

place different importance weights on who may forgive and what offenses may be forgiven.

Recent research has found preliminary evidence that priming a religious (vs. neutral)

mindset leads to higher satisfaction ratings and loyalty intentions when judging a service failure

and recovery effort by activating forgiveness processes in consumers' minds (Hyodo & Bolton,

2015). Moreover, reminding individuals of the God concept after they experience a threat makes

them more magnanimous (i.e., forgiving) in their reactions (Schumann, McGregor, Nash, &

Ross, 2014). We build on these findings to suggest that consumers may respond to brand

failures differently depending on their religious values regarding forgiveness.

Previous research has found that both Jews and Protestants make forgiveness decisions based on relevant theology from their religious affiliations, with Protestants more likely to forgive any offense, and Jews likely to believe that forgiveness can only be granted by the victim, repentance is required to achieve forgiveness, and some offenses may be too extreme to be forgiven (Cohen, Malka, Rozin, & Cherfas, 2006). Additionally, Evangelical Baptists believe in the need for God's forgiveness and in divine mandates to forgive others (Exline, 2008). Moral judgment and forgiveness is also determined by the extent to which one's religion endorses the Good-Evil dualism (Joshanloo, 2014). The stronger Good-Evil division in Western religions (but less so in Eastern religions) leads to a heavier insistence on personally avoiding evil and punishing evil-doers (Young, 2005). Together, we propose:

> *Proposition 6*: Religiously-informed values of forgiveness (e.g., God or others must forgive, certain offenses are unforgiveable, good-evil dualism) will moderate the effects of service and brand recovery efforts (vs. none) on satisfaction, loyalty intentions, and word-of-mouth behaviors.

6. Community

6.1. *Definitions and measures*

Another dimension of religion that may affect consumer behavior is religious community. Religion often helps satisfy individuals' needs for group identification, collective self-esteem, affiliation, and belongingness (Greenfield & Marks, 2007; Stark & Bainbridge, 1980; Ysseldyk, Matheson, & Anisman, 2010). Belonging to a religious group helps individuals create a sense of self and social identity through a shared history with past, present, and future members (Cohen, Hall, Koenig, & Meador, 2005; Saroglou, 2011). Religious communities also help individuals

by providing social support to members. However, while belonging to a religious group can increase individual and collective well-being, it can also lead to intergroup conflict (Ysseldyk et al., 2010) and prejudice (Allport & Ross, 1967).

Many scales exist to measure the community dimension of religion. For example, the interpersonal commitment sub-scale of the Religious Commitment Inventory (Worthington et al., 2003) and perhaps the extrinsic subscale of the Religious Orientation Scale (Allport & Ross, 1967) captures the social and affiliational dimension of religion. Additionally, the Asch Descent Assent Measure (Cohen & Hill, 2007) captures the extent to which belonging to a religious community is based on personal faith versus biological descent. To measure level of religious group identification, researchers could also adapt existing ethnic identification measures. For example, items from The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure (Phinney, 1992) could be adapted to measure strength of religious identification (e.g., "I have a strong sense of belonging to my own *religious* group."). Here, we develop two propositions on the effects of religious community on consumer behavior.

6.2. Religious community and the need to belong

Consumer research has established that the need to belong affects consumption choices, an effect likely to be moderated by the level of social support offered by one's religious community. Humans have a fundamental need to belong with others, and threats to belongingness can trigger coping behavior aimed at restoring self-esteem (Leary & Baumeister, 2000). This coping behavior can include choosing and consuming products that signal membership in a social ingroup. For example, when consumers feel ignored, they increase their levels of conspicuous consumption (in order to get noticed); when they feel rejected, they

increase their donation behavior (in order to improve relational status; Lee & Shrum, 2012). In addition, individuals who feel socially excluded become more interested in buying products that help them to fit in with their desired social groups (Mead, Baumeister, Stillman, Rawn, & Vohs, 2011) or link them with close others from their past (Loveland, Smeesters, & Mandel, 2010). Moreover, interpersonal rejection increases people's willingness to take financial risks, because they view having more money as instrumental to achieving popularity (Duclos, Wan, & Jiang, 2013). A number of studies have further corroborated the idea that consumption (particularly conspicuous consumption) can help individuals to overcome feelings of social rejection (e.g., Dommer & Swaminathan, 2013; Wan, Xu, & Ding, 2014; Wang, Zhu, & Shiv, 2012).

Participating in a religious community serves the function of satisfying members' needs to belong (Cohen, Hall et al., 2005; Saroglou, 2011). In fact, when people feel socially excluded, they tend to strengthen their religious beliefs, affiliations, and behaviors as a means to restore a sense of social inclusion (Aydin, Fischer, and Frey, 2010). However, religions differ on the extent to which they are community-based (e.g., Judaism, Christianity) or individual-based (e.g., Buddhism). For example, Christians are expected to attend church weekly with the other members of the congregation and be active members in their religious community. Alternatively, Buddhists primarily practice their religion individually as compared to formal communal gatherings (especially Buddhist followers living outside monastic settings). We expect community-based religions (vs. individual-based religions) to provide members with the social support they need to provide a cushion against threats to belongingness. Individuals who participate in community-based religions can turn to their religious groups as a strategy to cope with feeling excluded from other social groups. Supporting this notion, research has found that beliefs in supernatural agents (i.e., a religious beliefs explanation) provide individuals with

enough support to buffer them from the negative effects of social exclusion (e.g., Epley, Akalis, Waytz, & Cacioppo, 2008).

