The number of people moving across borders is growing at a steady pace. According to the International Migration Report, between 1990 and 2013, the number of international migrants rose by 50% [International Migration Report, 2013]. Migration is one of the major features of the changing face of urban society. Immigrants reshape a city landscape in terms of demographics and contribute to its ethnic, social, and religious diversity [MacDonald, Sampson, 2012, p. 14–15; Hiebert, 1995, p. 267]. For many reasons, mostly economical large urban centers attract immigrants from diverse cultures and ethnic backgrounds [National Research Council, 2003, p. 322].
Migration presents new challenges and opportunities for the urban community. On the one hand, it contributes to a growing ethnic, cultural, and religious diversity of a city population; on the other, it often makes intergroup relations in the city more complicated and even hostile. Considering the fact that Russia is predominantly a Christian country, the native population tends to perceive the influx of Muslim immigrants from non-Christian countries as a threat to their beliefs, values, and culture.

According to one study [Polovnev, 2011], Muscovite orthodox Christians are more cautious toward Muslims than Muslims are toward Christians. In fact, Muslims were identified to have 2.5 points out of 7 on a scale of social distance between Muslims and Christians, while Christians appeared to have 4 out of 7. Polovnev states, “The capital’s Christians often perceive the representers of Islam as hostile, troublesome, anxious, distant, and strange people. Taking in mind the activity and power attributed to Muslims, such a picture obviously creates a perception of danger and threat to their safety” [Ibid.]. However, the religious landscape of such a metropolis as Moscow is not represented only by the Orthodox religious community.

Scores of books and articles on intergroup prejudice and social distance focus on relationships between majority and minority groups. Yet little has been written on relationships between the minority groups themselves. Meanwhile, prejudice is not only common for the relationships between minority and majority groups; it can also be on a horizontal level between minority groups [White, Langer, 1999]. As Lee [Lee, n. a.] aptly notes, “Prejudice is about fear — fear of the unknown and fear of others who are different from ourselves.” The fact that people belong to minority groups does not mean they will automatically get along together; as humans, they can experience negative feelings toward each other.

In the present study, we will examine the attitudes of a religious minority group of the Seventh-day Adventists toward the religious and ethnic minority group of Muslim immigrants in Moscow and determine factors that influence those attitudes. Considering a previous study on the matter, we will focus on ten factors influencing intergroup relations such as prejudice, social distance, symbolic and realistic threats, intergroup anxiety, stereotypes, ethnocentrism, in-group identity, intergroup contact, and spirituality.

Theoretical Framework

The growing influx of immigrants and refugees fosters hostility and discriminatory attitudes toward the newcomers [Stephan, Ybarra, Bachman, 1999, p. 2222]. The conflict between a native population and immigrants is due to the intergroup relations issue. People tend to favor their own group over other groups in order to maintain a positive perception of their in-group and to maintain an appropriate level of self-esteem [Turner, Hewstone, 2010, p. 44]. The in-group relationships are marked with loyalty, trust, and intimacy, while relations to the out-group representatives are usually associated with greater ambiguity and uncertainty, sometimes even with anger and hostility [Matsumoto, Juang, 2008, p. 374].

Prejudice is expressed in cognitive, affective, and behavioral forms and implies open or subtle antipathy towards the disliked group [Brown, 2010, p. 7]. Social distance is the behavioral expression of prejudice, which arises due to the natural tendency of the in-group members to sustain positive social identity [Turner, Hewstone, 2010, p. 42].

Perceived threats influence attitudes, emotions, and behavior and lead to intergroup anxiety when interacting with out-group members [Stephan, Stephan, 1996, p. 409]. Among the constructs of the integrated threat theory (ITT) are symbolic and realistic threats [Stephan, Stephan, 2000, p. 23]. Symbolic or intangible fears are related to the issue of status, norms, and values that threaten the in-group’s identity [Triandis, Trafimow, 2003, p. 375]. When confronted by a foreign group, the indigenous group will likely perceive threats to their religious beliefs, philosophy, morality, and worldview [Stephan, Ybarra, Morrison, 2009, p. 44].

