

David Sherman
269-408-6482
sherman@andrews.edu

Problem

We analyze the relationships between religious internalization (Ryan, Rigby, & King, 1993) and social support, religious fundamentalism, and motivation for Divine and human relationships. More complete internalization, identification, involves the incorporation of religious values into the self. Less complete internalization, introjection, results from imposed motives and resulting guilt and impression management. We predicted that Divine relationships would be most related to identification, followed by human relationships and social support because of the role of relatedness in identification (Deci et al., 2001). However, we expected that fundamentalism would not contribute significantly to identification because conformity and religious identification are unrelated (Brambilla, Manzi, Regalia, & Verkuyten, 2013). We predicted that introjection would be most related to fundamentalism (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 2004), followed by social support, and that relationship variables would not be related to introjection.

Procedure

We recruited 306 respondents from a religiously-affiliated university who completed an online survey. Respondents completed the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (general social support; Zimet, Dahlem, Zimet, & Farley, 1988), Basic Psychological Need Satisfaction (general social support; Deci et al., 2001; Gagné, 2003), Intratextual Fundamentalism (intratextual fundamentalism; Williamson, Hood, Ahmad, Sadiq, & Hill, 2010), Revised Religious Fundamentalism (broad fundamentalism; Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 2004), Christian Religious Internalization (religious identification and introjection; Ryan et al., 1993) and Faith Maturity (motivation for Divine and human relationships; Ji, 2004) scales.

Results

Our sample is 60% female. All but 6% expressed some religious affiliation. Identification positively correlated ($r = .15$ to $.79$) with all variables. Introjection, however, only related to fundamentalism measures ($r = .22$ and $.28$). Linear regression explained 70% of variance in identification from the other scales, but only 12% in introjection. Relationship with God ($B = .74$, $t = 9.8$, $p < .001$) and broad fundamentalism ($B = .19$, $t = 2.8$, $p = .006$) independently predicted identification; only broad fundamentalism independently predicted introjection ($B = .29$, $t = 2.9$, $p = .004$). Using relative importance analysis (Gömping, 2006) to distribute shared variance, we found that a personal relationship with God accounted for most shared variance (LMG: 45%, PMVD: 80%) of religious identification and fundamentalism accounted for the majority for introjection (LMG 58%: PMVD 82%).

Conclusion

Our results were consistent with our hypotheses except for the positive relationship between fundamentalism and identification. In order to better understand the relationships between these variables, we plan to conduct a network analysis (Costantini, et al., 2017) once our data collection is complete to simultaneously illustrate the strengths of relationships between each variable.

50 word abstract

We analyzed the relationships between religious internalization and social support, religious fundamentalism, and motivation for Divine and human relationships. 306 respondents from a religiously-affiliated university were recruited to completed an online survey. Our results suggested Divine relationships were most related to identification while fundamentalism was most related to introjection.

Altemeyer, B., & Hunsberger, B. (2004). A revised religious fundamentalism scale: The short and sweet of it. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion* , 14 , 47-54.

Brambilla, M., Manzi, C., Regalia, C., & Verkuyten, M. (2013). Religiosity and prejudice: Different patterns for two types of religious internalization. *The Journal of social psychology* , 153 , 486-498.

Costantini, G., Richetin, J., Preti, E., Casini, E., Epskamp, S., & Perugini, M. (2017). Stability and variability of personality networks. A tutorial on recent developments in network psychometrics.. *Personality and Individual Difference* , 136, 68-78. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2017.06.011

Deci, E. L., Ryan, R. M., Gagné, M., Leone, D. R., Usunov, J., & Kornazheva, B. P. (2001). Need satisfaction, motivation, and well-being in the work organizations of a former eastern bloc country: A cross-cultural study of self-determination. *Personality and social psychology bulletin* , 27, 930-942.

Gagne, M. (2003). Autonomy support and need satisfaction in the motivation and well-being of gymnasts. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology* , 15 , 372-390.

Grömping, U. (2006). Relative importance for linear regression in R: the package relaimpo. *Journal of statistical software* , 17 , 1-27.

Ji, C. H. C. (2004). Faith maturity and doctrinal orthodoxy: A validity study of the faith maturity scale. *Psychological Reports* , 95 , 993-998.
doi:10.2466/pr0.95.3.993-998

Ryan, R. M., Rigby, S., & King, K. (1993). Two types of religious internalization and their relations to religious orientations and mental health. *Journal of personality and social psychology* , 65 , 586.

Williamson, W., Hood Jr, R. W., Ahmad, A., Sadiq, M., & Hill, P. C. (2010). The Intratextual Fundamentalism Scale: Cross-cultural application, validity evidence, and relationship with religious orientation and the Big 5 factor markers. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture* , 13 , 721-747.

Zimet, G. D., Dahlem, N. W., Zimet, S. G., & Farley, G. K. (1988). The multidimensional scale of perceived social support. *Journal of personality assessment* , 52 , 30-41.