Here, we propose that one's level of participation in a community-based (vs. an individual-based or no formal) religion provides enough social support to weaken the previously found effects of social exclusion on consumption outcomes. After experiencing social exclusion, we expect that adherents of community-based religions will experience higher levels of religious community support, and will therefore be less likely than others to spend strategically in order to be included in a desired social group (Mead et al., 2011) or to increase their popularity among others (Lee & Shrum, 2012; Duclos, Wan, & Jiang, 2013).

> *Proposition 7:* One's involvement in a community-based (vs. individual-based vs. no
>
> formal) religion will provide social support and dampen the effect of social exclusion on
>
> consumption choices that are intended to restore a sense of belonging.

In some cases, it is also possible that being involved in a religious community may make social exclusion even more difficult. For example, in response to a threat to their religious institutions, consumers might choose products as a means to justify these institutions (e.g., Cutright, Wu, Banfield, Kay, & Fitzsimons, 2011). Furthermore, experiencing social exclusion from one's own religious community (vs. an outgroup) may have an even more profound negative impact on those who are highly involved in a community-based religion. Therefore, we recommend future research to examine the conditions under which one's level of involvement in a community-based (vs. individual-based vs. no formal) religion either alleviates or exacerbates threats to belongingness.

6.3. Religious community and cultural dimensions

Religion can be seen as a form of culture (Cohen, 2009). Religious communities may affect consumer behavior because member involvement shapes the religion's cultural dimensions. One dimension that varies by culture is self-construal (independence versus interdependence; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Independents, or those from individualist countries such as the United States, tend to see themselves as unique and separate from others, whereas interdependents, or those from collectivist countries such as Japan or China, tend to see themselves as interconnected with others in their ingroup (Triandis, 1995). Previous research has found differences in consumer behavior between individuals from different cultures (e.g., Japanese vs. North Americans). For example, East Asians (collectivists) are more likely to choose products that help them conform to their social groups, whereas European Americans (individualists) are more likely to choose products that help them stand out from their social groups (Kim & Markus, 1999). Additionally, research has shown that collectivists are more likely than individualists to demonstrate compromise effects (Briley, Morris, & Simonson, 2000).

Previous research has shown that certain religious groups (e.g., Jews) are more interdependent, while other religious groups (e.g., Protestants) are more independent (Cohen & Hill, 2007) in certain aspects of religious identity, like whether private versus public prayer is valued. Future consumer research could investigate whether members of independent versus interdependent religious communities will also demonstrate many of the previously found cultural consumption differences. For example, we expect that people from collectivistic religions (e.g., Judaism, Hinduism), in which religion is very much thought of as not just one's

private beliefs but membership in a religious community, would exhibit some of the same

behaviors as collectivists (e.g., East Asians) have in prior work. Therefore, we propose:

> *Proposition 8*: Religions with greater religious community participation will exhibit a
>
> higher level of interdependence (vs. independence), thereby increasing preference for
>
> products that help consumers stand out from rather than fit into their social groups.

7. Discussion

In this article, we developed a conceptual framework and research agenda for exploring

the effects of religion on consumer behavior. Our contributions to the consumer psychology

literature are three-fold, as we: 1) conceptualized and delineated religion as a multidimensional

construct, 2) integrated definitions, measures, and previous research to explicate each dimension,

and 3) developed propositions to stimulate future research. We built on the more traditional

conceptualization of religion as either religious affiliation or level of religiosity by proposing

four distinct dimensions of religion that affect consumer behavior.

Our framework serves to both complement and extend extant literature by proposing

more specific religious mechanisms (e.g., beliefs, rituals, values, and community) to help explain

the previously found religious differences in consumer behavior. Furthermore, to stimulate

future theory development within each dimension of religion, we developed eight propositions

for new research avenues using our framework (see Table 1 for research propositions and key

supporting literature). For each dimension, we demonstrated how scholars can use our

conceptual framework to think about their own research. Using our conceptual framework and

set of propositions as idea generation tools, we hope to inspire consumer researchers to ask

deeper questions about why religion drives differences in consumer behavior, rather than to

simply explore what differences in consumer behavior exist between religious groups and levels of religiosity.

<div align="center">Please insert Table 1 here.</div>

7.1. Religion versus culture and personality

Religion, culture, and personality share an important and complex relationship. Religion not only shapes an individual's culture and personality, but is also shaped by culture and personality over time. Here, we discuss methods for disentangling religion, culture, and personality. Culture has been defined as "a pattern of shared attitudes, beliefs, categorizations, self-definitions, norms, role definitions, and values" (Triandis, 1996, p. 408), making it quite similar to religion. However, religion and national culture also differ in many ways; "A Southern Baptist male from Sacramento, a Sephardic Jewish grandmother from San Francisco, and an agnostic Chinese American student at the University of California, Berkeley share a language, a historic time period, and a geographic region [i.e., a culture] yet might not share their most important attitudes, beliefs, norms, or values" (Cohen, 2009, p. 194). Therefore, to isolate religious differences from cultural differences, we recommend religion researchers to restrict studies to participants from the same national culture (Vitell, 2010). Otherwise, in multinational studies of religion, researchers can control for national culture, majority/minority status, socioeconomics, and ethnicity, in order to isolate religion effects (Cohen & Neuberg, 2015).