Realistic or tangible fears deal with territorial, economic, or physical threat [Stephan, Ybarra, Morrison, 2009, p. 43]. Since there is an increasing number of labor migrants into the receiving country, the host community is becoming concerned about physical and material harm from the out-
groups such as pain, death, deprivation of valued resources, economic loss, threat to health, and personal security [Stephan, Renfro, Davis, 2008, p. 55].

Threats in effect influence attitudes, emotions, and behavior and lead to intergroup anxiety when interacting with out-group members [Stephan, Stephan, 1996, p. 409]. Oskamp notes, "People feel personally threatened in intergroup interactions because they are concerned about negative outcomes for the self, such as being embarrassed, rejected, or ridiculed" [Oskamp, 2000, p. 40]. The constant expectation of negative reactions leads to intergroup bias and prejudice [Riek, Mania, Gaertner, 2006, p. 336].

Stereotyping is a cognitive component of prejudice and is related to a judgment about an individual or an entire group. The process of categorization involves classifying people into groups based on common similarities [Matsumoto, Juang, 2008]. Stereotypes, from categories and perceptions, influence people's feelings about the out-group members [Stephan, Stephan, 1985].

Ethnocentrism reflects a tendency to view one's group as superior to others [Hall, 2005]. Its role in intergroup relations is aptly summed up by Stephan and Stephan: "So basic is ethnocentrism to intergroup relations that perceived superiority has been found even in minimal interactions between members of arbitrarily created groups" [Stephan, Stephan, 1985, p. 163]. Religious ethnocentrism is found to be a powerful predictor of hostility toward marginal out-groups [Altemeyer, Hunsberger, 2005, p. 383–384].

Intergroup contact has proven to be one of the most effective ways to reduce prejudice, since it changes cognitive perspectives of bias toward the individual/group [Pettigrew, 2008, p. 929]. The greater the intergroup contact, the lower the intergroup prejudice.

The effect of religion on the attitudes, motivation, and behavior of its adherents appears to be ambiguous. Allport observes, there is the two-way pull of religion as it leads some toward prejudice and some away from it [Allport, 1954, p. 422]. It has been widely confirmed that church members are more prejudiced than non-members [Allport, 1954; Argyle, Beit-Hallahmi, 1975; Dittes, 1973]. Yet, as Varga aptly notes, to have religion and to be religious are not the same [Varga, 2007, p. 146].

Spirituality was found to influence emotions strongly [Cunningham, Nezlek, Banaji, 2004, p. 1332; Emmons, 2005, p. 235]. Wakefield states that spirituality is not simply for "the interior life," but is "directed to the implementation of both the commandments of Christ, to love God and our neighbor" [Wakefield, 1983, p. 362]. Walsh [1999 as cited in Serlin, 2004] found positive correlation between spirituality and decreased anxiety and conflict. Spirituality involves positive psychological dynamics, such as positive emotions and reduced anxiety [Oman, Thoresel, 2005, p. 435].

This study seeks to examine the impact of cognitive, affective, and behavioral factors on the social distance and prejudice of the Seventh-day Adventist church members toward Muslim immigrants in Moscow, Russia.

The Context of the Study

Moscow, as the capital of the Russian Federation and a megacity in terms of economic and population growth, has become a "migration magnet" for both legal and undocumented immigrants [Religion, 2012]. Russia is now the second highest country after United States in terms of receiving immigrants [Mykhtaev, 2013]. The continuous decline of the native population is contributing by a steady growth of immigration. The Institute of National Strategy published a report in 2014 asserting that, if migration will keep its pace, the immigrants will comprise about 50% of Russian population by 2050 [INS, 2014]. Labor immigrants from almost 120 countries flock to the large cities of Russian Federation by the thousands in search of jobs [Rybakovsky, Ryazantsev, 2005]. According to the Bureau of Migration, as of 2013, there are about eleven million immigrants in Russia [Rossiyskaya Gazeta, 2013]. However, the official statistics do not reflect the number of undocumented immigrants.

Most labor immigrants come from Muslim countries such as Azerbaijan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Turkmenistan, and Kyrgyzstan [Noskova, 2011]. They occupy such low-skilled jobs as janitors, retail market traders, public-transportation drivers, construction workers, mining workers, and housekeepers. The absolute majority of labor immigrants are male (90%), and between 18–39 years old [Rybakovsky, Ryazantsev, 2005].
The immigrants often become victims of illegal exploitation, fraud, and discrimination from the recipient society [V. Peterburge migranty zhivut..., 2009; Mukomel, 2002]. According to one report, every fifth immigrant in Moscow is working in conditions close to slavery [Burnos, 2011].

