The Problem of Appropriate Psychology of Religion Measures for Non-Western Christian Samples with Respect to the Turkish–Islamic Religious Landscape

Zuhal Agilkaya

Doctoral Candidate in the Psychology of Religion, Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey;
and Bielefeld University, Bielefeld, Germany
E-mail: zuhalagilkaya@hotmail.com

Summary

Despite the fact that Islam is the second largest religion in the world, empirical studies on Muslim religiosity have been very rare. The reason for this is seen in the lack of measurements applicable to Muslim samples. Nonetheless, the few empirical studies about Muslims, the role of Islam in terms of physical and psychological well-being, and comparative studies give rise to hope. The problems of application, adaptation and translation of religiosity and spirituality scales developed for Christian traditions is an issue that the psychology of religion in Turkey is facing but has not yet solved. This article shall provide an overview of the religious landscape in Turkey that has to be considered when applying Turkish or Western measures of religiosity to Turkish samples. Further problems in cross-cultural/religious studies due to inappropriate measures are illustrated. Finally religiosity scales developed and/or applied within the psychology of religion research in Turkey are listed.

Turkey with its geo-politic location is a Eurasian bridge connecting Asia and Europe. Although the Ottoman Empire, from which the modern Turkey emerged, was considered as a European state (Lewis, 1968) today's EU leaders still delay Turkey's membership to the Union. The main arguments—although unspoken but implicitly obvious—are about the religious and cultural diversity that Turkey presents as a Turkish Islamic society. This attitude may

emerge from global Islamophobia or a fear of Turks particular to Europe since the Middle Ages. What is this religious and cultural diversity about?

Currently Islam is the fastest growing religion in the world and the second largest religious practice worldwide. There are over 1.5 billion persons who identify themselves as Muslims (Hall, Livingston, Brown, & Mohabir, 2011). However, one cannot talk about homogeneity within these Islamic societies, from the main Islamic block between central Asia and the Atlantic shores of Africa, up to the growing numbers of migrated or converted Muslims in Europe and the USA.

Islam is a religion that has to be evaluated with its effects on culture and social life. For Watt (1969), the words "*dīn*" and "religion" are synonymous, but their meanings differ fundamentally. For a Muslim, *dīn* covers all aspects of life, not simply private beliefs, or only a small piece of life as in some other religious traditions. Empirical results of international surveys like those from Gallup (2002, 2009) evidence this by findings that Turkish people involve their families, especially their parents, in making an important decision, for example. This respectful attitude towards the elderly in general and parents in particular reflects a religious sensitivity derived from Islamic notions.

The Turkish people accommodated rapidly and properly to Islamic conditions. The reason for this lies in their history of religion. Despite discussions that the Turks held shamanistic beliefs, historical records indicate that the religious life of the early Turks shared many aspects similar to Islam. These commonalities are a monotheistic belief, an image of an almighty, merciful God, belief in the hereafter, the creation of the world, and a number of rituals (Ogel, 1962; Yildirim, 1992; Baser, 1991; Gunay, 1996).

Islamic influences are observable in a wide range of Turkish life. Social life, customs, ethics as well as art, literature, architecture, etc. have Islamic traces. This is natural, since religion has a determent effect and role on the formation of culture. When we consider this and bear in mind that the human is a social being who creates culture and is himself influenced and nurtured by culture, then the appearance of different religious understandings and lives according to different human and society types becomes expected. In that sense, it appears questionable whether we can even speak about one, absolute religion. For faith this argument might hold true, but for the concept and phenomenon of religion such absoluteness cannot be claimed. Sahin (2010) formulated this issue by the difference between "religion" and "the conception of religion," with which he hit the mark. In this respect, the Turks possess a religious understanding and religiosity specific to their psychology that emerges from,

and is nourished by, their own sociology within their historical–cultural composition. This is a phenomenon valid for any culture, because, depending on social and cultural conditions, people understand and perceive religion differently. Even within the same religious tradition there are varieties of interpretations, and religion appears as a factor that shapes people's daily lives and societal ties and relations (Duriez, Fontaine, & Luyten, 2001). Thus it can be concluded in Christian's (1987) words that the "major world religions are, in practice, coalitions or mosaics of widely differing local adaptations that share a common core of beliefs, rituals, and organization." The religious landscape of Turkey offers such a colourful mosaic.

In contemporary Turkey, we increasingly find many forms of religiosity—with "popular religion" being an outstanding instance that is to be explained in detail in the following sections. This religious diversity forms a challenge for Turkish research in psychology of religion. The challenge lies in the task to find the appropriate measurements that comprehend the several religious life styles. Thus measures which assume a monolithic Turkish Islam and assess traditional rituals and beliefs no longer seem to be sufficient. There is a growing need to assess the variety of religious forms, including popular religion. In addition, the measurement tradition in Turkish psychology of religion relies largely on adaptations or translations of Western–Christian measures. This habit of imitation holds disadvantages from various aspects. It will be helpful to explain points with regard to Turkish religiosity in order to proceed with, and demonstrate the measurement issue.

Religiosity in Turkey

Turkey is always presented with its Muslim identity. In fact, ca. 99% of the population in Turkey consists of Muslims. This is approved by empirical studies (for a review see Ayas, 1992; Turkdogan, 1999; Istanbul Mulkiyeliler Vakfi, 1999; Gunay, 2001; Celik, 2003), governmental (AREM, 2007), national (TESEV 2006; KONDA, 2007; ANAR 2007) and international surveys (Youth in Europe II, 2006; Religionsmonitor, 2008; Gallup, 2009; International Social Survey, 2009) where Turkish people identify themselves as Muslims and perform Islamic worship.

The Turks were introduced to Islam by Sufism. Thus their religiosity was grounded on feelings of solid faith, commitment, devotion, and reverence and it "created a favourable atmosphere for the mixing together of officially prescribed elements of religion with folk features either barely tolerated by the

religious leadership or even proscribed by them, although in vain" (Hall, Livingston, Brown, & Mohabir, 2011). This atmosphere set the conditions for a highly spiritual religious perception and way of living. Muslim spirituality in general and Turkish spirituality in particular are rooted theoretically in the Qurʾān and practically in the religious lives of the proliferating sects and orders (for empirical results and practical outcomes of Turkish spirituality, see Duzguner, 2007, 2011; Ayten, 2010a; Horozcu, 2010; Bostanci Dastan, & Buzlu, 2010). Together with the pre-Islamic religious habits this spiritual background evolved to a specific folk religiosity, which is at present observable in the beliefs and practices of Turkish–Muslim popular religiosity. Therefore, the researcher in the psychology of religion working on Turkish samples has to consider this syncretic religious life and decide whether he or she aims to assess literal Islamic religiosity (e.g., with Mutlu's (1989) *Islamic Religiosity Scale*), the widespread folk religiosity (e.g., with Yapici & Zengin's (2003) *Religious Affection Scale*) or the increasingly popular religiosity (e.g., with Arslan's (2003) *Popular Religiosity Scale*).

In summing up, besides superstitious habits and practices as characteristics of folk religiosity that is a widely represented Turkish typology of religiosity; virtues and values emerging from and shaped by official Islamic thought such as tolerance, especially religious tolerance (see Aydin, 1999; Acikgoz, 2004, Mehmedoğlu 2006), the culture of living together in peace (see Acikgoz, 2004; Uysal & Ayten, 2005), altruism (see Duzguner, 2011; Ayten, 2010a), gratitude (see Gocen, 2012), forgiveness (see Ayten, 2009a), benevolence and helping (see Ayten, 2010a), modesty, hospitality, respecting the old and wise (see Sancaklı, 2006), protecting the small and orphan (see Agirman, 2007), caring for the sick and poor (see Topal, 2008; Baykan, 2008; Okumus, 2008; Uraif, 2008; Gunay 2008; Macit, 2008), living in good neighbourhood, close family ties (see Aydin, 2004), submission to the will of Allah (see Ayten, 2010c), belief in destiny (see Kandemir, 2006; Kaplan, 2010), having strong beliefs in the Hereafter, mostly as a place where justice will occur (see Agilkaya, 2010, 2011), are other religiously grounded positive traits by which the Turks are particularly characterized.

Changes in Religious Life

After the 1990s, the religious landscape in Turkey—predominantly the religious lives of elite classes with higher educational and socio-economic status, rather than traditional, folk religiosity—has been observed to change in terms of religious people's fashion styles, entertainment preferences, social networks

and relations. Religious leaders and authorities became more visible in the public arena, which was not the case earlier (for details see Cakir, 1995; Komecoğlu, 2000), and started to spread their community's views by means of their own media organs (private TV and radio channels, journals and news-letters) as well as by organs of the secular mass media. Thus religion, religious life and the religious person became more public, visible, reachable and criti-cisable. By producing their own fashion, movies, music, holiday opportuni-ties, financial institutions, foundations, etc., the religious (upper) class created an *alternative public* (Karabiyik Barbarosoğlu, 2002) as a new market moti-vated and driven by a new religious life style. From times when it was dis-cussed whether listening to music was sinful, today we have reached a point where Muslims listen, produce, broadcast, commercialize all kinds of music and/or their *own* music. World stars like Yusuf Islam and Sami Yusuf are only two such examples. Thus religion has become a popular theme as it ever was in the history of the Republic of Turkey.

The popularization of religion has had two important outcomes for Turkish society. Firstly, the interest in religion has increased immensely, sometimes resulting from pure curiosity, sometimes in trying to live and learn the Mus-lim identity at least at a minimum level, and sometimes as affectation. Sec-ondly, a negative result of the rising interest in religious issues has evoked some doubts around religion (Bilgin, 2003). The intense discussions of reli-gious topics about the end of the world, the Hereafter, Hell and Heaven, etc. by scholars of different and mostly contradicting opinions aroused distrust and uncertainty within society. This has confused the minds of people who had been very comfortable with their traditional beliefs that were now under attack. This resulted in the destruction of solid values and their replacement by ambiguity, especially among the traditionally pious. People tend to blindly accept them, the decisions, values and *truths* imposed by an authority without investigating and criticizing, instead of engaging in intellectual effort to find the right with their free will. This *fear* or *escape from freedom* in Fromm's sense (1941) is also valid for the religious individual. People also prefer (or more than elsewhere) relating to religious issues, to get *one* direct and definite answer about what is wrong or right, good or bad, sinful or permissible. If this is impossible, then they become depressed, distressed and develop doubts.

The influence of social change, in the Turkish case explicitly by laicism and modernity, also transformed classical Islamic religiosity types (folk and elite) (Gunay, 1999). This fact can be considered within Hodgson's (1974) ideas that changes occurring in the socio-cultural structure affect people's religious

lives. Changes in religious understanding and life lay down the foundations for the occurrence of new religiosity styles.

For psychology of religion studies, this means that, in order to capture these changes within Turkish–Muslim religiosity, the researcher should choose measures that point to attitudes towards religion (e.g., with Ok's (2011) *Ok-Religious Attitudes Scale*; Sezen's (2008) *Faith Development Measure*), reflect the emergence of popularity and laicism within Turkish Islam (e.g., with Costu's (2009) *Religious Orientation Scale*) and maybe reflect mentioned doubts (e.g., with Ok's (2009a) *Clergy Vocational Conflict Scale*; Yapici's (2002) *Religious Dogmatism Scale*).