The term "personality" refers to individual differences in cognition, affect, and behavior (APA.org, 2015). Religions affect personality, because religious doctrines promote in individuals a unique set of beliefs, rituals, values, and community structures that shape patterns of thinking, feeling, and behaving. Previous researchers have found a relationship between

religiosity and a variety of personality traits, such as agreeableness, conscientiousness, lower

impulsivity (Saroglou, 2002), conservatism, and self-direction (Saroglou, Delpierre, & Dernelle,

2004). However, our review of the literature suggests that the four dimensions of religion offer

the potential for more explanatory power than personality alone. Moreover, to our knowledge,

little to no research has explored the relationship between religious beliefs, rituals, values, and

community structures on personality traits, which is an important area for future research.

7.2. Religiously unaffiliated consumers

Our framework of religious beliefs, rituals, values, and community also attempts to

understand how these dimensions differ across and between the large and growing population of

non-religious consumers. In its report "The Future of World Religions: Population Growth

Projections," the Pew Research Center (2015) projects that the number of individuals around the

globe who identify as "unaffiliated" will climb from 1.13 billion in 2010 to 1.23 billion in 2050.

In the U.S., the percentage of unaffiliated grew from 16% in 2007 to 23% in 2014, largely driven

by declining beliefs in younger adults (Cohn, 2015).

Unaffiliated consumers will most likely fit into our framework as those who score low on

beliefs, rituals, values, and community. However, future research should also consider

differences in beliefs, rituals, values, and community between adherents of various non-religious

worldviews. For example, atheism and agnosticism emphasize a lack of belief (presumably

accompanied by low levels of participation in religious rituals, values, or community). In

contrast, Secular Humanists also have a lack of religious belief, but they have organized their

own communities and meeting places, and have created a new set of collective rituals and values

(Worthen, 2015). Further, people who consider themselves "spiritual but not religious" are

likely to score high on measures of beliefs but low in terms of participation in rituals and community. Therefore, it is important to consider the heterogeneity of the unaffiliated population when conducting research on religion. In addition, while beyond the scope of the current review, there is a burgeoning literature that examines the various ways in which consumers substitute products or brands for religion (e.g., Shachar, Erdem, Cutright, & Fitzsimons, 2011). These findings suggest that non-religious consumers will be more susceptible to a variety of marketing strategies than religious consumers. However, it is also possible that these different non-religious worldviews will respond differently to marketing messages, depending on what they are attempting to substitute (e.g., a lack of belief vs. a lack of community).

7.3. Challenges and opportunities for conducting religion research

Before encouraging scholars to conduct research using our framework, we want to highlight a few challenges and additional opportunities for conducting religion research in the consumer domain. First, it may be difficult for researchers to recruit participants of varying religions and levels of religiosity, especially in behavioral labs at universities across the globe. Researchers of successful multi-religious studies recruit participants in a number of ways, with the appropriate recruitment method determined by the research question. For example, researchers who want to study people of different religions where they are dominant in their society will need to gain access to different countries to collect data (e.g., Greece for study of Greek Orthodoxy, Israel for study of Judaism). On the other hand, researchers who want to avoid confounding religion and country will need to collect data within countries, cities, and/or samples with adequate representations of relevant religions. We do not propose that either

approach is inherently more valuable, but that the research question should determine what kind of sampling would provide the best theoretical test (Cohen & Neuberg, 2015).

Another challenge in conducting research on religion and consumer behavior is identifying and developing measures that are reliable across multiple religious groups, not solely Christians. While some measures have been developed specifically for use with one religion or another, Saroglou (2011) developed a 12-item, four-dimensional measure (e.g., beliefs, bonding, behaving, and belonging) of religiosity that has good reliability across religious groups.

In addition to measuring religious beliefs, rituals, values, and community, it is possible to temporarily activate a multitude of identities, such as one's parent self, scholar self, ethnic minority self, or moral self. Therefore, it is likely that priming religious beliefs, rituals, values, and community (vs. a neutral state) may affect consumption preferences. Just as priming interdependence versus independence (e.g., Mandel, 2003) or high versus low power distance (e.g., Zhang, Winterich, & Mittal, 2010) can influence consumer behavior, priming Judaism versus Protestantism (which differ on the interdependence-independence dimension and on other dimensions) or priming Catholicism versus Buddhism (which may differ on the power distance dimension) may produce similar findings. Activating religious identities and specific aspects of these identities can be done in a number of explicit and implicit ways, depending on one's research question. For example, individuals can write an essay about their religious membership or about specific religious constructs of interest, such as belief in a soul (e.g., Li et al., 2012). Alternatively, religious dimensions could be subliminally primed by presenting words like "God" on a computer screen so quickly they are not consciously perceived ("subliminal priming"). Additionally, participants can unscramble sentences with subtle religious content (vs. neutral) such as words like divine or spirit (Shariff & Norenzayan, 2007). Whether researchers

choose to measure or manipulate religious constructs, we still suggest that they explore the distinct religious mechanisms that drive differences in consumer behavior.

7.4. Limitations and future directions

In developing a conceptual framework for conducting research in religion and consumer behavior, we recognize our inability to be entirely comprehensive in our review of the relationship between religion and consumer behavior. By focusing on the effects of the four dimensions of religion on consumer behavior, we miss some other aspects of the relationship between religion and consumer behavior, such as how consumer culture in turn affects religious practices (e.g., Miller, 2004), and how consumer culture can be similar to a religion (e.g., Belk & Tumbat, 2005). We encourage scholars to use our research framework primarily as a stepping-stone in considering more aspects of the relationship between religion and consumer behavior.