Frisch [1967, p. 100 as cited in Alonso, 1987] aptly points to the central paradox of labor migration, “We called for labor, and human beings came.” The ever-growing number of immigrants evokes anxiety and fear among the native population. Immigrants were ranked highest on a scale of potential threats for Muscovites, even higher than the threat of terrorists and other criminals [Ryabikov, 2012].

The Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) church is a religious group that belongs to the conservative Christian body: worldwide in extent, evangelical in doctrine, and professing no creed but that of the Bible. Members place strong emphasis on the Second Advent, which they believe is near, and observe the Sabbath of the Bible, the seventh day of the week. From the group’s historical outset in Russia in the 1880s, Seventh-day Adventists have been severely persecuted by the government. Being a religious minority, the group was ostracized by the predominant Orthodox church on social and political levels. Due to Sabbath observations, church members often couldn’t find appropriate work and experienced pressure from school administrations because their children were missing school on Saturday.

During Communist times, church members, along with other Christians, were persecuted as a hostile ideological group resisting the communist ideology. Many leaders and church members were condemned and assassinated as “enemies of the people” [Heinz, 1997]. But during these times, the Moscow SDA church took the role of a leading church within the USSR [Gonchar, n. a.].

Perestroika and democratic reforms led to the tremendous growth of the Moscow Church in the 1990s. For the first time in their history, Adventists in Moscow were granted access to launch evangelistic and benevolent ministries for the public. Church members offered free-will service in city hospitals, held several music concerts in the leading halls, and most importantly, began to preach the Gospel in public.

Today, the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Moscow belongs to a minority religious group, which has 3,622 local church members worshipping in sixteen churches in Moscow and its suburb. Even though the church is legally recognized by the government, on the level of everyday interaction, its believers often experience hostility from members of the predominant religion. As with Muslim immigrants, mass media often communicates an “enemy” image of the Adventist church (as well as of other protestant churches) and feeds the “us against them” mentality by portraying Adventists negatively. This was especially the case after a murder in Nizhniy Novgorod in 2015 by a person who called himself an Adventist, even though the murderer was ex-communicated from the church [Stewart, 2015; Russian Man..., 2015].

To sum up, both religious minorities — Muslim and Adventist — experience negative attitudes toward them from the Orthodox majority in Moscow; both groups are striving for an in-group identity and survival in a hostile environment. Because of this, one would expect that the despised groups would express at least a feeling of accommodation and acceptance toward each other as members of religious minorities. Yet, the relationship of one minority (Adventists) toward the other (Muslims) is far from what is expected.

**Methodology**

This study argues that the intergroup prejudice and social distance can be expressed by a minority group toward another minority group, which is informed by symbolic and tangible threats, stereotypes, intergroup anxiety, in-group identity, ethnocentrism, intergroup contact, and spirituality. This study contributes to a deeper understanding of intergroup relations between minority groups. It also helps us to understand what factors influence and reduce negative feelings and attitudes in a religious group.

The findings of this study suggest spirituality to be the primary means in reducing prejudice toward a religious minority group of Muslim immigrants. It also suggests realistic threat to have more significant effect on attitudes of Adventists than symbolic threat. Likewise, the moderating effect of the emotional factor (intergroup anxiety) has a far greater influence on prejudice and social distance than the cognitive factor (stereotypes).
Population and Sample

Even though there are no absolute guidelines for the sample size using structural equation modeling (SEM), there are some raw guidelines as follows. A sample size below 100 is considered "small," while between 100–200 falls under a "medium;" a sample exceeding 200 subjects is considered "large" [Kline, 2005, p. 15]. The recommended goal for a researcher is to have the ratio of sample size to the number of free parameters not less than 5:1. Thus, model testing in this study with 72 parameters should have not less than 360 subjects.