Religiosity Typologies in Turkey

Not only doctrines of a particular religion determine the various expression of religion within a society. Local and cultural circumstances, social patterns and history of a particular society are also significant factors for the appearance of different types of religiosity. In that sense, Turkey's religious landscape is shaped by its state regime, internal migration, urbanization, squatting, etc. With respect to such factors, Turkish researchers, sociologists and psychologists of religion suggested different typologies of religiosity regarding their empirical findings or observations.

Throughout history as well as today Turkey's religious landscape consists typologically of traditional, conservative, mystic folk religiosity, with elements like shrine visiting and saint cults (Gunay, 2001). According to Cakir (2002), the republic period of Turkey marked three Muslim types: *modern*, as the guarantors of the laicist system, *Islamist*, who call for the immediate politicization of religious people, and *traditional*. Another typology (Clévenot 1987; Gunay, 2001) for today's Turkish religiosity refers to *traditionalist/traditional folk* religiosity, which is represented by large masses in rural areas, middle and lower classes and slum areas; in opposition to these *pietists*, religiosity is represented in more educated groups as a spiritual response to materialistic world views marked by a return to religion on individual and familiar levels. *Opportunist* religiosity as the third type seems to be a continuation of the second one because it appears in almost the same social classes. These intellectual or semi-intellectual people use their religious image as an opportunity to gain social status in special circles. Once introducing themselves as atheists or agnostics, now they do not abstain from expressing their religious views. The last type is the *militant* who shows open reaction against Western civilization and is supported by Iranian and Arab influences (Clévenot 1987; Gunay, 2001). Gunay

(2001) emphasizes that these types, which he reformulates as *traditional and conservative folk* religiosity, own basic Islamic knowledge, perform formal Islamic practices within Islamic norms and traditional culture and are syncretisized with popular traits, mystical and mythological influences; the orthodox believers attached to *normative* religion and religiosity, *sectarianism* or *new congregationalism* and the radical and political *Islamist extremists*, are in different ways in social interaction, relation and reaction to each other. For instance, the adherents of a particular sect, who present a highly spiritual and mystic religiosity, are not that open to modernization or contemporary influences. Literal Islam excludes other forms of religiosity in the name of authentic religiosity; however folk Islam embraces all traditional forms of religious life but is not open to changes or modern tendencies and interpretations (Gunay, 2001). This is reminiscent of Weber (1964), who typologized religiosities in terms of high quality (*virtuoso religiosity*) and lower quality (*mass religiosity*). Gunay (1999) reports that, in the interaction of religion and culture in Turkey, these typologies actually vary and differentiate and are multifunctional. Demographic, geographic, historical, congregational, cultural but also educational, socio-economical and political factors play a role in this diversity.

It is obvious that Turkish religiosity is grounded on the basic classification of folk versus literary religiosity. Above-mentioned typologies are partly conceptualized in other studies with slightly modified labels of the different religiosity types. Next to these psycho-sociological types, however, there is another aspect that determines various forms of religious lives within a religion. Sub-groups within a particular religion, like different communities, congregations, sects, and orders, all develop their own type of religiosity within their specific understanding of religion and religiosity (Glock, 1962; Catalan, 1994). The Alawis, Shi'is and Sunnis as congregational sub-groups, the followers of religious leaders like the Gulen movement as religious communities, and the orders like the Nakshis, the Kadiris, just to name a few, are all religious sub-groups in Turkish society representing their own religiosity typologies. Therefore, investigating religion with respect to different typologies or these sub-groups requires appropriate measures that focus on these orientations (e.g., Sezen's (2008*) Religious Fundamentalism Scale*; Yapici's (2002) *Religious Dogmatism Scale*; Costu's (2009) *Religious Orientation Scale*).

Folk and Popular Religiosity in Turkey

The interaction between religion and social change in Turkey, especially after the 1990s (Bilgin, 2003), affected Turkey's religious landscape and produced

a new kind of religiosity that has its roots in traditional folk religiosity. The widely represented folk religiosity, as a typical phenomenon of Turkish religiosity of the masses, has undergone a transformation and appeared as a new product of modernization in the form of *popular religiosity*. This new category of religion as the folk's new understanding and modern perception is not a theological but rather a categorical distinction and has gained much attention in recent sociological and psychological research on religion in Turkey.

Although the terms *folk—popular—mass* religiosity are mostly used interchangeably in literature, a distinction has to be mad between folk and popular religiosity, at least for Turkey. However, defined as the religion of rural milieus and described as peasant religion in the *Encyclopedia of Religion* (Christian, 1987), folk religion is not limited to the peasant in Turkish–Islamic context but rather to the masses of society. Thus in Turkey, without excluding the peasant's religiosity (Celik, 2004), the term is used in a wider sense and is more spread out in society like Weber's (1946) term *mass religiosity* addresses. Folk religiosity is rooted in different sources and elements and thus presents a syncretic structure. The theological aspects in this type of religiosity are neglected in favour of intense ritualistic practices accompanied by mythological, magical and Sufi traces (Gungor, 1998), which are inherited from traditional beliefs and practices from Turkish history of religion. These various beliefs and practices that are mostly prohibited and accused by official Islam like beliefs in supernatural beings apart from Allah (like *jinns* and demons); venerations of mystics, personalities considered holy in history and culture and their houses, mosques, shrines and tombs, organizations of birthday celebrations or death anniversaries (*mawlids*) of such saints; belief in the harmful evil eye and various protective and curative methods; carrying amulets, charms, prayers or special passages from the Qurʾān as magical cures or protectors; rites of magic, witchcraft, exorcism; divinations by means of dream interpretation are characteristic features of folk Islam and are performed not only in Turkey but also in many other Islamic countries. The *Heterodox Beliefs and Practices Scale* developed by Karaca (2001b) gives one the opportunity to assess exactly these features. Other numerous folk rites and public festivities performed with a religious touch that neither defy Islamic law nor possess a harmful trait are various ceremonies around human life events (birth, marriage, death), celebration of holy days, nights and events, the cycle of the year, etc.

However, a change emerged in Turkish folk religiosity and its social base and traits. The urbanization experience after the 1950s of the rural–traditional culture added new dimensions to folk religiosity like popularity. The distin-

guishing characteristic of popular religiosity is that it is related to the forms of religious lives of societies living in the modernization process. In other words, however popular religiosity is grounded on particular beliefs and rituals of traditional culture it possesses a dimension that is specific to the changing process (Celik, 2004). In this process, folk beliefs become widespread and popularized.

To point out this transformation, folk religiosity began to be discussed within the notion of *popular culture* and *popular religion*. Popular religion is a construction of a variety of traditional, pagan, and superstitious beliefs with concepts and beliefs withdrawn from official religion. Hence it is defined as a "generic term employed to describe the unorthodox, non-institutional beliefs, rites and practices that accompany mainstream religion" (Dictionary of Belief & Religions). In that sense, popular religion is a kind of transformed continuum of official religion that in this way "is pervasive in society and culture", finding its expression not only in formal religious institutions but in all dimensions of cultural and social life (Long, 1987). The meaning of this dichotomy is better understood with reference to Redfield (1956) who made a wider distinction within culture itself. His concept of *great tradition* and *little tradition* is a division of culture between that of the educated, upper class versus that of the masses of the lower class. Redfield's theory is parallel to Weber's (1946) who indicated that within the world religions there are different types of religiosities. His *virtuoso religiosity* corresponds with the religion of Redfield's members of the great tradition, whereas his *mass religiosity* points to that of the little tradition. In that sense, it can be argued that, with the popularization of cultural–religious elements of the great tradition, popular religiosity is the mass religiosity of the members of the little tradition.

Popular religion gains its place in society by its service to official religion with its cultural factors and traditional beliefs. Although it is not a proper religion constituent on scripture, creeds, doctrines, prescriptions, prohibitions etc., popular religiosity and folk religiosity are not separated in clear lines, neither practically in real life nor theoretically in literature.

The phenomenon of popular religiosity plays an essential role for the past and present of Anatolia (Tanyu, 1976; Inalcik, 1992; Mardin, 1993; Babinger & Koprulu, 1996; Gunay & Gungor, 1998; Ocak, 1999). With the urbanization, people from different areas of Anatolia migrated west and settled down in the peripheries of big cities and metropolis. As a result of this uncontrolled wave of migration, slums proliferated around the cities and its inhabitants established their own socio-cultural environments in which a different kind of

traditional folk religiosity was produced: *popular Islam*. Thus authentic, historical elements of folk religiosity were reshaped in the popular culture atmosphere. Its roots from the past and its appearance as a product of daily life are essential characteristic of popular religiosity. Consequently, it has to be regarded as a cultural reflection that emerged with the phenomenon of industrialization and modernization, i.e., the prevalence of mass production and communication (Lefebvre, 1968; Schudson, 1987). As Parker (1998) asserts, against the *deterritorialization* of modernity, popular religion supports the individual in his struggle to establish and maintain his existence in the crowded city life, and improve his living conditions. Thus popular beliefs have social and individual functions, because they function as a source for trust and hope in social as well as individual times of crises, like natural disasters, financial crisis or unemployment, disease, and the like. Although the effects of modernism and secularisms seem to have denuded religion's public and institutional grounds, religion still appears to maintain its function as a transcendent meaning making system to solve ontological problems relating to the aim of life and the world on individual level (Berger, 1967) as it is seen the characteristics of Turkish popular religiosity.

Characteristics of Turkish Popular Religion

Popular religion sometimes functions side-by-side with official Islam but also sometimes as an alternative to it, e.g., in the phenomenon of shrine visiting observable in Turkey. Gellner (1992) notes that popular Islam is institutionalized in a form that leans on intermediators and emphasizes religious enthusiasm; Celik (2004) in turn gives as an appropriate example for this approach the phenomenon of shrine visiting. Shrine visiting has a function of establishing a connection with the sacred. Ritualistic visits to the shrines, tombs, houses of the "saints" serve as a mediator between the people, especially in big, modern cities and the transcendent and satisfy socio-psychological as well as spiritual needs. To obtain blessings and good fortune, during special happy life events such as birth, marriage, a new job, recovery from illness, etc., veneration and visits to the places and persons considered sacred are also a must, especially as an act of gratitude for such good grace and its maintenance. Performed with these intentions and expectations, such visits have been criticized and forbidden by scholastic Islam while nevertheless continuing to exist within Turkish folk religiosity as an element of cultural habits and tradition (Gunay, Gungor, Tastan, & Sayim, 2001; Acikgoz, 2004; Celik, 2004). To test these popular features within Turkish religiosity, quantitatively scales developed by

Arslan (*Popular Religiosity Scale*, 2003) Costu (*Religious Orientation* Scale, 2009) and Karaca (*Heterodox Beliefs and Practices Scale*, 2001b) seem to be appropriate; but also qualitative research like the comprehensive field study by Kose & Ayten (2010) and their team gives interesting insights into this phenomenon.

Another example for the popularization of Islamic beliefs and practices in Turkish modernity are the celebrations of holy days and nights. Formerly the fasting time of Ramadan, for instance, was marked by enhanced modesty, hidden donations, private spirituality, caring for the poor and sick in silence. Now huge breaks in fasting, campaigns for donations, TV shows and other entertaining or spiritual programs at holy times are organized. The feast after the fasting month—abandoned from its proper name and meaning and now labelled "sugar feast"—like the feast of sacrifice become more and more like instruments of capitalism, vanity, and show business thus losing their authentic, religious, spiritual character. Western civilization has been experiencing this for a long time with the changing of the holy days of Christmas into a new market place for capitalism.