7.5. Concluding remarks

Through our conceptual framework and research agenda we encourage researchers to stop thinking about religion as merely a grouping variable or an individual difference variable and instead, to uncover the psychological mechanisms driving differences in consumer behavior between individuals of various religious beliefs, rituals, values, and communities. While there has been in recent years an increasing number of articles exploring the effects of religion on consumer behavior in recent years, the numerous issues we have raised are new and untested. Our conceptual framework and propositions for future research have sought to reveal that the role religion plays in shaping consumer behavior is even richer and more promising than consumer psychologists may have realized.

References

Aaker, J. L., Fournier, S., & Brasel, S. A. (2004). When good brands do bad. *Journal of Consumer Research, 31*(1), 1-16.

Ahmad, K., Rustam, G. A., & Dent, M. M. (2011). Brand preference in Islamic banking. *Journal of Islamic Marketing, 2*(1), 74-82.

Allport, G.W. (1950). *Individual and His Religion*. New York: McMillan.

Allport, G. W., & Ross, J. M. (1967). Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 5*, 432-443.

Alserhan, B. A. (2010). On Islamic branding: Brands as good deeds. *Journal of Islamic Marketing, 1*(2), 101-106.

American Catholic (2014). The Seven Catholic Sacraments. Retrieved from: http://www.americancatholic.org/features/special/default.aspx?id=29

Anong, S. T., & Fisher, P. J. (2013). Future orientation and saving for medium-term expenses. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, 41*(4), 393-412.

APA.org (2015). Personality. Retrieved from: http://www.apa.org/topics/personality/

Atran, S., & Norenzayan, A. (2004). Religion's evolutionary landscape: Counterintuition, commitment, compassion, communion. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 27,* 713-770.

Aydin, N., Fischer, P., & Frey, D. (2010). Turning to God in times of ostracism: The impact of social exclusion on religiousness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 36*, 742–753.

Baumeister, R. F., Bauer, I. M., & Lloyd, S. A. (2010). Choice, free will, and religion. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality, 2*(2), 67-82.

Becker, E. (1973). *The denial of death.* Free Press.

Belk, R. W., & Tumbat, G. (2005). The cult of Macintosh. *Consumption, Markets, and Culture*, *8*(3), 205–17.

Belk, R. W., Wallendorf, M.R., & Sherry, J., Jr. (1989). The sacred and the profane in consumer behavior: Theodicy on the odyssey. *Journal of Consumer Research, 16* (June), 1-38.

Benson, P. L., & Spilka, B. (1973). God image as a function of self-esteem and locus of control. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 13,* 297-310.

Bjarnason, D. (2007). Concept Analysis of Religiosity. *Home Health Care Management and Practice 19*(5), 350–355.

Briley, D. A., Morris, M. W., & Simonson, I. (2000). Reasons as carriers of culture: Dynamic versus dispositional models of cultural influence on decision making. *Journal of Consumer Research, 27*, 157-178.

Burnett, J. J. (1981). Psychographic and demographic characteristics of blood donors. *Journal of Consumer Research, 8*, 62-66.

Chung, E., & Beverland, M. (2006). An exploration of consumer forgiveness following marketer transgressions. *Advances in Consumer Research, 33*, 98.

Cohen, A. B. (2009). Many forms of culture. *American Psychologist, 64*, 194-204.

Cohen, A. B. (2015). Religion's Profound Influences on Psychology: Morality, Intergroup Relations, Self-Construal, and Enculturation. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 24*(1), 77 - 82.

Cohen, A. B., & Hall, D. E. (2009). Existential beliefs, social satisfaction, and well-being among Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant older adults. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 19*, 39 – 54.

Cohen, A. B., Hall, D. E., Koenig, H. G., & Meador, K. G. (2005). Social versus individual

motivation: Implications for normative definitions of religious orientation. *Personality &

Social Psychology Review, 9*, 48-61.

Cohen, A. B., & Hill, P. C. (2007). Religion as culture: Religious individualism and collectivism

among American Catholics, Jews, and Protestants. *Journal of Personality, 75*, 709-742.

Cohen, A. B., Malka, A., Rozin, P., & Cherfas, L. (2006). Religion and unforgivable offenses.

Journal of Personality, 74, 85-118.

Cohen, A. B., & Neuberg, S. L. (2015). Religion and Religious Conflict. Chapter in preparation

for *Handbook of Cultural Psychology* (D. Cohen & S. Kitayama, eds.).

Cohen, A. B., Pierce, J. D., Jr., Chambers, J., Meade, R., Gorvine, B. J., & Koenig, H. G. (2005).

Intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity, belief in the afterlife, death anxiety, and life satisfaction

in young Catholics and Protestants. *Journal of Research in Personality, 39*(3), 307-324.

Cohen, A. B., Siegel, J. I., & Rozin, P. (2003). Faith versus practice: Different bases for

religiosity judgments by Jews and Protestants. *European Journal of Social Psychology,

33*, 287-295.

Cohn, Nate (2015). Big drop in share of Americans calling themselves Christian. *New York

Times*, May 12.

Cotte, J., Ratneshwar, S., & Mick, D. G. (2004). The times of their lives: Phenomenological and

metaphorical characteristics of consumer timestyles. *Journal of Consumer Research, 31*

(September), 333-345.

Cutright, K. M. (2012). The beauty of boundaries: When and why we seek structure in

consumption. *Journal of Consumer Research,* 38(5), 775-790.