This study used purposive sampling procedure [Cooper, Schindler, 2006] in order to obtain a representative sample from Moscow SDA Churches. A total of sixteen SDA Churches were chosen to represent various parts of Moscow’s city center and suburbs with a total population of 3,622 members. For each church, a contact person, a pastor, or an elder was identified and asked to distribute the questionnaires. Due to a concern to retrieve back a sufficient number of surveys (not less than 360), the pastors were advised to use convenience sampling [Ibid., 2006].

A total number of 394 surveys was retrieved from the sixteen churches. Prior to the evaluation of the measurement model, outliers were detected. Hence, 194 outliers with values equal or smaller than zero $p2 < 0.05$ were removed from the data set using Mahalanobis distance, which yielded a number of 200 respondents with a verified normal data distribution.

The survey instrument was constructed by designing new scales and adapting existing scales obtained from previous research, a total eighty items (including demographic section). All scales were tested and yielded a reliability coefficient above $\alpha = .70$.

The proposed model includes two criterion, five mediatory, and three predictor variables. The social distance scale was adapted from Bogardus Social Distance [Bogardus, 1933]. Seven items represent different types of social relationships: within marriage, friendship, within neighbor-hoods, within occupational and business groups, and within national and political groups, along with refusal to have any relationships. The participants were asked to judge the amount of social distance using seven questions, which were rated on a 5-point scale; 1 (no/none), 2 (a few), 3 (some), 4 (most), 5 (any). Higher score indicate lower social distance and vice versa.

The prejudice scale was adapted from [Paolini et al., 2004, p. 770]. Six bipolar traits were used to assess how the respondent felt towards the immigrants. The items were measured on 7-point scale (1 warm — 7 cold; 1 negative — 7 positive; 1 friendly — 7 hostile; 1 suspicious — 7 trusting; 1 respect — 7 disrespect; 1 admiration — 7 disgust). The higher the score, the more prejudice is manifested.

The mediatory variable, the intergroup anxiety scale was adapted from Stephan and Stephan [Stephan, Stephan, 1985, p. 157]. It was measured by eight items to determine if people would feel more or less anxious, impatience, irritated, frustrated, happy, defensive, apprehensive, or nervous when interacting with the immigrants. The higher score indicated a higher level of anxiety.

The symbolic and realistic threat scales were adapted from Laher and modified by the researcher [Laher, 2008]. The statements were rated on a 5-point Likert scale with "strongly disagree" to a "strongly agree" order. The higher point indicated greater perceived symbolic or realistic threats.

The ethnocentrism scale was constructed by the researcher on the basis of related literature and contains twelve items, which include statements on perceptions of superiority of the SDA Church organization, its distinctive beliefs, practices, and people in comparison to other Christian denominations. The items employed a 5-point Likert scale with the highest indicating the ethnocentric attitudes of the respondents.

The stereotype scale was used to assess the respondents’ beliefs about immigrants. Each participant was asked to indicate the percentage of Asian and Caucasian immigrants who might possess any of nine traits given in the scale, such as laziness, greed, dishonesty, arrogance, etc. The response was constructed by 10-point scale from (0–100%) thereby making 10% interval. A higher score indicated a greater amount of stereotype.

The predictor variable, the contact scale was adapted from [McNally, 2010], and was further modified for the context of the present research. The questions seek to gain information: how often and where do the Muscovites come in contact with immigrants. The amount of contact was measured by a 5-point Likert scale, which comprised the following degrees: 1 (almost never), 2 (seldom), 3 (sometimes), 4 (often), 5 (very often). The higher the point, the greater is the amount of contact, and vice versa.
The development of the five items for the in-group identity construct indicators came from social identity theory [Tajfel, Turner, 1979, p. 33], self-categorization theory [Turner et al., 1987], and rom Cheek and Briggs [1982, p. 401]. The church members were asked to indicate their level of personal commitment to the in-group in terms of sharing common beliefs, involvement in church activities, and friendship with other members of the group. The items were constructed on a basis of 5-point Likert scale, with the highest indicating stronger in-group identity of the respondent.

The spirituality construct was measured by sixteen items adapted from Thayer long-form faith maturity scale (TFS) [Thayer, 2008]. In the present study the respondents were asked to indicate their level of spiritual maturity in terms of relationship with God, with people, personal Bible study and prayer, and witnessing. The scale was based on the 5-point Likert scale with the highest point indicating the greater spiritual maturity of the respondent.