The popularization of Islam/religion in Turkey is also very obvious in the media. As technical developments like improvements in mass media communication facilitated the mediating role of popular culture and its tools became a platform not only for the secular but also for the religious. Increasing TV shows and programs on religious issues, Islamic friend and partnership websites, and mobility possibilities made religion more accessible. The boom in *faith tourism* and growth in air transport facilities, for example, have contributed to an increase in pilgrimages even among the secular. Here again the pure pious and spiritual intentions of the pilgrim can be questioned, when a pop singer, a show men, or a top model starts such a journey under the spotlights without observing the basic rules of Islam before or after the pilgrimage. The development of popular religious orientations by means of global spaces like mass media, internet, etc., is a reminder of what sociologist call the "second oral culture era" (Ong, 1988).

There is a gulf between those who represent official, literal Islam and the uneducated, lower class masses imbedded in popular religious beliefs and practices. However, the Islamic elite, represented by scholars, researchers and leaders who are involved in religious issues and occupy a particular status in society, such as a chair at a university, leadership of a religious community, director of a Islamic organization or the like, started to present themselves and their ideas by benefiting from the possibilities and opportunities that mass

media offers. This can be interpreted firstly as taking advantage of the blessings of capitalism where even religion finds a market for its products and, secondly, as a mission of the above-mentioned elites to illuminate the masses with regard to their superstitious habits in their popular religiosity. These persons, mostly academic theologians or non-academic community leaders, either talk about their views, which are unique and absolutely correct (!) or they are confronted with opposite thinkers and dispute heavily controversial Islamic issues. These discussions, on one hand, lead to another kind of popularization of religion, in a positive way, in terms of correcting false beliefs of the folk; on the other hand, the masses develop doubts about their long-standing religious attitudes and behaviours and/or get confused due to the discussions by Islamic experts.

Finally, popular culture is perceived as something negative because the term *popular* refers to terms like consumption, materialism, capitalism, production, etc.; not only sociologically but also in terms of religion/Islam, since popular practices are mostly not recognized by official Islam. For religion as an institution, this negative perception means that a new way of believing emerged, a way in which religion is *materialized* and is no longer a moral or meaning system but something *produced* in order to get some benefits. The popularity of such beliefs is based on the facts that they serve as alternative sources for spiritual needs satisfaction and that they are in harmony with the secular lifestyle and the postmodern conception that "anything goes". To distinguish this kind of religiosity the researcher can make profit of scales based on religious orientation like derived from Hoge (1972) by Karaca (*Intrinsic Motivational Religiosity Scale*, 2001a) or developed by Onay (*Religious Orientation Scale*, 2002).

Having illustrated some characteristics that have to be considered when a researcher works in the Turkish context, we can proceed with the methodological issues that appear in research with non-Western cultures in general and Turkish–Islam in particular.

The Problem of Appropriate Measurement

Psychologists and sociologist of religion have long been concerned with the measurement of religiosity and its typologies, dimensions, and development as well as with religious commitment, conversion, behaviour, experience, etc. However, the fact that "there is only one religion, though there are a hundred versions of it" (Shaw, 1931) made this engagement harder than analyzing the styles in an art object (Hodgson, 1974). Starting with the problem which

terminology to use to define religion and religiosity, as Fromm (1978) states, the researcher is confronted with many difficulties. Defining religiosity is as complicated as defining religion itself, as can be seen in the realm of philosophical, sociological, psychological definition attempts. This problematic of defining evolves to describing from there to operationalizing and finally to measuring religiosity. Staying in one particular socio-cultural context makes this effort a bit easier but doing cross-cultural or cross-religious research is another difficult challenge for the researcher. Because firstly the appearance and reflections of religion in daily life vary from society to society; secondly, and most important, because of fundamentally diverse religions but also due to the societies' historical and cultural heritage, their relations with other cultures, state regimes, education policies, living conditions:

> The sociocultural context is the external foundation for religious beliefs, attitudes, values, behavior, and experience…the fact that people cannot really be separated from their personal and social histories, and that these exist in relation to group and institutional life. Families, schools, and work are part of the "big picture", and we cannot abstract a person from these influences (Hood, Hill, & Spilka, 2009).

Exactly this is the reason why the measurements of religiosity have to fit into the "big picture" and take into account the local and specific conditions of a religion. Although early attempts of operationalizing religiosity met this requirement, contemporary attempts are trying to globalize their measure tools in order to make them applicable simultaneously to different cultural and religious contexts (for examples see Hill & Hood, 1999). This kind of assessment seems to have the advantage of making comparisons between different religions and the emerging religiosities. However, whether it is possible to compare different religions and religiosities at all is questionable. To solve this problem, more general than specific measures were invented like the latest *Faith Q-Sort* by Wulff (presented in 2011 at the IAPR Congress in Bari, Italy), for instance. Although, the "avoidance wherever possible of the nouns 'religion', 'religions', and 'spirituality'; similarly, avoidance as much as possible of 'belief' and its variants" (Wulff, 2011) makes one think that such measures attempt to assess religiosity without religion, Wulff's (2011) explanation "that faith is expressed in diverse ways, whatever its nature" and the aim "to offer sufficient options for those who are irreligious or even hostile to religion" point to the faith–religiosity dichotomy mentioned above and may even provide an instrument for successful comparative faith studies.

There is no doubt that religious rites and symbols are determined by religion and its norms themselves, but they also vary according to the social environment where the particular religion is embedded and performed. Thus a religion does not only show differences to other religions, but also within the same religion differences appear depending on geographical, historical, cultural, and individual differences. Islam and its perception and praxis, for example, vary from the Arabian Peninsula to Asia Pacific Muslim countries, from Turkey to European religiosity of Muslim migrants and converts. But also within the same country differences in the typologies of religiosity appear, as it has been shown in the Turkish example. As an instrument for qualitative research, the "25 Faith Development Interview questions" translated by Mehmedoğlu and Aygun (2006) might be a tool that would avoid making mistakes in assessing Turkish–Islamic context. Although, as one of the translators himself, Aygun (2010) reports problems of the Turkish translation these interview questions seem to have proved themselves as appropriate for universal use (e.g., Aygun, 2010; Snarey, 1991; Drewek, 1996; Furushima, 1983).

The Translation Problem

Another problem with general tools is translation. When researchers make use of scales for cross-cultural and cross-religious studies, they should pay attention to a correct and equivalent translation. The translation issue is not only a matter of language. Especially in religious studies the "cultural asymmetry" between different systems (Libeg, 2005), in our case theological and cultural factors have to be considered. Since the accuracy of lexical equivalents has long been recognized as problematic in translating and interpreting, the translator has to focus not only on language but also on socio-cultural norms and conditions that are permanently changing (Libeg, 2005; Stern 2004). When it comes to measuring religiosity, the availability and mastering of background knowledge and reference materials in interaction with specialist is a must for translators. For studies in social sciences, this means interrelatedness with the socio-psychological conditions prevailing in the society that is to be studied. For the scientific study of religion, this means knowledge about the core aspects, basic creeds, and rituals of a particular religion that enables the researcher to speak the same language with the religion that is to be examined. A good example for the problematic of correct and congruous translation is the international religiosity survey *Religionsmonitor* (Bertelsmann Stiftung, 2008). The Turkish version of the questionnaire contains spelling errors as well as translation and interpretation mistakes, and the Islamic–Turkish,

Islamic–German and Christian–German items are not congruent. Putting spelling and grammar errors aside, I would like to give some examples of incongruence from a recent comparison of the German and Turkish version of the survey (https://inquery.bertelsmann-stiftung.de).

Regarding religious practices, the original German–Christian version asks; *How often do you pray? (Wie häufig beten Sie?)*, while the German–Islamic version asks; *How often do you pray the obligatory prayer? (Wie häufig beten Sie das Pflichtgebet?)*, and the Turkish–Islamic version only asks; *Do you pray? (Dua eder misiniz?)*. Considering the position of the German–Islamic question, it is obvious that the daily five time rituals in Islam are meant and can be accepted as congruent with the German–Christian question. However, there is a serious mistake in the Turkish–Islamic item. The word *dua* does not describe the same method of worship as the five daily rituals and refers to *personal prayer*. Furthermore, the ritual prayers performed five times each day are obligatory for a Muslim, while *dua* is a personal, voluntary conversation, a communication with God. Thus the word cannot be used interchangeably to refer to the five daily rituals that are called *namaz* in Turkish and *salah* in Arabic. As mentioned this is the recent situation of the survey, which previously actually contained an item showing this sensitivity in terms of the different meanings of *dua* and *Pflichtgebet (obligatory prayer)*. The question, *Do you perform your daily obligatory worship (Günlük farz ibadetinizi yerine getiriyor musunuz?)* that appears to have been withdrawn from the survey was not without problems but was more appropriate to indicate the five daily rituals. The problem is more complex because the German–Islamic item was not identical to the Turkish–Islamic version. The German item asked, *How often do you pray the obligatory prayer? (Wie häufig beten Sie das Pflichtgebet?)* and the latter asked *Do you perform your daily obligatory worships? (Günlük farz ibadetlerinizi yerine getiriyor musunuz?)* Now the *Religionsmonitor* no longer includes this question after the five time rituals, which in my opinion is a fatal mistake when aiming to assess Islamic religiosity.

The survey items about personal prayer and meditation include similar mistakes such as the prayer issue. Reaching 28% of the survey, the German–Christian responder is asked how often he/she is praying and meditating (*Wie häufig beten Sie? Wie häufig meditieren Sie?*). At the same level, the German–Islamic responder is given a set of three questions: *How often do you pray the obligatory prayer (Wie häufig beten Sie das Pflichtgebet?); How often do you pray personal prayers? (Wie häufig beten Sie persönliche Gebete?); How often do you meditate (Wie häufig meditieren Sie?)*. However, the Turkish–Islamic version

consists of the same two items as the German–Christian version: *How often do you pray? (Dua eder misiniz?); How often do you meditate? (Tefekkür eder misiniz?)*. The lack of the item *How often do you pray the obligatory prayer (Wie häufig beten Sie das Pflichtgebet?)* in the Turkish–Islamic version was discussed above. However, this is not the only inadequacy of this part. While the German–Christian item asks about the frequency of *prayers (How often…(Wie häufig …?))*, the Turkish–Islamic item asks whether the responder prays or not, *Dua eder misiniz? (Do you pray?)*. On the other hand, the German–Islamic item distinguishes between prayer and personal prayer by asking: *How often do you pray personal prayers? (Wie häufig beten Sie persönliche Gebete?)*. As discussed above, this is quite appropriate, since in an Islamic context there must be a distinction between prayer/obligatory prayer (*namaz/salah*) and the personal prayer (*dua*). Unfortunately, the same sensitivity is not shown in the Turkish–Islamic version, where the only question is about the personal prayer *(Dua eder misiniz? (Do you pray?))*.