Cutright, K. M., & Samper, A. (2014). Doing it the hard way: How low control drives preferences for high-effort products and services. *Journal of Consumer Research, 41*(3), 730-745.

Cutright, K. M., Wu, E. C., Banfield, J. C., Kay, A. C., & Fitzsimons, G. J. (2011). When your world must be defended: Choosing products to justify the system. *Journal of Consumer Research, 38*(1), 62-77.

Dommer, S. L., & Swaminathan, V. (2013). Explaining the endowment effect through ownership: The role of identity, gender, and self-threat. *Journal of Consumer Research, 39*(5), 1034-1050.

Doran, C. J., & Natale, S. M. (2011). ἐμπάθεια (Empatheia) and caritas: The role of religion in fair trade consumption. *Journal of Business Ethics, 98*(1), 1-15.

Duclos, R., Wan, E. W., & Jiang, Y. (2013). Show me the honey! Effects of social exclusion on financial risk-taking. *Journal of Consumer Research, 40*(1), 122-135.

Durkheim, E. (1912/1995). *Elementary forms of religious life* (K. E. Fields, Trans.). New York: Free Press. (Original work published 1912)

Epley, N., Akalis, S., Waytz, A., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2008). Creating social connection through inferential reproduction: Loneliness and perceived agency in gadgets, gods, and greyhounds. *Psychological Science, 19*, 114-120.

Exline, J. (2008). Beliefs about God and forgiveness in a Baptist Church sample. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 27*(2), 131-139.

Graham, J., & Haidt, J. (2010). Beyond beliefs: Religions bind individuals into moral communities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 14*(1), 140-150.

Greenberg, J., Pyszczynski, T., Solomon, S., Rosenblatt, A., Veeder, M., Kirkland, S., & Lyon, D. (1990). Evidence for terror management theory II: The effects of mortality salience on reactions to those who threaten or bolster the cultural worldview. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*(2), 308-318.

Greenfield, E. A., & Marks, N. F. (2007). Religious social identity as an explanatory factor for associations between more frequent formal religious participation and psychological well-being. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 17*, 245-259.

Haidt, J. (2007). The new synthesis in moral psychology. *Science, 316*, 998-1002.

Hall, D., Cohen, A. B., Meyer, K. K., Varley, A., & Brewer, G. A., Jr. (in press). Costly signaling increases trust, even across religious affiliations. *Psychological Science*.

Harris, E.J. (1998). *What Buddhists believe*. Boston, MA: Oneworld Publications.

Heine, S. J., Harihara, M., & Niiya, Y. (2002). Terror management in Japan. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 5*(3), 187-196.

Hill, P. C., Exline, J. J., & Cohen, A. B. (2005). The social psychology of justice and forgiveness in civil and organizational settings. In E.L. Worthington, Jr. (Ed.), *Handbook of forgiveness* (pp. 477-490). New York: Routledge.

Hill, P. C., & Hood, R. W., Jr. (1999). *Measures of religiosity*. Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press.

Hirschman, E. C. (1981). American Jewish Ethnicity: Its Relationship to Some Selected Aspects of Consumer Behavior. *Journal of Marketing, 45*(3), 102-110.

Hirschman, E. C. (1990). Secular immortality and the American ideology of affluence. *Journal of Consumer Research, 17*(1), 31-42.

Hoge, D. R. (1994). Introduction: The Problem of Understanding Church Giving. *Review of Religious Research, 36*(2), 101-110.

Hood, R. W., Jr., Hill, P. C., & Spilka, B. (2009). *The Psychology of Religion: An Empirical Approach (4ᵗʰ Ed.).* New York: The Guilford Press.

Hood, R. W., Jr., & Morris, R. J. (1983). Toward a theory of death transcendence. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 22*, 353-365.

Hymer, S. (1995). Therapeutic and redemptive aspects of religious confession. *Journal of Religion and Health, 34*(1), 41-54.

Hyodo, J. D., & Bolton, L. E. (2015). How does religion affect consumer response to brand failure? Working paper.

Inzlicht, M., & Schmeichel, B. J. (2012). What is ego depletion? Toward a mechanistic revision of the resource model of self-control. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 7*, 450-463.

Inzlicht, M., Schmeichel, B. J., & Macrae, C. N. (2014). Why self-control seems (but may not be) limited. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 18*(3), 127–133.

Izberk-Bilgin, E. (2012). Infidel brands: Unveiling alternative meanings of global brands at the nexus of globalization, consumer culture, and Islamism. *Journal of Consumer Research, 39*(4), 663-687.

James, W. (1902). *The Varieties of Religious Experience: A Study in Human Nature*. The Gifford Lectures on Natural Religion Delivered at Edinburgh in 1901-1902. London: Longmans, Green, and Co.

Johnson, K. A., Hill, E. D, & Cohen, A. B. (2011). Integrating the study of culture and religion: Toward a psychology of worldview. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 5*(3), 137-152.

Johnson, K. A., Memon, R., Alladin, A., Cohen, A. B., Okun, M. A. (2015). Who Helps the

      Samaritan? The Influence of Religious vs. Secular Primes on Spontaneous Helping of

      Members of Religious Outgroups. *Journal of Cognition and Culture, 15*(1-2), 217 – 231.

Jonas, E., & Fischer, P. (2006). Terror management and religion: Evidence that intrinsic

      religiousness mitigates worldview defense following mortality salience. *Journal of*

      Personality and Social Psychology, 91(3), 553-567.