For data analysis this study employed SEM using AMOS version 17.0 to determine the patterns of relationship among the variables and to explain the variance with the model proposed in this research [Kline, 2005]. SEM was used to build the model from ten latent variables, spirituality (S), in-group identity (ID), contact (C), symbolic threat (ST), realistic threat (RT), stereotype (SR), ethnocentrism (ET), anxiety (A), prejudice (P), and social distance (SD).

This study employed a two-step approach in model analysis [Ibid.]. In the first step the measurement models were evaluated, and in the second step the structural model was assessed.

In order to obtain the model fit and remove insignificant items, the following parameters were used, Chi-square, normed fit index (NFI), comparative fix index (CFI), incremental fix index (IFI), Tucker-Lewis index (TLI), and relative fix index (RFI), which were expected to be above 0.90 [Ibid.]. After running SEM software, all indicators with critical ratio above 1.96 were removed [Ibid.]. Furthermore, indicators showing low factor loading (less than about .70) and those greater than 0.05 levels as appeared in parameter estimates were also removed in order to ensure a model fit for every measurement.

As a result of preliminary analysis the final measures contained the following items: prejudice — four items, social distance — three items, symbolic threat — four items, realistic threat — four items, intergroup anxiety — five items, stereotypes — four items, ethnocentrism — two items, in-group identity — two items, intergroup contact — four items, and spirituality — four items.

Since two variables (in-group identity and ethnocentrism) were left with less than three indicators and two variables (contact and symbolic threat) had a weak relationship with other latent variables, they were removed from the structural model.

After the removal of non-significant indicators, paths, and the latent variables, the model was processed and evaluated again. The goodness-of-fit results for the final model were as follows, Chi-square ($\chi^2/df$) = 1.055, $p = .283$, NFI = .936, RFI = .926, IFI = .996, TLI = .996, CFI = .996 (see Table 1). These results indicate a very good model (Fig. 1) since the $p$-value is higher than 0.05 and all test for model fit are above 0.90 [Byrne, 2001].

### Table 1. Goodness-of-Fit Index for Final Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Threshold value</th>
<th>Values obtained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMIN P</td>
<td>&gt; .050</td>
<td>.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>&gt; .900</td>
<td>.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFI</td>
<td>&gt; .900</td>
<td>.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFI</td>
<td>&gt; .900</td>
<td>.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>&gt; .900</td>
<td>.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>&gt; .900</td>
<td>.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>&lt; .050</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of Study

The model shows that prejudice directly and significantly influences social distance ($\beta = .40$, $p < 0.05$), and, along with realistic threat explains 41% of its variance ($R^2 = .41$) (Table 2). This indicates that the way church members feel about interaction with the immigrants (friendly-hostile, warm-cold or positive-negative) increases or decreases their desire to associate with them by way of friendship, common workplace, and desire to see them coming to work in Moscow. When prejudice increases, social distance increases accordingly; hence Adventists express less desire to see Muslim immigrants as their friends or work with them, and not see them come to the country to work.

Spirituality directly and indirectly through anxiety (10%) negatively influences prejudice ($\beta = –.16$, $p < 0.05$) with a total effect of 26% ($R^2 = .26$). In other words, spirituality indicators such as a relationship with Jesus Christ, love for each other, worshipping together, and sharing one’s faith with others reduce prejudice, namely, feeling friendly-hostile, warm-cold or positive-negative toward the immigrants. That means, the more the members are committed to Christ, love each other, come together in worship, and are involved as witnesses, the less they feel prejudiced toward Muslim immigrants.

Realistic threat directly and indirectly (through stereotypes and anxiety) affects prejudice ($\beta = .31$, $p < 0.05$) and explains a total 60% of its variance ($R^2 = .60$). This means that the indicators of realistic threat such as losing jobs because of immigrants, increased tax burden on the local population, threats to personal safety, and health concerns influence negative, cold, and hostile feelings in relation to the immigrants.