The next item in this set of questions is about meditation. The German–Christian and Islamic versions simply ask: *How often do you meditate? (Wie häufig meditieren Sie?)*. With this question the German–Islamic version completes its set of three questions about *obligatory prayer (Pflichtgebet), personal prayer (persönliche Gebete) and meditating (meditieren)*. This triple combination is quite appropriate and even essential in an Islamic context to determine practices of religiosity and/or spirituality. Again, unfortunately, the Turkish–Islamic version poses the meditation question in an unlucky way. The item, *How often do you meditate?* is expressed/translated from the Arabic (*tafakkara*) by *tefekkür*, which literally means *thinking, contemplating (Tefekkür eder misiniz? (Do you meditate?))*. In an Islamic context the term involves the meaning and performance of contemplating deeply, of thinking about God, his creation, wisdom, miracles, grace, etc., and is a highly appreciated feature in Islamic spirituality. In this sense it does not imply the same meaning as *meditation*, at least not in Turkish culture. The word *meditation (meditasyon)* also exists in the Turkish language, and is used like it is in the West. Therefore, in Turkish culture, the Western term *meditation* which associates mental and bodily practices cannot be used interchangeably with the term *tefekkür* that has an Islamic spiritual character and refers to thinking towards God. Nevertheless, it would be interesting to see what kinds of differences appear in the results when both, *tefekkür* and *meditation* are asked separately, since both practices are common in Turkish society.

Another issue with this item is that the expression *tefekkür* is considered to be a religious term and is thus not that popular and colloquial. Similarly, the terms *panteizm* and *vahdet-i vücut* mentioned in parentheses in the item referring to the feeling of being one with all, the term *tasallut* in the item about the liberation from an evil power in the God relation question are also specific terms that might be well known in more highly educated (religious) circles but I doubt seriously whether it is understood in daily language or by average Turkish people. Surveys addressing different social classes should make use of articulate language and avoid the application of specific terminology.

These examples from the *Religionsmonitor* demonstrate how important it is to adopt and/or translate measures into another culture and language correctly and carefully and show that merely knowing a language is inadequate. Insufficient cultural and religious knowledge may lead to mistakes in interpretation which, in turn, may mislead results especially when one aims to obtain analogous data.

Turkish psychology of religion also makes use of translations for the measurement of religiosity. Turkish researchers either benefit from directly translated measures or adapted translations of Western measures. It was Aygun (Mehmedoğlu & Aygun, 2006) who translated the revised (Fowler, Streib, & Keller, 2004) *Faith Development Interview* questions developed by Fowler (1981) into Turkish. Aygun used the questions in his doctoral dissertation in order to compare the faith development of Turkish adolescents growing up and living in Turkey with that of Turkish migrants in Germany (Aygun 2010). Ok (2006) applied the interview in Turkey in order to test the measure for religious diversity in Islam as part of a project on Faith Development. Agilkaya (2008) partially benefited from the questions in her master thesis for examining the religious attitudes and behaviours of people who had attempted suicide. Another example of the translation quandary is the *MMRI*. Uysal, Turan, & Isik (2011) made use of Apaydin's (2010) translation of the *Munich Motivation Psychological Inventory of Religiosity (MMRI)* (Zwingmann & Moosburger, 2004) into Turkish and applied it to a Turkish sample. The *MMRI* aims to determine the multi-dimensional motivational structure of religiosity. The researchers identified that the factorial structure of the scale is suitable for examining Turkish social, cultural, and religious structures. Reliability and validity tests approved the scale. Results illustrated that this measure, developed in a different cultural atmosphere, is a useful tool for measuring, describing, and evaluating religious lives of people who live in

traditional societies where values like trust in Allah, solidarity and ethical responsibility, etc., are prevalent, e.g., in the Turkish society.

Adapting Western–Christian Measurements to Muslim Samples

Western–Christian measurements have to be approached carefully when one intends to examine, in general, different cultures and, in particular, Turkish samples since not all of these measures are appropriate. The main reason therefore is that religiosity within Turkish Islam differs from religiosity within Western Christianity. In particular, scales with doctrinal character should be handled with caution. For instance, adapted God image scales are specific examples of inaccurate measurement. In an Islamic context, God images or relation measures consisting of items like "God guides me like a good parent" (Lawrence, 1991), "God is always there like a father and cares for me like a mother" (Streib & Gennerich, 2011) are inappropriate for Muslim samples. The father image is a reflection of Christianity's concept of the Trinity, which is absolutely indefensible and unacceptable in an Islamic context. Another example would be the early measures of religiosity, when trying to assess religiosity by means of church attendance frequencies or the meaning of the church (e.g., Dunkel, 1947; Armstrong, Larsen, & Mourer, 1962; Heise & Yonge, 1968). These again are not suitable scales for Muslim samples, since Islam has neither an institutional religious authority nor representatives like the Church. Furthermore, worship in Islam is neither performed as it is in Christianity or Judaism nor is it limited to a special place or institution. Firstly, collective worship in Islam that requires attendance at a specific place (mosque) is only obligatory for men; secondly, there is only one religious ritual, the Friday prayer that has to be performed collectively in the mosque. Thirdly, as this collective prayer is only a duty for Muslim men, responses to related items by Muslim women will give false results, if religiosity should to be assessed by attendance in collective practices or 'mosque attendance'. Therefore while church attendance might be a relevant indicator for Christian religiosity, going to the mosque is not an equivalent indicator for Muslims. Parallels or accordance might be found in other aspects of religiosity, such as in the dimensions to be illustrated below. However, the researcher also has to be also careful here because the dimensions and their intensity may vary according to socio-cultural context. Multi-dimensional scales that are translated or adapted appropriately into Turkish would solve the above-mentioned issues relating to aspects such as religious practice, knowledge, emotions, and beliefs. The scales developed by Uysal (*Islamic Religiosity Scale*, 1995) and its modified versions

by Mehmedoğlu (*Islamic Religiostiy Scale*, 2004) and Ayten (*Brief Islamic Religiosity Scale*, 2009b) or Kayiklik (*Religious Life Scale*, 2003), for example, with items about faith in Allah as the one and only God and Mohammad as his prophet, performance of the five daily prayers, fasting, ability to read the Qu'rān in its revealed language (Arabic) and ethical consequences due to Islamic faith for instance might solve the above-mentioned problems.

Measures of Religiosity in Turkey

Reviewing measures of religiosity in Turkish psychology and sociology of religion research reveals that they are either inspired by or adapted from European or American religiosity scales or have been translated into Turkish as shown in Table 1, which presents a selection of religiosity scales adapted, translated or developed in order to assess religiosity in Turkey. Unfortunately, this article cannot discuss each and every measure in detail. This list is also not complete nor does it show all the developments and applications of the methodology of Turkish psychology of religion research. In addition, this article does not intend to suggest that the demonstrated scales are the most important. This table, which is a draft for more comprehensive research in the future, merely attempts to give an overview, a selection of measures in Turkey, demonstrating some of the earliest and latest, some of the frequently applied, and some of the original scales.

The most influent approach to developing religiosity scales in Turkey is the multi-dimensional approach of Glock and Stark (1969). Early attempts (e.g. Yaparel's (1987) *Religious Life Inventory*) as well as later efforts (e.g. Ayten's (2009b) *Brief Islamic Religiosity Scale*) referred to Glock and Stark's (1969) model and developed multi-dimensional religiosity scales with respect to Turkish–Islamic religiosity. In Glock's sense, this approach seems to be appropriate. According to Glock (1962), the world religions, although fundamentally different in some aspects, present a general pattern relating to the dimensions of religiosity. As one of the early researchers adapting Glockian dimensions, Koktas (1993) states that the most essential aspects of Islamic religiosity are reflected in Glock & Stark's dimensions. In fact, Islamic religiosity provides an opportunity for such a multi-dimensional analysis. The theoretical or ideological dimension of Islamic religiosity consists of the creeds of Islam. Religious commands to be fulfilled bodily or materially make up the ritualistic dimension. The experiential dimension finds it reflections in the devotion to Allah in awe, in an experience of *mysterium tremendum* and *mysterium fascinans* to use Otto's (1926) words. The mystical Sufi traces

Table 1

Author	Measure (total # items) Factoral Structure (# items)	Reliability	Subsequent Research	Based on…
Ozbaydar (1970)	*Belief in God and Religion Measure* (53) • Belief in God (18) • Belief in Religion (35)		Ozbaydar (1970) Uyaver (2010)	Religious beliefs (Kuhlen & Arnold, 1944)
Yaparel (1987)	Religious Life Inventory (31) • Belief: prevalent beliefs, religious particularism, ethical behavior (4) • Rituals (10) • Emotions (7) • Intellect (10)	$\alpha = .86$	Yaparel (1987) Koktas (1993) Koktas (1995) Yapici (2004)	Multi-dimensions of religiosity (Glock & Stark, 1969)
Köktas (1993)	*Religious Life Inventory* (81) • Ideology: particularism, ethical behavior (14) • Rituals: obligatory worship, voluntary worship (12) • Experience: effects of religion, closeness to Allah (4) • Intellect: basic religious knowledge (7) • Secular Consequences: politics, economics, family, education, neighborhood, science (44)		Köktas (1993)	Multi-dimensions of religiosity (Glock & Stark, 1969)
Yildiz (1998)	*Religious Life Inventory* (31) • Belief (4) • Emotions (7) • Behavior (10) • Intellect (10)	$r = .86$	Yildiz (1998) Yildiz (2006) Sahin (2001) Atalay (2005) Kafali (2005)	Multi-dimensions of religiosity (Glock & Stark, 1969)

Table 1 (*cont.*)

Author	Measure (total # items) Factoral Structure (# items)	Reliability	Subsequent Research	Based on...
Uysal (1995)	*Islamic Religiosity Scale* (26) • Consequences (8) • Ideology (8) • Intellect (3) • Rituals (4) • Social Functions of Religious Behavior (3)	α = .97	Uysal (1995) Mehmedoglu (2004) Musa (2004) Ayten (2009) Turan (2009) Ceviz (2009) Cetin (2010) Bener (2011)	Multi-dimensions of religiosity (Glock & Stark, 1969)
Mehmedoğlu (2004)	*Islamic Religiosity Scale* (33) • Ideology (4) • Rituals (6) • Experience (7) • Intellect (4) • Consequences (12)	α = .96	Mehmedoğlu (2004) Humbetova (2004) Gashi (2008) Yrysbayev (2009) Yuce (2009)	Multi-dimensions of religiosity (Glock & Stark, 1969; Uysal, 1995)
Ayten (2009)	*Brief Islamic Religiosity Scale* (10) • Religious Faith and Consequences (6) • Religious Rituals and Knowledge (4)	α = .80	Ayten (2009) Ayten (2010b) Altinli (2011)	Multi-dimensions of religiosity (Glock & Stark, 1969; Uysal, 1995)
Kayiklik (2003)	*Religious Life Scale* (36) • Belief (12) • Worship (15) • Ethics (9)	α = .87	Kayiklik (2003)	Multi-dimensions of religiosity (Glock & Stark, 1969)
Yapici & Zengin (2003)	*Religious Affection Scale* (17) • Effect of Religion (17)	α = .95	Yapici & Zengin (2003) Yapici (2006)	Multi-dimensions of religiosity (Glock & Stark, 1969)

Table 1 (*cont.*)