Jonas, K. J., & Huguet, P. (2008). What day is today? A social-psychological investigation into

      the process of time orientation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34*(3), 353-

      365.

Joshanloo, M. (2014). Eastern conceptualizations of happiness: fundamental differences with

      western views. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 15*, 475-493.

Kahle, L. R., Beatty, S. E., & Homer, P. (1986). Alternative measurement approaches to

      consumer values: The List of Values (LOV) and Life Styles (VALS). *Journal of*

      Consumer Research, 13, 405-409.

Kasser, T., & Sheldon, K. M. (2000). Of wealth and death: Materialism, mortality salience, and

      consumption behavior. *Psychological Science, 11*(4), 348-351.

Kay, A. C., Gaucher, D., Napier, J. L., Callan, M. J. & Laurin, K. (2008). God and the

      government: Testing a compensatory control mechanism for the support of external

      systems. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*, 18-35.

Kim, H., & Markus, H. R. (1999). Deviance or uniqueness, harmony or conformity? A cultural

      analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*(4), 785.

Klein, I. (1979). *Guide to Jewish religious practice*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary.

Kopalle, P. K., Lehmann, D. R., & Farley, J. U. (2010). Consumer expectations and culture: The

      effect of belief in Karma in India. *Journal of Consumer Research, 37*(2), 251-263.

Kupor, D. M., Laurin, K., & Levav, J. (in press). Anticipating divine protection? Reminders of

      God can increase non-moral risk-taking. *Psychological Science*.

Kurzban, R., Duckworth, A. L., Kable, J. W., & Myers, J. (2013). A cost/benefit model of

      subjective effort and task performance. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 36*(6), 707-726.

Leary, M. R., & Baumeister, R. F. (2000). The nature and function of self-esteem: Sociometer

      theory. *Advances in experimental social psychology, 32*, 1-62.

Lee, J., & Shrum, L. J. (2012). Conspicuous consumption versus charitable behavior in response

      to social exclusion: A differential needs explanation. *Journal of Consumer Research,

      39*(3), 530-544.

Levav, J., & Zhu, R. J. (2009). Seeking freedom through variety. *Journal of Consumer Research,

      36*(4), 600-610.

Li, Y. J., Johnson, K. A., Cohen, A. B., Williams, M. J., Knowles, E. D., & Chen, Z. (2012).

      Fundamental(ist) attribution error: Protestants are dispositionally focused. *Journal of

      Personality and Social Psychology, 102*, 281-290.

Loveland, K., Smeesters, D., & Mandel, N. (2010). Still preoccupied with 1995: The need to

      belong and preference for nostalgic products. *Journal of Consumer Research, 37*(3), 393-

      408.

MacInnis, D. J. (2011). A framework for conceptual contributions in marketing. *Journal of

      Marketing, 75,* 136-154.

MacInnis, D. J., & Patrick, V. M. (2006). Spotlight on affect: Affect and affective forecasting in

      impulse control. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 16*(3), 224-231.

Mandel, N. (2003). Shifting selves and decision making: The effects of self-construal priming on consumer risk-taking. *Journal of Consumer Research, 30*, 30-40.

Mandel, N., & Heine, S. J. (1999). Terror management and marketing: He who dies with the most toys wins. *Advances in Consumer Research, 26*, 527-532.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*, 224-253.

Mathras, D., Mandel, N., & Cohen, A. B. (2015). Consumer confessions: Implications for self-regulation and well-being. Working Paper.

Maxham III., J. G., & Netemeyer, R. G. (2003). Firms reap what they sow: The effects of shared values and perceived organizational justice on customers' evaluation of complaint handling. *Journal of Marketing, 67*(1), 29-45.

McAlexander, J. H., DuFault, B. L., Martin, D. M., & Schouten, J. W. (2014). The marketization of religion: Field, capital, and consumer identity. *Journal of Consumer Research, 41*(3), 858-875.

McCullough, M. E., & Willoughby, B. L. (2009). Religion, self-regulation, and self-control: Associations, explanations, and implications. *Psychological Bulletin, 135*(1), 69.

Mead, N. L., Baumeister, R. F., Stillman, T. F., Rawn, C. D., & Vohs, K. D. (2011). Social exclusion causes people to spend and consume strategically in the service of affiliation. *Journal of Consumer Research, 37*(5), 902-919.

Miller, V. J. (2004). *Consuming religion: Christian faith and practice in a consumer culture.* New York: Continuum.

Minkler, L., & Coşgel, M. M. (2004). Religious identity and consumption. *Economics Working Papers*: The University of Connecticut.

Minton, E. A. & Kahle, L. (2013). *Belief Systems, Religion, and Behavioral Economics:*

    Marketing in Multicultural Environments. New York, NY: Business Expert Press.

Muraven, M., Tice, D. M., & Baumeister, R. F. (1998). Self-control as limited resource:

    Regulatory depletion patterns. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 774-

    789.

Murray-Swank, A. B., McConnell, K. M., & Pargament, K. I. (2007). Understanding spiritual

    confession: A review and theoretical synthesis. *Mental Health, Religion, & Culture,*

    10(3), 275-291.

Meyers-Levy, J. & Loken, B. (2014). Revisiting gender differences: What we know and what

    lies ahead. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 25*(1), 129-149.