Intergroup anxiety directly influences prejudice ($\beta = .60$, $p < 0.05$). When Muscovite Adventists meet Muslim immigrants, their feelings of irritation, frustration, impatience, and defensiveness influence their hostility, coldness, and negative reaction toward the immigrants.
The final structural model shows a direct relationship between intergroup anxiety and realistic threat and anxiety and stereotypes. The latent variable RT directly and indirectly influences A \((\beta = .35)\) and, along with SR explains 51% of its variance. The perception of threat — that Moscow immigrants may take their their jobs, cause them to pay more taxes, cause health problems, and negatively affect their security — evokes feelings of anxiety associated with irritation, impatience, frustration, and defensiveness when they interact with immigrants.

Overall, prejudice is directly influenced by realistic threat (31%), spirituality (16%), and anxiety (61%), and indirectly affected by spirituality (10%), and realistic threat (29%). All direct and indirect effects explain 72% of variance of prejudice \((R^2 = .72)\) (Table 3). However, the remaining 28% of unexplained variance for \(P\) may be explained by other factors such as the history of intergroup relations \([\text{Matsumoto, Juang, 2008}]\), cultural value differences and situational and personality factors \([\text{Stephan et al., 2008}]\).

**Table 2. Significant and Non-Significant Path Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant paths</th>
<th>Non-significant paths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S to A ((\beta = –.17, p = .02))</td>
<td>S to SR ((\beta = .00, p = .834))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT to A ((\beta = .35, p = .00))</td>
<td>SR to SD ((\beta = .02, p = .773))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A to P ((\beta = .61, p = 0.00))</td>
<td>A to SD ((\beta = .07, p = .843))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S to P ((\beta = –.16, p = 0.00))</td>
<td>S to RT ((\beta = –.07, p = .704))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT to P ((\beta = .31, p = 0.00))</td>
<td>S to SD ((\beta = –.07, p = .473))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P to SD ((\beta = .40, p = 0.00))</td>
<td>SR to P ((\beta = .09, p = .116))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT to SR ((\beta = .53, p = 0.00))</td>
<td>RT to A ((\beta = .23, p = 0.00))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR to A ((\beta = .23, p = 0.00))</td>
<td>RT to SD ((\beta = .31, p = 0.00))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3. The Summary of Effects in the Final Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Dependent variables</th>
<th>Direct effects</th>
<th>Indirect effects</th>
<th>Total effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>–.158</td>
<td>–.100</td>
<td>–.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–.104</td>
<td>–.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>–.165</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The contact of the respondents with Muslim immigrants in Moscow was found to be an insignificant predictor of prejudice against immigrants. The amount of contact with the immigrants in residential areas, in business transactions, in friendly conversation, and at work does not influence
the Adventists’ feeling being more or less warm, positive, friendly, and trustful toward them. This finding partially negates the results of several studies of the contact hypothesis, which repeatedly report that contact with the members of the out-group is associated with lower levels of prejudice toward that group [Allport, 1954; Combs, Griffith, 2007, p. 222; Miller, Smith, Mackle, 2004, p.221; Pettigrew, 1998, p. 65].

One possible explanation for contact being an insignificant predictor of intergroup relations is the quality of the contact of Muscovite Adventists with Muslim immigrants. According to descriptive statistics, the majority of the respondents (77.5%) indicated that the most frequent contact occurs in city streets, while 79% said that they meet Muslims in their neighborhood rarely or only from time to time. At the same time, almost all the respondents (96%) reported that they host immigrants at home rarely or very rarely, with only 4% hosting them often.

Taking this perspective into consideration, one may perceive the quality of the contact between the Muscovite Adventists and Muslim immigrants, which appears to be more occasional and superficial than personalized and longitudinal. Meanwhile, a recent study in Moscow has shown that the primary need and the greatest problem for immigrants is not legal documentation or even a lack of money, but rather a lack of community [Sreda, 2012]. Most immigrants indicated loneliness as one of the major problems they experience in a foreign land.

One of the important findings of this study is that spirituality facilitates both the contact within the group and between the groups of people. The quality of personal relationships with God and fellowship with one another influences the quality of intergroup relationships, as well as the attitudes toward out-groups. The more church members perceive their association with God and with one another, the less they feel prejudiced against Muslim immigrants. Hence, spirituality, unlike the contact variable, does not only focus on “when” and “where” the contact occurs, but also on “why” and “how” people connect to each other.