Author	Measure (total # items) Factoral Structure (# items)	Reliability	Subsequent Research	Based on...
Apaydin (2010)	*Munich Motivational Religiosity Inventory* (26) • Relation with God as Source of Strength and Trust (14) • Ethical Control (4) • Cooperative Control(2) • Prosocial and Religious Intellectual Responsibility (8)		Uysal, Turan & Isik (2011)	Multi-dimensional motivational religiosity (Zwingmann & Moosburger, 2004)
Kayiklik (2000)	*Religious Orientation Scale* (10) • Intrinsic Religiosity (6) • Extrinsic Religiosity (4)	$\alpha = .78$	Kayiklik (2000) Hosrik (2010)	Religious orientation (Allport & Ross, 1967)
Gurses (2001)	*Religiosity Scale* (21) • Intrinsic Religiosity (9) • Extrinsic Religiosity (12)		Gurses (2001) Kayacan (2002)	Religious orientation (Allport & Ross, 1967)
Cirhinliolgu (2006)	*Religious Orientation Scale* (23) • Intrinsic Religiosity (11) • Extrinsic Religiosity (12)	$\alpha = .90$	Cirhinlioglu (2006) Cirhinlioglu (2010)	Religious orientation (Allport & Ross, 1967)
Kotehne (1999)	*Age Universal I-E Scale* (20) • Intrinsic Scale (9) • Extrinsic Scale (11)	$\alpha = .82$ $\alpha = .48$	Kotehne (1999) Gocen (2005) Koc (2008)	Religious orientation (Allport & Ross, 1967; Gorsuch & Venable 1983)
Kotehne (1999)	*Quest Scale* (6) • Quest (6)	$\alpha = .34$	Kotehne (1999) Gocen (2005)	Religious life inventory (Darley & Batson, 1973)

Table 1 (*cont.*)

Author	Measure (total # items) Factoral Structure (# items)	Reliability	Subsequent Research	Based on . . .
Karaca (2001a)	*Intrinsic Motivational Religiosity Scale* (10) • Intrinsic Motivation (19)	α = .84	Karaca (2000) Karaca (2001a) Karaca (2006) Kirac (2007) Guler (2007) Cetin (2008) Balcı (2011) Gocen (2012)	Religious orientation (Hoge, 1972)
Mutlu (1989)	*Islamic Religiosity Scale* (14) • Belief (14)	α = .94	Mutlu (1989) Kaya (1998)	Religious attitudes
Kaya (1998)	*Religious Attitudes Measure* (31) • Positive Attitudes (17) • Negative Attitudes (14)	α = .96	Kaya (1998) Apaydin (2002) Kafalı (2005)	Religious attitudes and behaviors (Mutlu, 1989; Ozbaydar 1970)
Tas (2003)	*Religiosity Measure* (12) • Belief (6) • Worship and Social Life (6)	α = .93	Tas (2003) Kandemir (2006)	Religious attitudes
Onay (2004)	*Religious Orientation Scale* (18) • Cognition (8) • Behavior (6) • Emotion (4)	α = .95	Onay (2002) Onay (2004)	Religious attitudes
Costu (2009)	*Religious Orientation Scale* (37) • Normative Religious Orientation (30) • Popular Religious Rrientation (7)	α = .87	Costu (2009)	Religious attitudes

Table 1 (*cont.*)

Author	Measure (total # items) Factoral Structure (# items)	Reliability	Subsequent Research	Based on ...
Arslan (2003)	*Popular Religiosity Scale* (12) • Popular Religious Beliefs (12)	α = .85	Arslan (1997) Arslan (2002) Arslan (2003) Arslan (2004)	Popular religious attitudes
Ok (2011)	*Ok-Religious Attitudes Scale* (8) • Cognition (2) • Affection (2) • Behavior (2) • Relation, with God (2)	α = .91	Ok (2011)	Religious attitudes (Francis, Kerr & Lewis, 2005)
Mehmedoğlu & Aygum (2006)	*Faith Development Interview* (26) • Life Review (6) • Relations (3) • Present Values and Commitments (8) • Religion and World View (9)		Ok (2006) Agilkaya (2008) Aygun (2010)	Faith development (Fowler, 1981)
Ok (2009)	*Scale of Faith or Worldview Schemas* (18) • Literal Faith (5) • Historical Reductionism (5) • Pluralist Relativism (4) • Historical Hermeneutics (4)		Ok (2009) Ok & Cirhinlioglu (2010)	Faith development (Fowler, 1981) Religious styles (Streib, 2001)
Sezen (2008)	*Faith Development Scale* (8) • Religious Diversity (3) • Religious Autonomy (3) • Critical Thought (2)	α = .71	Sezen (2008)	Faith development (Leak, Loucks & Bowlin, 1999)

Table 1 (*cont.*)

Author	Measure (total # items) Factoral Structure (# items)	Reliability	Subsequent Research	Based on …
Uysal (2001)	*Religiousness Scale* (34) • Religious Features and Practices (15) • Social Features and Practices (12) • Personal Ethics (5) • Negative Character Traits (2)	α = .93	Uysal (2001) Uysal (2006) Capcioglu (2003)	
Karaca (2001b)	*Heterodox Beliefs and Practices Scale* (10) • Heterodox Practices (5) • Heterodox Beliefs (5)	α = .63	Karaca (2001b)	Heterdox beliefs
Yapici (2002)	*Religious Dogmatism Scale* (16) • Religious Dogmatism (16)	α = .91	Yapici (2002) Yapici (2004)	Dogmatism (Rokeache, 1960; Frenkel-Brunswik, 1948)
Topuz (2003)	*Religious Development Scale* (55) • Disbelief (11) • Deceptive Religiosity (11) • Imitative Religiosity (11) • Investigative Religiosity (11) • Pleasurable Religiosity (11 items)	α = .80	Topuz (2003)	Religiosity typologies described in Ghazali's works, especially in *Ihyaʾ ulʿulum al-dīn* [*Revival of Religious Sciences*] and *Mükaşefetüʿl-kulub* [*The Discovery of the Hearts*] (for Gazzali's works see www.ghazali.org

Table 1 (*cont.*)

Author	Measure (total # items) Factoral Structure (# items)	Reliability	Subsequent Research	Based on . . .
Guler (2007a)	*God Perception Scale* (22) • Loving God Perception (8) • Positive God Perception (4) • Distant/Unconcerned God Perception (4) • Scaring/Punishing God Perception (3) • Negative God Perception (3)	$\alpha = .83$	Guler (2007a,b) Guler (2011)	God perceptions
Guler (2007a)	*Guilt Scale* (20) • Repentence (9) • Self-Punisment (5) • Punishment Expectation (6)	$\alpha = .90$	Guler (2007a,b)	Feelings of guilt/sinfulness
Sezen (2008)	*Religious Fundamentalism* (12) • Religious Doctrines (6) • Symbolic Thought (3) • Categoric Thought (3)	$\alpha = .84$	Sezen (2008) Kaya (2011)	Religious fundamentalism (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 2004)
Ok (2009)	*Clergy Vocational Conflict* (10) • Vocational Cognitive Conflict (10)	$\alpha = .76$	Ok (2002) Ok (2004) Ok (2005) Ok (2009)	Religious conflict, quest, doubts
Mehmedoğlu (2011)	*God Image Scale* (76) • Positive God Image: merciful (11), protecting (8), submitted (5), competent/ transcendent (12), friend (7), close/ immanent (7), officious/controlling (6), loving (8), not requesting (2) • Negative God Image: punishing (7), testing (3)	$\alpha = .89$	Mehmedoğlu (2011) Akyuz (2011)	Islamic/ Qu'rānic images of God

within Turkish religiosity provide the mental potentials for this experiential dimension. The intellectual dimension is an essential part of Islamic religiosity since basic knowledge about Islam is required for the performance of core religious duties. It must also be noted that, in Islam, the achievement of knowledge and education in religious as well in secular sciences is a highly appreciated task. The consequences in social life, as the consequential dimension, are widespread, since "Islam is not merely a religion but a total way of life" (Patai, 1987) and is related to almost every domain in the life of a Muslim as also recognized by non-Muslim scholars (e.g. Charnay, 1974; Patai, 1987). The question to which extent the conceptualization of religiosity in five dimensions matches Turkish religiosity encouraged Turkish psychologists of religion to develop more varieties of multi-dimensional religiosity scales with emphasis on different dimensions (see Table 1).

Allport & Ross' (1967) concept of intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity is another inspiration in Turkish psychology of religion research for developing religiosity measures. Scales based on religious orientation (e.g., Hoge, 1972) have been recognized as appropriate for different religious contexts since they do not refer to one specific religious system (Karaca, 2001a). It was Kayiklik (2000) who adapted the *Religious Orientation Scale* by Allport & Ross (1967) to Turkish culture. With slight differences, Gurses (2001) developed a similar measure. According to their results, for the intrinsic religious person, religion is an aim. Hokelekli (1993) defined this kind of religiosity as *psychological needs religiosity* with respect to the functions of religion. In contrast, for the extrinsic religious person, religion is a medium through which he/she aims to achieve goals such as social acceptance. Karaca (2001a) explains his preference for the adaptation of the *Intrinsic Motivational Religiosity Scale* (Hoge, 1972) to Turkish society by stating that this scale is developed in a wide perspective, which allows one to embrace different religions and cultures and that it has the chance to provide more useful findings about real religiosity, because, he argues, if it is assumed that religion is directed from inside, then the intrinsic motivational dimension of religiosity will more realistic and functional in understanding religious life and religiosity.

Turkish psychologists of religion made also use of scales assessing religious attitudes. The *Ok-Religious Attitude Scale* (Ok, 2011) was constructed to measure religious attitudes in Islamic–Turkish tradition. It was observed (Ok, 2011) that the scale revealed a good criterion validity, compared to *Francis Scale of Attitude Towards Christianity* (Francis, Kerr, & Lewis, 2005) and *Intrinsic Religiosity Scale* (Allport & Ross, 1967). As a kind of Islamic version/adaptation of Francis' scale this scale with its Islamic terminology

seems to be an appropriate measure of Islamic attitudes. However the validity of Ok's *Religious Attitude Scale* for Islamic tradition in general has to be tested.

As last examples for adaptations and standardizations to Turkish culture of particular scales, one should refer to Sezen's (2008) measures. Sezen (2008) adapted the *Faith Development Scale* by Leak, Loucks, & Bowlin (1999) into Turkish stating that this tool has the advantage of being an effective and short measurement in predicting personal, social and religious variables in faith development. The *Religious Fundamentalism Scale* by Altemeyer & Hunsberger (2004) is another adaptation by Sezen (2008). The author shares Hill & Hood's (1999) view that this scale enables the assessment of to which degree a person is religious fundamentally regardless of being Christian, Muslim or Jew.

In all these examples it is debatable whether these adapted approaches are appropriate for Turkish/Islamic religiosity. Whereas the religious studies and the applied measures in the West are rooted theoretically and methodologically in theological, sociological and psychological solid ground, Turkish instruments for empirical studies of religion lack theoretical, epistemological and methodological originality. However, developments and efforts being made in Turkish psychology of religion research give rise to hope.