Norenzayan, A., Dar-Nimrod, I., Hansen, I. G., & Proulx, T. (2009). Mortality salience and

    religion: divergent effects on the defense of cultural worldviews for the religious and the

    non-religious. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 39*(1), 101-113.

Pace, S. (2013). Does religion affect the materialism of consumers? An empirical investigation

    of Buddhist ethics and the resistance of the self. *Journal of Business Ethics, 112,* 25-46.

Paglieri, F., Borghi, A. M., Colzato, L. S., Hommel, B., & Scorolli, C. (2013). Heaven can wait.

    How religion modulates temporal discounting. *Psychological Research, 77*, 738-747.

Paloutzian, R. F., & Ellison, C. W. (1982). Loneliness, spiritual well-being, and quality of life. In

    L. A. Peplau & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Loneliness: A sourcebook of current theory, research*

    and therapy (pp. 237-244). New York: Wiley-Interscience.

Park, C. L. (2005). Religion as a meaning-making framework in coping with life stress. *Journal*

    of Social Issues, 61(4), 707-729.

Peifer, J. (2007). Religious giving as a response to the community. Center for the Study of Economy and Society, Working Paper Series # 42 (October).

Pennebaker, J. W., & Beall, S. (1986). Confronting a traumatic event: Toward an understanding of inhibition and disease. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 95*, 274-281.

Penner, L. A., Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., & Schroeder, D. A. (2005). Prosocial behavior: Multilevel perspectives. *Annual Review of Psychology, 56*, 365-392.

Pew Forum (2008). U.S. religious landscape survey. Washington, DC: The Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life.

Pew Forum (2012). The global religious landscape. Retrieved from:
http://www.pewforum.org/2012/12/18/global-religious-landscape-exec/

Pew Research Center (2015). The Future of World Religions: Population Growth Projections, 2010-2050.

Phinney, J. S. (1992). The Multigroup Ethnic Identity Measure: A new scale for use with diverse groups. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 7*(2), 156-176.

Piedmont, R. L. (1999). Does spirituality represent the sixth factor of personality? Spiritual transcendence and the five-factor model. *Journal of Personality, 67*(6), 985-1013.

Poloma, M. M., & Pendleton, B. F. (1989). Exploring types of prayer and quality of life: A research note. *Review of Religious Research, 31*(1), 46-53.

Ray, J. J. & Najman, J. (1974). Death anxiety and death acceptance: A preliminary approach. *Omega, 5*, 311-315.

Regnerus, M. D., Smith, C., & Sikkink, D. (1998). Who gives to the poor? The influence of religious tradition and political location on the personal generosity of Americans toward the poor. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 31*(3), 481-493.

Rindfleisch, A., Burroughs, J. E., & Wong, N. (2009). The safety of objects: Materialism,

existential insecurity, and brand connection. *Journal of Consumer Research, 36*(1), 1-16.

Ritzema, R. J., & Young, C. (1983). Causal schemata and the attribution of supernatural

causality. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 11*, 36-43.

Rook, D. W. (1985). The ritual dimension of consumer behavior. *Journal of Consumer

Research, 12*(3), 251-264.

Rucker, D. D., & Galinsky, A. D. (2008). Desire to acquire: Powerlessness and compensatory

consumption. *Journal of Consumer Research, 35*(2), 257–267.

Saroglou, V. (2010). Religion and the five factors of personality: a meta-analytic review.

Personality and Individual Differences, 32, 15 – 25.

Saroglou, V. (2011). Believing, bonding, behaving, and belonging: The big four religious

dimensions and cultural variation. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 42,* 1320-1340.

Saroglou, V., Delpierre, V., & Dernelle, R. (2004). Values and religiosity: A meta-analysis of

studies using Schwartz's model. *Personality and Individual Differences, 37*, 721-734.

Schaler, J. A. (1996). Spiritual thinking in addiction-treatment providers: The spiritual belief

scale. *Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly, 14*(3), 7-33.

Scheepers, P., & Te Grotenhuis, M. (2005). Who cares for the poor in Europe? Micro and macro

determinants for alleviating poverty in 15 European countries. *European Sociological

Review, 21*(5), 453-465.

Schmidt, R., Sager, G. C., Carney, G., Jackson, J. J., Zanca, K., Muller, A., & Jackson, J. (1999).

Patterns of Religion. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Schumann, K., McGregor, I., Nash, K. A., & Ross, M. (2014). Religious magnanimity:

  Reminding people of their religious belief system reduces hostility after a threat. *Journal

  of Personality and Social Psychology, 107*(3), 432-453.

Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Are there universal aspects in the structure and contents of human

  values? *Journal of Social Issues, 50*(4), 19-45.

Schwartz, S. H., & Huismans, S. (1995). Value priorities and religiosity in four Western

  religions. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 58*, 88-107.

Shachar, R., Erdem, T. Cutright, K., & Fitzsimons, G. (2011). Brands: The opiate of the non-

  religious masses? *Marketing Science*, *30*(1), 92-110.

Shariff, A. F., & Norenzayan, A. (2007). God is watching you: Priming God concepts increases

  prosocial behavior in an anonymous economic game. *Psychological Science, 18*(9), 803-

  809.

Sheets, C. A. (2013). Monsanto Named 2013's 'Most Evil Corporation' In New Poll.

  International Business Times, June 10.

Shepherd, S., Kay, A. C., & Eibach, R. P. (2015). How symbolic fusions with religion imbue

  products with increased reliability and safety. Working paper.