Descriptive study supports the influence of spirituality on prejudice. Low spirituality of the age group of 20–29 years olds correlates to the highest amount of prejudice among the same age group. Conversely, a higher perception of spirituality among the age groups 50–59 and 60-and-above corresponds with the lower prejudice among the respondents of the same age.

The study found negative correlation between spirituality and anxiety, meaning that higher perceptions of spirituality correlate to decreased feelings of anxiety [Oman, Thoresel, 2005, p. 435; Serlin, 2004, p. 27]. It appears that such dimensions of spirituality as commitment to Christ, relationships with other people, witnessing to others, and worshipping together negatively influence such anxiety feelings as impatience, irritation, frustration, and defensiveness in relation to Muslim immigrants. Hence, the more spiritual the Adventists are, the less they feel anxious about the interaction with Muslim immigrants. This is one of the major findings of this study.

Symbolic threat was removed from the structural model due to a low significance level in the relationship to the other variables in the model. It appears that symbolic threats such as perceptions that Muslim immigrants negatively influence Russian culture, Russian language, national traditions and values, and Christian norms do not significantly influence prejudice toward immigrants.

In the prejudice reduction model, perceived realistic threat turned out to be the independent variable, which influenced all four dependent variables (SR, A, P, and SD). Realistic threat influences attitudes (SR, P), emotions (A), and behavior (SD) in relation to Muslim immigrants. This indicates that realistic threat should be considered as one of the most important factors in predicting prejudice against Muslim immigrants in Moscow. The study conducted by Maddux, Galinsky, Cuddy, and Polifroni [2008, p. 74] among university students, confirms the importance of RT as an independent variable in explaining negative attitudes and feelings toward Asian immigrants.

The reason for such a high perception of realistic threat may be due to the fact that threat is connected with the social categorization process, which involves categorizing people into in-groups and out-groups, “us” and “them” [Brewer, Gaertner, 2003; Brown, 2010]. Public media fosters this process by showing Asian and Caucasian immigrants as unwanted and even dangerous elements in Russia. They are labeled as potential criminals, job-stealers, and a threat to the safety of Muscovites [Kalnin, 2004; Otnoshenie..., 2005; Zibrova, 2008].

Ethnocentrism was removed from the analysis due to an insufficient number of remaining indicators. It seems that ethnocentrism does not influence prejudice and social distance, which means, the ethnocentric attitudes of the Adventist church members do not influence their prejudice against
Muslim immigrants in Moscow. One of characteristic features of ethnocentrism is a negative attitude toward out-group members and a positive evaluation of in-group members [Brewer, 2001, p. 17].

However, from the descriptive research on perceptions of ethnocentrism it appears that the Adventists in Moscow do not really believe in their superiority over other religious groups. The overwhelming majority of the respondents believe the Adventist church has better doctrines (99% agree and strongly agree, $M = 4.60$, $SD = 0.602$), but when it comes to people in the church, they are not so optimistic. Only 64% believe the Adventists are more trustworthy than others, while 36% either disagree or undecided on that ($M = 3.74$; $SD = 0.909$). When asked about whether they agree that the Adventists are special people, the respondents were almost equally divided on the opinion (46% disagree and undecided and 54% agree and strongly agree; $M = 3.51$, $SD = 1.080$). Finally, for the question, if the respondents prefer to do business with the Adventists rather than with non-Adventists, 42.5% were undecided or disagreed, while 57.5% agreed and strongly agreed with it. Hence, the respondents generally believe that Adventism is better when compared with other denominations, but that Adventists are probably no better than the rest.

Conclusion

This study has shown that Seventh-day Adventists, as a religious minority group, express negative attitudes toward another religious minority in Moscow: Muslim immigrants. With regards to Muslims, Adventists share the same prejudice as the majority of native Muscovites. According to White and Langer, this paradox can be explained by two factors: similarity and relative distinctiveness [White, Langer, 1999]. Even though Adventists are a religious minority compared to the Russian Orthodox church, both religious groups, though different from each other in many ways, can express similar feelings in relation toward Muslim immigrants, which may be more distinctive to Adventists when compared with the Orthodox. Hence, with regards to attitudes toward immigrants, Moscow Adventists, who are native Russians by and large, are closer to the Russian Orthodox majority; whereas the Muslim minority group appears to be more distinctive for the Adventists than the Russian Orthodox majority.

