



Understanding links between secularization, rationalisation and insecurity

A recommendation by **Adrien Fillon**  based on peer reviews by 1 anonymous reviewer of the STAGE 2 REPORT:

Martin Lang, Radim Chvaja (2024) Mechanisms of secularization: Testing between the rationalization and existential insecurity theories. OSF, ver. 2, peer-reviewed and recommended by Peer Community in Registered Reports.

<https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/gy7sj>

Submitted: 06 September 2024, Recommended: 29 October 2024

Cite this recommendation as:

Fillon, A. (2024) Understanding links between secularization, rationalisation and insecurity. *Peer Community in Registered Reports*, 100897. [10.24072/pci.rr.100897](https://doi.org/10.24072/pci.rr.100897)

Published: 29 October 2024

Copyright: This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

What relationship can be expected between secularization, rationalization and insecurity? While some authors argue that rationalization reduces the willingness to belong to religious groups, others have suggested that insecurity increases this need to belong to religious groups. In the current study, Lang and Chvaja (2024) adjudicated between these two possibilities using an economics game with 811 participants from two countries: US and Poland. The central question posed by the authors is whether cooperative insecurity increases the probability of joining a religious normative group. They tested the relationship between an environment (secure and insecure) and institution (which related to the norm context: religious and secular) on the probability of choosing the normative group in an experimental setting. The authors included an adequate power analysis, alternatives for non-supported hypotheses, and filtering to ensure a high quality of data collection. They also undertook a pilot study to ensure the quality of the procedure and sensitivity of the analyses. There were only a few, minor, and well documented deviations from stage 1. For the non-religious group, secularity increased the odds of joining the normative group when faced with insecurity. For the religious group, the results were mixed, mostly due to the unexpected high rate of participants joining the religious group in the secure environment. The researchers then pooled the regular and reversed scenarii and found support for the existential insecurity theory. The authors concluded that both theories (the rationalization theory and the existential insecurity theory) can be at work, as the majority of the sample did not choose the religious normative group due to a potential rationalization, but they do slightly more when faced with (existential) insecurity. The Stage 2 manuscript was evaluated over two rounds of review. Based on detailed responses to

reviewers' and the recommender's comments, the recommender judged that the manuscript met the Stage 2 criteria and therefore awarded a positive recommendation. **URL to the preregistered Stage 1 protocol:** <https://osf.io/yzgek> **Level of bias control achieved: Level 6.** *No part of the data or evidence that was used to answer the research question was generated until after IPA.* **List of eligible PCI RR-friendly journals:**

- [Advances in Cognitive Psychology](#)
- [Collabra: Psychology](#)
- [International Review of Social Psychology](#)
- [Peer Community Journal](#)
- [PeerJ](#)
- [Royal Society Open Science](#)
- [Social Psychological Bulletin](#)
- [Studia Psychologica](#)
- [Swiss Psychology Open](#)

References:

1.Lang, M. & Chvaja, R. (2024). Mechanisms of secularization: Testing between the rationalization and existential insecurity theories [Stage 2]. Acceptance of Version 2 by Peer Community in Registered Reports. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/gy7sj>

Reviews

Evaluation round #1

DOI or URL of the preprint: https://osf.io/preprints/psyarxiv/gy7sj?view_only=
Version of the preprint: 1

Authors' reply, 16 October 2024

Dear Dr. Fillon,
thank you for your comments and for organizing the peer-review of our Stage-2 RR.

We followed your guidance and the suggestions of the reviewer and included deviations from Stage-1 in the supplements. Specifically, we moved the table detailing pre-registered analyses/inferences to supplements (as all of the information in this table is in the main text anyway) and added a column to this table detailing our deviations for each analytical/inferential step. Since the deviations were minor, we did not include all of the columns from the table you suggested, but within this one column in our table, we address all the questions posed by the columns in the table you suggested (I hope this makes sense).

We further moved the pilot results into the supplements and added an overview of our results in a table as suggested by the reviewer. We also addressed the reviewer's comment that we did not predict the effect would be different in the reversed scenario (in the 4.1. discussion section). Finally, based on the feedback from our colleagues, we added one more caveat to the limitations section in the discussion (4.3), namely that we did not manipulate rationalization as another potential way to test between the two theories. As a result of this addition, we re-ordered the flow of the argument in this subsection such that the addition would naturally fit there.

We hope this changes improved the manuscript and thank again for your help.
Best wishes,
Martin Lang.

Decision by [Adrien Fillon](#) , posted 07 October 2024, validated 09 October 2024

Minor Revision

Dear authors,

Thank you for sending back the manuscript. I am very happy to see the stage 2 of this particularly interesting project.

I sent the manuscript to one reviewer and reviewed it myself and found that we both agreed that the manuscript could be improved with a few minors enhancements, one being mandatory by PCI-RR.

This modification is the inclusion of a deviation from stage 1 text or table to help the reader understand if you could follow perfectly the stage 1 procedure or had to made few modifications. If you want to do it quickly, you can reuse the table page 82 in the following: <https://osf.io/z2brs> (table named SX). I also agree with all the reviewer's points that you will need to address, especially that you can put the pilot study in a supplementary, maybe directly in the OSF to improve the flow of the manuscript.

Further, the analysis plan beginning page 12 reads as "we plan to do x", please rephrase as "we did X".

Minor typos:

Design page 8 "Participants were *be* blind"

Page 22 the title "Conclusion" needs to be a higher level that it is (it is at the same level as a subtitle of the discussion at this moment).

Best regards,

Adrien Fillon

[Download the review](#)