Smith, C., & Emerson, M. O. (2008). *Passing the plate. Why American Christians don't give

  away more money.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Sood, J., & Nasu, Y. (1995). Religiosity and nationality: An exploratory study of their effect on

  consumer behavior in Japan and the United States. *Journal of Business Research, 34*, 1-9.

Stark, R., & Bainbridge, W. S., (1980). Networks of faith: Interpersonal bonds and recruitment to

  cults and sects. *American Journal of Sociology, 85*, 1376-1395.

Tam, L., & Dholakia, U. (2014). Saving in cycles: How to get people to save more money. *Psychological Science, 25*(2), 531-537.

Templer, D. I. (1970). The construction and validation of a Death Anxiety Scale. *The Journal of General Psychology, 82*(2), 165-177.

Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Triandis, H. C. (1996). The psychological measurement of cultural syndromes. *American Psychologist, 51*(4), 407-415.

Vitell, S. J. (2009). The Role of Religiosity in Business and Consumer Ethics: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Business Ethics, 90*, 155-167.

Wan, E. W., Xu, J., & Ding, Y. (2014). To be or not to be unique? The effect of social exclusion on consumer choice. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *40*(6), 1109-1122.

Wang, J., Zhu, R. J., & Shiv, B. (2012). The lonely consumer: Loner or conformer? *Journal of Consumer Research*, *38*(6), 1116-1128.

Worthen, Molly (2015). Wanted: A theology of atheism. New York Times, May 30.

Worthington, E. L., Jr., Wade, N. G., Hight, T. L., Ripley, J. S., McCullough, M. E., Berry, J. W., Schmitt, M. M., Berry, J. T., Bursley, K. H., & O'Connor, L. (2003). The Religious Commitment Inventory—10: Development, refinement, and validation of a brief scale for research and counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 50*(1), 84–96.

Young., E. L. (2005). A brief contrast between Eastern and Western religions. The Natural Systems Institute. Retrieved from: http://www.thenaturalsystemsinstitute.org/

Ysseldyk, R., Matheson, K., & Anisman, H. (2010). Religiosity as identity: Toward an understanding of religion from a social identity perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 14*(1), 60-71.

Zhang, Y., Winterich, K. P., & Mittal, V. (2010). Power distance belief and impulsive buying. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *47*(5), 945-95.

Table 1

Proposed research avenues: The effects of religion on consumer behavior

Dimensions	Research Propositions	Supporting Literature
Beliefs	A belief system is a cultural ideology in which individuals share a set of commonly accepted truths about their world (Saroglou, 2011).	
1	Religious beliefs about the afterlife (e.g., existence of Heaven, reincarnation, acceptance of impermanence) will dampen the effects of mortality salience on status-seeking, materialism, and self-brand connections.	Becker, 1973; Cohen & Hall, 2009; Jonas & Fischer, 2006; Norenzayan et al. 2009
2	Religious beliefs about external control (e.g., belief in a controlling God) will mitigate the effects of a perceived lack of power, freedom, or personal control on preference for high-effort products, luxury products, and/or variety seeking.	Benson & Spilka, 1973; Cutright, 2012; Kay et al. 2008
Rituals	Rituals are symbolic, repeated behaviors that typically follow a formal script (i.e., performed in the same manner every time) (Rook, 1985).	
3	Religious practice of cleansing rituals (e.g., penance, physical cleansing) will moderate the effects of making a confession about a past consumer transgression (vs. not confessing) on subsequent amends-making behaviors (e.g., dieting, environmentally-friendly behaviors).	Hymer, 1995; Mathras et al., 2015; Murray-Swank et al., 2007
4	The practice of religious rituals that presume a more cyclical (vs. linear), future-focused (vs. past- or present-focused) time orientation will increase consumer behaviors aimed at improving one's future (e.g., sustainability, financial saving, and investment).	Jonas & Huguet, 2008; Kopalle et al., 2010; Paglieri et al., 2013; Tam & Dholakia, 2014
Values	Values are guiding principles and norms in an individual's life (Schwartz, 1994).	
5	Strict (vs. lenient vs. no) religious consumption values will moderate the effects of exhibiting self-control in a primary task (e.g., avoiding temptation) on self-control during a secondary task (e.g., food indulgence, impulsive purchases), as a result of self-regulatory strength and focus on chronic, long-term goals.	Baumeister et al., 2010; Inzlicht et al., 2014; Kurzban et al., 2013; McCullough & Willoughby, 2009; Muraven et al., 1998
6	Religiously-informed values of forgiveness (e.g., God or others must forgive, certain offenses are unforgiveable, good-evil dualism) will moderate the effects of service and brand recovery efforts (vs. none) on satisfaction, loyalty intentions, and word-of-mouth behaviors.	Cohen et al., 2006; Hill et al., 2005; Hyodo & Bolton, 2015; Izberk-Bilgin, 2012; Schumann et al., 2014
Community	Communities provide members with group identification, affiliation, and a sense of belonging (e.g., Greenfield & Marks, 2007).	
7	One's involvement in a community-based (vs. individual-based vs. no formal) religion will provide social support and dampen the effect of social exclusion on consumption choices that are intended to restore a sense of belonging.	Aydin et al., 2010; Cutright et al., 2011; Leary & Baumeister, 2000; Mead et al., 2011
8	Religions with a greater religious community participation will exhibit a higher level of interdependence (vs. independence), thereby increasing preference for products that help consumers stand out from rather than fit into their social groups.	Chan et al., 2009; Kim & Markus, 1999; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1995