In summary, this study supports some initial hypotheses of research. First, it has found the ITT model to be an effective predictor of prejudice toward Muslim immigrants in Moscow. There is substantial evidence that SDA church members in Moscow share common threats and attitudes toward immigrants with the majority of Muscovites. Of two threats ($ST$ and $RT$) only realistic threat was found to be a strong predictor of prejudice. Second, with respect to the mediating role of the cognitive factor (stereotypes), the emotional factor (intergroup anxiety) has the highest direct effect on prejudice (61%). In addition, anxiety appears to play a predominant role in predicting negative attitudes toward Muslim immigrants in Moscow [Bizman, Yinon, 2001, p. 191; Stephan, Stephan, 1985, p. 157].

Intergroup contact and symbolic threats however, had no effect whatsoever on other mediating and dependent variables and were removed from the model. However, taking the moderating effect of contact, spirituality was found to play a crucial role in reducing negative feelings and attitudes. Consistent with the intergroup contact theory [Dovidio et al., 2003, p. 5; Pettigrew, Tropp, 2008, p. 922], which prescribes the prerequisites for meaningful contact, on the level of relationships spirituality facilitates knowledge and cooperative interaction. It also encourages reaching common goals, friendship opportunities, and the interdependence of church members within the religious community through their involvement in Christian fellowship and worship. Moreover, it fosters a cognitive reassessment of the in-group identity to a more inclusive, superordinate identity by relating to one another and to others from a spiritual and social perspective.
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Все возрастающее количество мигрантов, приезжающих из мусульманских республик в Москву, представляет собой серьезный вызов в сфере межгрупповых отношений в городской среде. Как и остальные москвичи, представители религиозного меньшинства «Церковь христиан адвентистов седьмого дня» разделяют общие предрассудки по отношению к другому меньшинству – мусульманским мигрантам. Данное исследование ставит своей целью определить факторы, влияющие на формирование негативного отношения верующих к мигрантам, а также предложить модель борьбы с предрассудками.

Предлагаемая модель включает в себя две зависимые переменные (социальная дистанция и предрассудки), пять переменных-модераторов (символический страх, реальный страх, этноцентризм, стереотипы и межгрупповая тревога) и три независимые переменные (межгрупповой контакт, внутригрупповая идентичность и духовность). Анкетный опрос проводился в 16 общинах, всего было опрошено 394 респондента. Данные опроса были изучены и обработаны методом структурного моделирования с помощью компьютерной программы AMOS 17-й версии.

Исследование показало, что духовность, реальный страх и межгрупповая тревога оказывают непосредственное влияние на предрассудки и объясняют 72% распределения данной переменной. Реальный страх и предрассудки напрямую влияют на социальную дистанцию и объясняют 41% коэффициента дисперсии данной переменной. Далее исследование показало, что духовность, реальный страх и стереотипы напрямую влияют на межгрупповую тревогу и объясняют 31% коэффициента дисперсии данной переменной. Также было установлено прямое влияние реального страха на формирование стереотипов, что объясняет 28% коэффициента дисперсии данной переменной.

Результаты данного исследования свидетельствуют о наличии определенного уровня негативного восприятия одного религиозного меньшинства другим. Исследование также выявило, что фактор духовности является одним из ключевых в борьбе с предрассудками членов «Церкви христиан адвентистов седьмого дня» по отношению к мигрантам-муслиманам. Согласно проведенному исследованию, реальный страх имеет преобладающее влияние на поведение членов церкви по сравнению с символическим. Подобным образом преобладающее влияние на предрассудки и социальную дистанцию оказывает посреднический эмоциональный фактор (межгрупповая тревога), а не когнитивный (стереотипы).

Исследование может быть полезно для тех, кто изучает сферу межгрупповых отношений, а именно сферу взаимодействия религиозных меньшинств. Также данное исследование может быть полезно для христианских лидеров с целью обучения христианских общин в области кросс-культурной коммуникации и культурного разнообразия.

Ключевые слова: предрассудки; межгрупповые отношения; меньшинство; миграция; духовность