Conclusion

Measures of religiosity used in the psychology of religion are mainly developed within or for a Western Judeo-Christian context. However, especially for the purpose of religious studies, these measures are inappropriate for straightforward adaptation to non-Western civilizations and cultures by standard translations. Consequently, researchers in the psychology of religion, especially those who are interested in cross-cultural and cross-religious studies—as Glock (1972) points out, the real challenge lies in the cross-cultural study of religious commitment—should be equipped with more "sophisticated theological literacy" (Hunter, 1989). This is of course not a call for a "religious psychology" in Beith-Hallahmi's (1991) sense but rather a statement that the psychology of religion and spirituality needs to be religiously and spiritually informed about the content of specific faith traditions in order to make meaningful empirical predictions (Hood, 1992; Gorsuch, 2008; Porpora, 2006; Hood, Hill, & Spilka, 2009). Here a brief introduction of Turkish–Islamic religiosity was given in order to provide such information.

In conclusion, methodological approaches for the measurement of religiosity should correspond with the theological and cultural framework to which the particular religion or religiosity belongs. Religiosity measures, mostly developed by Western–Christian scholars, should be applied to non-Western–Christian cultures very carefully. If translations have to be made, researchers should be sure that these are done by translators/interpreters who know not only both languages very well, but are also familiar with the religious and cultural characteristics/atmosphere of the field researched.

References

Acikgoz, O. (2004). *Turk Muslumanliginin en belirgin vasiflari* [The distinct features of Turkish Muslims]. *Turk Dunyasi Arastirmalari, 148*, 159-178.

Agilkaya, Z. (2008). *Intihar Girisiminde Bulunanlarda Dini Tutum ve Davranislar* [Religious Attitudes and Behaviors of Suicide Attempters]. Unpublished master thesis. Istanbul: Marmara Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

Agilkaya, Z. (2010). *Intihar ve Din: Intihar Girisiminde Bulunanlar Uzerine Empirik Bir Arastirma* [Suicide and Religion: an empirical research on suicide attempters]. *Marmara Universitesi Ilahiyat Fakultesi Dergisi, 2010*(1), 173-202.

Agilkaya, Z. (2011). Religious attitudes and behaviors among suicide attempters in Turkish–Muslim society. In K. McKay, & J.E. Schlimme (Eds.), *Making Sense of Suicide*, (pp. 51-58) Oxford: Inter-Disciplinary Press.

Agirman, C. (2007). *Fert ve Toplumun Yetim ve Oksuzlere Karsi Sorumluluklari* [Individual and Social Responsibilities Towards the Orphan]. *Dinbilimleri Akademik Arastirma Dergisi, VII*(2), 9-30.

Akyuz, Z. (2011). *Genclerde Benlik Saygisi ve Tanrı Tasavvuru* [Self-Esteem and God Image among Adolescents]. Unpublished master thesis, Istanbul: Marmara Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

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

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*(1), 47-54.

Altinli, M. (2011). "I am spiritual but not religious" Movement in Turkey within University Students/Sample. Unpublished master thesis. London: University of London Hythrope College.

ANAR (2007). *Turkiye'deki Muslumanlarin Dindarlik ve Kurani Kerim okuma anlayisi* [The understanding of religiosity and reading the Qurʾān of Muslims in Turkey].

Apaydin, H. (2002). *Burclarin Dini Tutum ve Davranislarla Iliskisi* [The relation between the signs of zodiac on religious attitudes and behaviors] *Dinbilimleri Akademik Araştırma Dergisi, II*(3), 183-204.

Apaydin, H. (2010). *Munchner Motivasyonel Dindarlik Envanteri: Boyutsal Kontrol ve Denetim* [Munich Motivation Psychological Inventory of Religiosity: Dimensional analysiz and revision]. *Dinbilimleri Akademik Arastirma Dergisi, 10*(2), 287-312.

AREM (2007). *T.C. Ic Isleri Bakanligi Arastirma ve Etutler Merkezi. Avrupa Yasam Kalitesi Arastirmasi* [Turkish Internal Affaires Ministry Research and Study Center. European Life Quality Survey].

Armstrong, R.G., Larsen, G.L., & Mourer, S.A. (1962). Religious attitudes and emotional adjustment. *Journal of Psychological Studies, 13*, 35-47. In P.C. Hill, & R.W. Hood Jr. (1999). *Measures of Religiosity.* Birmingham: Religious Education Press.

Arslan, M. (1997). *Anadolu'nun Bir Tasra Ilçesindeki Insanların Dindarlık Boyutları Üzerine Sosyolojik Bir Arastırma: Iskilip Örneği.* On dokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Samsun.

Arslan, M. (2002). *Dinsel boyutluluğun sosyolojik bağlamı: Faktör analitik bir çalısma* [Sociological context of religious dimensionality]. *Dinbilimleri Akademik Arastırma Dergisi, 2*(4), 161-186.

Arslan, M. (2003). *Populer dindarlik olceginin gelistirilmesi: gecerlik ve güvenirlik calismasi* [Development of popular religiosity scale]. *Dinbilimleri Akademik Araştırma Dergisi, III*(1), 97-116.

Arslan, M. (2004). *Türk Populer Dindarlığı.* [Turkish Popular Religiosity]. Istanbul: Dem Yay.

Atalay, T. (2005). *Ilkogretim ve Liselerde Dindarlik* [Religiosity in Elementary and High Schools]. Istanbul: Dem Yay.

Ayas, M.R. (1992). The religious values of the youth: From the 1940's to the present date. *Dokuz Eylul Universitesi Ilahiyat Fakultesi Dergisi, VII*, 1-5.

Aydin, M. (1999). *Turk Toplumunda Dini Hosgorunun Temelleri* [The foundations of Turkish religious tolerance]. *Selcuk Universitesi Ilahiyat Fakultesi Dergisi, 98, VIII*, 7-17.

Aydin, M.Z. (2004). *Ailenin Onemi ve Kardesler arasi Iliskiler* [The importance of family and the relationships between siblings] *Diyanet Aylık Dergi, 165*, 56-57.

Aygun, A. (2010): *Religiose Sozialisation und Entwicklung bei muslimischen Jugendlichen in Deutschland und in der Turkei: empirische Analyse und religionspädagogische Herausforderungen* [Religious Socialization and Dvelopment of Muslim Adults in Germany and Turkey: Empirical Analysis and Challenges in Religious Education]. Bielefeld: University Bielefeld.

Ayten, A. (2009a). *Affedicilik ve Din: Affetme Eğilimi ve Dindarlıkla İlişkisi Üzerine Ampirik Bir Araştırma* [Forgiveness and religion: An empirical study on the relation between forgiveness attitudes and religiosity]. *Marmara Universitesi, Ilahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, 37*(2), 111-128.

Ayten, A. (2009b). *Prososyal Davranislarda Dindarlik ve Empatinin Rolu* [The Role of Religiosity and Empathy in Pro-Social Behavior]. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Istanbul: Marmara Universitesi.

Ayten, A. (2010a). *Empati ve Din: Turkiye'de Yardimlasma ve Dindarlik Uzerine Psikososyal Bir Arastirma* [Empathy and Relgion: A Psycho-Social Research about Benevolence and Religiosity in Turkey]. Istanbul: Iz Yayincilik.

Ayten, A. (2010b). *'Sahip Olma' mi 'Emanet Gorme' mi? Cevre ve Dindarlık Iliskisi Uzerine Bir Arastirma* [A study on environment and religiosity]. *Dinbilimleri Akademik Araştırma Dergisi, 10*(2), 203-233.

Ayten, A. (2010c). *Tanri'ya Siginmak—Dini Basa Cikma Uzerine Psiko-Sosyal Bir Arastirma* [Taking Refuge in God—A Psycho-Social Study on Religious Copying]. Istanbul: Iz Yayincilik.

Babinger, F., & Koprulu, F. (1996). *Anadolu'da Islamiyet* [Islam in Anatolia]. R. Hulusi (Cev.), Istanbul: Insan Yay.

Balcı, F., (2011). *Psikolojik ve Oznel Iyi Olma Hali ile Dini Inançlar Arasındaki Iliski Uzerine bir Inceleme* [A Research on Relationship between Psychological and Subjective Well-Being and Religious Beliefs]. Unpublished master thesis. Bursa: Uludag Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

Baser, S. (1991). *Gok Tanrinin Sifatlarina Esmau'l–Husna acisindan Bakis* [A view on Gok God attributes from the point of Esmau'l–Husna]. Istanbul: Seyran Iktisadi Isletmesi.

Baykan, E. (2008). *Yoksulluk ve Dindarlar–Yeni Yoksulluk Ekseninde Turkiye'nin Mumkun Gelecegi ve Dindarlar Uzerine Dusunceler* [Poor and devout—Thoughts on Turkey's likely future and devout Muslims with respect to the concept of new poverty]. In K. Tuna, I. Altan, I.A. Eren, & Z. Gunes (Eds.), *International Symposium On Poverty, III* (pp. 438-442). Istanbul: Deniz Feneri Yay.

Beit-Hallahmi, B. (1991). Goring the sacred ox: Towards a psychology of religion. In H.N. Malony (Ed.), *Psychology of Religion: Personalities, Problems, Possibilities*, (pp. 189-194). Grand Rapids, MI: Baker.

Bener, M. (2011). *Dindarlik-Es secimi iliskisi (SDU ornegi)* [Spouse Choice–Religiosity Relation (SDU Example)]. Unpublished master thesis. Isparta: Suleyman Demirel Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

Berger, P. (1967). Religious institutions. In Neil J. Smelser, *Sociology: An Introduction*, (pp. 329-380) New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Bilgin, V. (2003). *Populer Kultur ve Din: Dindarligin Degisen Yuzu* [Popular religiosity and religion: the changing face of religiosity]. *Uludag Universitesi Ilahiyat Fakultesi Dergisi, 12*(1), 193-214.

Bostanci Dastan, N., & Buzlu, S. (2010). *Meme Kanseri Hastalarında Maneviyatın Etkileri ve Manevi Bakım* [The effects of spirituality and pastoral care in breast cancer patients]. *Maltepe Universitesi Hemsirelik Bilim ve Sanati Dergisi, 3*(1), 73-78.

Cakir, R. (1995). *Ayet ve Slogan: Turkiye'de Islami Olusumlar* [Ayah and slogan: Religious developments in Turkey]. *8*. Baski. Istanbul: Metis Yay.

Cakir, R. (2002). *Cumhuriyet Doneminde Turkiye'de Islami Hayat* [Islamic life in Turkey during the republic area]. *National Geographic Turkey*, January, 94-103.

Capcioğlu, I. (2003). *Sosyal Degisme Sürecinde Din ve Kadinin Toplumsal Konumu (Kastomonu Ornegi)* [Religion and the Status of Woman in the Social Change Process (Kastamonu Example)]. Unpublished master thesis. Ankara: Ankara Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

Celik, C. (2003). *Degiskenler ve Boyutlar Baglaminda Turk Toplumunda Dini Hayatin incelenmesi* [The investigation of religious life in Turkey according to variations and dimension], *Bilimname I, 1*, 153-174.

Celik, C. (2004). *Turk Halk Dindarliginda Degisim ve Sureklilik* [Change and continuity in Turkish folk religiosity]. *Cukurova Universitesi Ilahiyat Fakultesi Dergisi, 4*(1), 213-239.

Cetin, U.F. (2010). *Ortaogretim düzeyinde genclerde dindarlik-empati iliskisi (Isparta Örnegi)* [The Relation Religiosity–Empati among Students (Isparta Example)]. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Isparta: Suleyman Demirel Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

Ceviz, F.H. (2009). *Orta Yas ve Yaslilikta Dindarlik, Mistik Tecrube ve Benlik Algisi* [Religiosity, Mystical Experience and Self-Perception among Middle and Old Aged]. Unpublished master thesis, Istanbul: Marmara Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

Charnay, J.-P. (1974). *Préalables Epistémologique a une Sociologie Réligieuse de l'Islam*. [Epistemological conditions for a sociology of religion of Islam]. *Archives de Sciences Sociales des Religions, 37*, 79-86.

Christian Jr., W.A. (1987). Folk Religion. In M. Eliade (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, (pp. 370-374) New York: Macmillan.

Cirhinlioğlu, F.G. (2006). *Universite Ogrencilerinde Utanc Egilimi, Dini Yönelimler, Benlik Kurgulari ve Psikolojik Iyilik Hali Arasındaki Iliskiler* [The Relationships Among Shame Proneness, Religious Orientations, Self-Construals, Psychological Well-Being Within a University Student Group]. Yayınlanmamis Doktora Tezi. Ankara: Hacettepe Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

Cirhinlioğlu, F.G. (2010). *Dini yönelimler ve önyargı* [Religious orientations and prejudice]. *Uluslar arası Insan Bilimler Dergisi, 7*(1), 1366-1384.

Cirhinlioğlu, F.G., & Ok, U. (2010). *Inanc ya da Dunya Gorusu Bicimleri ile Intihara Yonelik Tutum, Depresyon ve Yasam Doyumu Arasindaki Iliskiler* [The relations between faith or worldview styles and attitude towards suicide, depression and life satisfaction]. *C.U. Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 34*(1), 1-8.

Clévenot, M. (Ed.) (1987). *L'Etat des Religions dans le Monde* [The State of Religions in the World]. Paris: la Découverte/le Cerf.

Costu, Y. (2009). *Dine Normatif ve Popüler Yaklasim—"Bir Dini Yönelim Ölcegi Denemesi"* [Normatif and popular approach to religion—"A religious orientation scale attempt"]. *Hitit Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, 8*(15), 119-139.

Dictionary of Beliefs & Religions (1995). R. Goring (Ed.), Wordsworth Reference, Edinburgh: W&R Chambers Ltd.

Drewek, P.A. (1996). *Cross-Cultural Testing of James W. Fowler's Model of Faith Development Among Baha'is.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Ottawa.

Dunkel, H.B. (1947). *General Education in the Humanities*. Washington DC: American Council on Education.

Duriez, B., Fontaine, R.J., & Luyten, P. (2001). *La Religiosité Influence–telle encore Notre Vie? Nouvelles Preuves Soutenant la Différenciation des Structures de Valeurs en fonction de Différents Types de Religiosité* [Does religiosity still influence our life? New proofs sustain the differentiation of the validity structures in the functions of different types of religiosity]. In V. Saroglou, & D. Hutsebaut (Eds.), *Religion et développement humain: Questions psychologiques*, (pp. 94-113). Paris–Montréal: L'Harmattan.

Duzguner, S. (2007). A Study on the Influence of Mawlawi Sema Ritual on Human Psychology. *Marife, 7*(3), 195-214.

Duzguner, S. (2011). *Investigating the Role of Spirituality on Altruistic Behavior*. Presentation at the Conference of the International Association of the Psychology of Religion (IAPR) Bari, Italy, August, 2011.

Fowler, J.W. (1981). *Stages of Faith. the Psychology of Human Development and the Quest for Meaning*. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.

Fowler, J.W., Streib, H., & Keller, B. (2004). *Manual for Faith Development Research*. 3rd edn., Atlanta, GA: Center for Research in Moral and Faith Development & Bielefeld: Research Center for Biographical Studies in Contemporary Religion.

Francis, L.J., Kerr, S., & Lewis, C.A. (2005). Assessing attitude towards Christianity among adolescents in South Africa: The Francis Scale. *South African Journal of Psychology, 35*, 147-155.

Fromm, E. (1941). *Escape from Freedom*, New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Fromm, E. (1978). *Psychoanalysis and Religion*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Furushima, R.Y. (1983). *Faith Development Theory: A Cross-Cultural Research Project in Hawaii*. Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College.

Gallup (2002). *Religion Dominates Daily Life in the Islamic World*. Retrieved 15 March 2012, from: http://www.gallup.com/poll/5383/Religion-Dominates-Daily-Life-Islamic-World.aspx.

Gallup (2009). How was the Poll of Islamic Countries conducted? Retrieved 15 March 2012, from: http://www.gallup.com/poll/124139/Poll-Islamic-Countries-conducted.aspx.

Gashi, F. (2008). *Kosova Bolgesinde Arnavut, Bosnak ve Turk Genclerinin Dini Yönelimleri* [Religious Orientations of Albanian, Bosnian, and Turkish Adolescents]. Unpublished Master Thesis, Istanbul: Marmara Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

Gellner, E. (1992). *Postmodernism, Reason and Religion*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Glock, C.Y. (1962). On the study of religious commitment. *Religious Education, 57*, Suppl. 4, 98-110.

Glock, C.Y. (1972). On the study of religious commitment. In J.E. Faulkner (Ed.) *Religion's Influence in Contemporary Science, Readings in the Sociology of Religion*. (pp. 38-56). Ohio: Charles E. Merril.

Glock, C.Y., & Stark, R. (1969). Dimensions of religious commitment. In R. Robertson (Ed.) *Sociology of Religion*, (pp. 253-261). New York: Penguin.

Gocen, G. (2005). *Dini inanc ve ibadetin kendisi gerceklestirme ile iliskisi* [Relationship Between Religious Worship and Religious Belief and Self-Actualization Levels]. Unpublished Master Thesis. Bursa: Uludag Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

Gocen, G. (2012). *Sukur ve Psikolojik Iyi olma Hali Arasındaki Iliski Uzerine Bir Alan Arastirmasi* [A Field Study on the Relation between Appreciation and Psychological Well-Being]. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ankara: Ankara Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Gorsuch, R. (2008). On the limits of scientific investigation: Miracles and intercessory prayer. In J.H. Ellens (Ed.), *Miracles: God, Science, and Psychology in the Paranormal. Vol. 1. Religious and Spiritual Events* (pp. 280-299). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Gorsuch, R.L., & Venable, G.D. (1983). Development of an "age universal" I-E scale. *Journal for the Scientific of Religion, 22*(2), 181-187.

Guler, O., & Aydın, M. (2011), *Yasami Sürdürmede Dini Inancin Rolu* [The Role of Religious Belief as a Reason for Living]. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Ankara: Ankara Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

Guler, O. (2007a). *Tanri'ya Yönelik Atiflar, Benlik Algisi ve Günahkarlik Duygusu (Yetişkin Örneklem)* [Attributions to God, Self-Perception and Guilt (Adult Sample)]. Unpublished Master Thesis. Ankara: Ankara Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

Guler, O. (2007b). *Tanri Algisi Olcegi (TA): Gecerlik ve Güvenirlik Calismasi* [God Perception Scale: Its Validity and Reliabilty]. *Ankara Universitesi Ilahiyat Fakultesi Dergisi, XLVIII*(1), 123-133.

Gunay, M. (2008). *Dinin Ana Gayelerini Gerceklestirmede bir Risk Unsuru olarak Yoksullukk Kulturu* [Poverty culture as an element of risk in the realization of the main goals in religion]. *Islam Hukuku Arastirmalari Dergisi, 11*, 303-316.

Gunay, N. (1996). *Eski Turk Dini* [Former Turkish Religion]. *Suleyman Demirel Universitesi, Ilahiyat Fakultesi Dergisi, 3*, 261-272.

Gunay, U., & Gungor, H. (1998). *Turk Din Tarihi* [History of Turkish Religion]. 2. Baski. Kayseri: Lacin Yay.

Gunay, U. (1999). *Erzurum Kenti ve Cevre Koylerinde Dini Hayat* [Religious Life in Erzurum and Eviorment]. Istanbul: Erzurum Kitapligi.

Gunay, U. (2001). *Cagdas Turkiye'de Din, Toplum, Kultur, Gelenek ve Degisme* [Religion, society, culture, tradition, and change in contemporary Turkey]. *Cukurova Universitesi Ilahiyat Fakultesi Dergisi, 1*(2), 1-38.

Gunay, U., Gungor, H., Tastan, A.V., & Sayim, H. (2001). *Ziyaret Fenomeni Uzerine bir Din Bilim Arastirmasi* [A Science of Religion Study on the Phenomenon of Visits]. Kayseri: Erciyes Universitesi Yay.

Gungor, H. (1998). *Turk Bodunbilimi Arastirmalari* [Turkish Ethnology Studies]. Kayseri: Kivilcim Kitabevi Yay.

Gurses, I. (2001). *Kolelik ve Ozgurluk Arasinda Din: Universite Ogrencileri Uzerinde Sosyal Psikolojik Bir Arastirma* [Religion between Slavery and Freedom: A Socio-Psychological Study on University Students]. Bursa: Arasta Yay.

Hall, R.E., Livingston, J.N., Brown, C.J., & Mohabir, J.A. (2011). Islam and Asia Pacific Muslims: The implications of spirituality for social work practice. *Journal of Social Work Practice, 25*(2), 205-2015.

Heise, P., & Yonge, G. (1968). *Omnibus Personality Inventory: Form F Manual*. New York: The Pschological Corporation.

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

Hodgson, M.G.S. (1974). *The Venture of Islam: Conscience and History in a World Civilization*. Vol. I. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Hoge, R. (1972). A validated intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 11*(4), 369-376.

Hokelekli, H. (1993). *Din Psikolojisi* [Psychology of Religion]. Ankara: TDV Yay.

Hood Jr., R.W. (1992). Sin and guilt in faith traditions: Issues of self-esteem. In J. Schumaker (Ed.), *Religion and Mental Health*, (pp. 110-121). New York: Oxford University Press.

Hood Jr., R.W., Hill, P.C., & Spilka, B. (2009). The psychological nature and functions of religion. In *The Psychology of Religion—An Empirical Approach*, (p. 4), 4th edn., New York: Guilford Press.

Horozcu, U. (2010). *Tecrubi Arastirmalar Isiginda Dindarlik ve Maneviyat ile Ruhsal ve Bedensel Saglik Arasındaki Iliski* [The relation between religiosity and spirituality with physical and mental health with respect to empiric studies]. *Milel ve Nihal, 7*(1), 209-240.

Hosrik, M.E. (2010). *Dua ve Plasebonun Sigiller Uzerindeki Etkisi* [The Effect of Prayer and Placebo on Warts]. Unpublished Master Thesis. Ankara: Ankara Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

Humbetova, I. (2004). *Dini Tutum ve Davranislarin Olusumunda Mukafat ve Cezanin Etkisi* [The Effect of Award and Punishment in the Formation of Religious Attitudes and Behaviors]. Unpublished Master Thesis, Istanbul: Marmara Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

Hunter, W.F. (Ed.). (1989). The case for theological literacy in the psychology of religion [special issue]. *Journal of Psychology and Theology. 17*.

Inalcik, H. (1992). *Osmanli Imparatorlugunda Islam* [Islam in the Ottoman Empire]. M. Ozel (Cev.). Istanbul: Dergah Yay.

International Social Survey (2009). *Turkiye'de Dindarlik: Uluslar arasi bir Karsilastirma* [Religiosity in Turkey: An International Comparison]. Carkoğlu, & Kalaycioğlu.

Istanbul Mulkiyeliler Vakfi Sosyal Arastirmalar Merkezi (1999). *Turk Gencligi 98*, Konrad Adenauer Vakfi Adina Yapilmis Calisma [Social Research Center of Istanbul Mulkiyeliler Foundation. Turkish Youth '98. Study in the name of Konrad Adenauer Foundation]. Ankara.

Kafali, H. (2005). *Lise ogrencilerin Dini Inanc ve Tutumlarin Sosyal Iliskilere Etkisi. Ergani Ornegi* [The Effect of Religious Beliefs and Attitudes on Highschool Students' Social Relations]. Konya: Selcuk Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

Kandemir, Y. (2006). *Kader Inancinin Psikoterapik Acidan Fonksiyonu* [The Psychotherapic Function of Fate Perceptions]. Unpublished Masters Thesis, Erzurum: Ataturk Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

Kaplan, H. (2010). *Ilahi Adalet Psikolojisi*, Istanbul: Express Yayinevi.

Karaca, F. (2000). *Olum Psikolojisi* [Death Psychology]. Istanbul: Beyan Yay.

Karaca, F. (2001a). *Din psikolojisinde metot sorunu ve bir dindarlik olceginin Turk Toplumuna standardizasyonu* [The problem of methodology in the psychology of religion and the standardization of religiosity scale into Turkish society]. *EKEV Akademi Dergisi, 3*(1), 187-201.

Karaca, F. (2001b). *Heteredoks inanc ve davranislar olcegi uzerine bir degerlendirme* [An evaluation of the Heterodox Belief and Behaviors Sscale]. *Ataturk Universitesi Ilahiyat Fakultesi Dergisi, I*, 145-168.

Karaca, F. (2006). *Kader algisi-Ruh Sagligi Iliskisi Uzerine Empirik bir Arastirma (Farklı Kader Algilarinin Psikoterapik Degeri Uzerine)* [An experimental study on the relation between destiny perception and mental health (On psychotherapic evaluation of different destiny perceptions)]. *Islami Arastirmalar Dergisi, 19*(3), 479-489.

Kaya, M. (1998). *Din Egitiminde Iletisim ve Dini Tutum* [Communication and Religious Attitudes in Religious Education]. Samsun: Etut Yay.

Kaya, M., & Aydin, C. (2011). *Universite Ogrencilerinin dini inanc ile ahlaki olgunluk düzeyleri arasindaki iliskinin incelenmesi* [A study on the relation between religious belief and ethical maturity among university students]. *Ondokuz Mayis Universitesi Ilahiyat Fakultesi Dergisi*, 30, 15-41.

Kayacan, M. (2002). *Dini gruplara giriş ve çıkış motivleri (Dini gruplara giren bireyler üzerinde sosyal psikolojik bir araştırma)* [Motives of Joining and Leaving Religious Groups (A Socio-Psychological Study on Individuals Joining a Religious Group)]. Unpublished Master Thesis. Bursa: Uludag Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

Kayiklik, H. (2000). *Dini Yasayis Bicimleri: Psikolojik Temelleri Acisindan Bir Degerlendirme* [Religious Life Styles: An Evaluation on its Psychological Grounds]. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Izmir: Dokuz Eylul Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

Kayiklik, H. (2003). *Orta Yas ve Yaslilikta Dinsel Egilimler* [Religious Attitudes in the Middle and Old Ages]. Adana: Baki Kitabevi.

Koktas, M.E. (1993). *Turkiye'de Dini Hayat—Izmir Ornegi* [Religious life in Turkey—Example of Izmir]. Istanbul: Isaret Yay.

Komecoğlu, U. (2000). *Kutsal ile Kamusal: Fethullah Gulen Cemaati Hareketi* [The sacred and public: The Fetullah Gulen movement], In N. Gole (Ed.), *Islam'in Yeni Kamusal Yuzleri*, (pp. 148-194). 2. Baski. Istanbul: Metis Yay.

KONDA (2007). *Gundelik Yasamda Din, Laiklik ve Turban Arastirmasi* [Research on religion, laicism and head scarf in daily life].

Kose, A., & Ayten, A. (2010). *Turbeler: Populer Dindarligin Duraklari* [Tombs: Popular Religiosity's Stops]. Istanbul: Timas Yay.

Kostas, M. (1995). *Universite Ogrencilerinde Dine Bakis* [The Look on Religion of University Students]. Ankara: TDV Yay.

Kotehne, G. (1999). *Religious Orientation and Personality*. Unpublished Master Thesis, Istanbul: Bogazici Universitesi.

Kuhlen, R.G., & Arnold, M. (1944). Age differences in religious beliefs and problems during adolescence. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 65*, 291-300.

Lawrence, R.T. (1991). The God Image Inventory: The Development, Validation, and Standadization of a Psychometric Instrument for Research, Pastoral and Clinical Use in Measuring the Image of God. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Washington DC: The Catholic University of America. In P.C. Hill, & R.W. Hood Jr., (1999). *Measures of Religiosity*. Birmingham: Religious Education Press.

Leak, G.K., Loucks, A.A., & Bowlin, P. (1999). Development and Initial Validation of a Global Measure of Faith Development. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 9*, 105-124.

Lefebvre, M. (1968). *La Vie quotidienne dans le monde moderne* [Daily Life in Modern World]. Paris: Gallimord.

Lewis, B. (1968). *The Emergence of Modern Turkey.* 2nd edn. London: Oxford University Press.

Libeg, A. (2005). Practical aspects of translation: Bridging the gap between theory and practice. *Proceedings of the European Integration–Between Tradition and Modernity Congress, 1*, 352-358.

Long, C.H. (1987). Popular religion. In M. Eliade (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, (pp. 442-452) New York: Macmillan.

Macit, M. (2008). *Sivil Toplum ve Dinsellik Ekseninde Yoksullukla Mucadele* [Struggle againts poverty in frame of civil society and religiosity]. *EKEV Akademi Dergisi, 37*, 61-72.

Mardin, S. (1993). *Din ve Ideoloji* [Religion and Ideology]. 6. Baski. Istanbul: Iletisim Yay.

Mehmedoğlu, A.U. (2004). *Kisilik ve Din* [Personality and Religion]. Istanbul: DEM Yay.

Mehmedoğlu, A.U. (2006). *Ilahiyat Fakültesi Ogrencilerinin Deger Yonelimleri ve Dindarlik-Deger Iliskisi (M. Ü. İlahiyat Fakültesi Ornegi)* [Value Orientation and the Religiosity–Value Relation of Divinity Students (Marma University Faculty of Divinity Example)]. *Marmara Universitesi Ilahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, 30*, 133-167.

Mehmedoğlu, A.U. (2011). *Tanrıyı Tasavvur Etmek* [Imagining God]. Istanbul: Camlica Yay.

Mehmedoğlu, A.U., & Aygun, A. (2006). *James W. Fowler ve Inanc Gelisim Teorisi* [James Fowler and the theory of religious development]. *Cukurova Universitesi Ilahiyat Fakultesi Dergisi, 6*(1), 118-139.

Musa, M. (2004). *Balkan Muslumanlarinda Din-Kimlik Butunlesmesi* [The Integration of Religion—Personality among Balkan Muslims]. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Istanbul: Marmara Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

Mutlu, K. (1989). *Bir Dindarlik Olcegi* [A religiosity scale]. *Islami Arastirmalar Dergisi, 3*(4), 194-199.

Ocak, A.Y. (1999). *Turkler, Turkiye ve Islam* [Turks, Turkey, and Islam]. Istanbul: Iletisim Yayinevi.

Ogel, B. (1962). *Islamiyetten Once Turk Kultur Tarihi* [Turkish History of Culture before Islam]. Ankara.

Ok, U. (2002) *Challenges of Studying Religion at University Level: An Inquiry into Stress experienced by Turkish Muslim Theology Students in their Thinking about Religion.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Birmingham: University of Birmingham.

Ok, U. (2004): Handling doubt in teaching religion: a Turkish case study. *Teaching Theology and Religion, 7*, 201-212.

Ok, U. (2005): *Dini duşuncede yaşanan stresin (şuphe, uyumsuzluk, celişki vb.) boyutları* [Dimensions of religious stress]. *Dini Araştırmalar, 8*, 11-40.

Ok, U. (2006). Faith development and perception of diversity among Muslims in Turkey. *Dinbilimleri Akademik Arastirma Dergisi, VI*(3), 221-247.

Ok, U. (2009a). Cognitive conflict and well-being among Muslim clergy. *Archive for the Psychology of Religion, 31*, 151-176.

Ok, U. (2009b). *Dini Semalar Olceginden Inanc veya Dünya Gorusu Semaları Olcegine* [From The Scale of Religious Schemas to the Scale of Faith or Worldview Schemas]. *C.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 35*(2), 149-155.

Ok, U. (2011). *Dini tutum olcegi: olcek gelistirme ve gecerlik calismasi* [Religious Attitudes Scale: development and validity]. *Uluslararasi Insan Bilimleri Dergisi, 8*(2), 528-549.

Okumus, E. (2008). *Bir Sosyal Esitsizlik Orneği Olarak Yoksullugun Dini Mesrulastirimi* [Religious legitimation of poverty as an example of social inequality]. In K. Tuna, I. Altan, I., A. Eren, & Z. Gunes (Eds.), *International Symposium On Poverty, Vol. III*, (pp. 443-456). Istanbul: Deniz Feneri Yay.

Onay, A. (2002). *Dini yonelim olcegi—Olcek gelistirmede yontem: Teorik altyapi, gecerlilik ve guvenirlilik* [Religious Orientation Scale—methods in developing scales: theoretical foundations, reliability and validity]. *Islamiyat, 5*(4), 181-192.

Onay, A. (2004). *Dindarlik, etkilesim ve degisim* [Religiosity, Interaction and Change]. Istanbul: DEM Yay.

Ong, W.J. (1988). Orality and literacy: The technologizing of the word. In T. Hawkes (Ed.), *Structuralism and Semiotics (New Accents)*. (pp. 344-43). New York: Methuen.

Otto, R. (1926). *Das Heilige* [The Sacred]. Gotha: Leopold Klotz Verlag.

Ozbaydar, B. (1970). *Din ve Tanrı Inancinin Gelismesi Uzerine bir Arastirma* [A Study on the Development of Religion and Belief in God]. Istanbul: Baha Matbaasi.

Parker, G.C. (1998). Modern popular religion. *International Sociology, 13*(12), 195-212.

Patai, R. (1987). Folk Islam. In M. Eliade (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, (pp. 382-385). New York: Macmillan.

Porpora, D.V. (2006). Methodological atheism, methodological agnosticism and religious experience. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 36*, 57-75.

Redfield, R. (1956) *Peasant Society and Culture*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.

Religionsmonitor (2008). Bertelsmannstiftung (Ed.) (2009). *Woran glaubt die Welt? Analysen und Kommentare zum Religionsmonitor 2008* [What does the world believe in? Analysis and comments on the Religionsmonitor 2008]. Gutersloh: Verlag Bertelsmannstiftung.

Sahin, A. (2001). *Universite Ogrencilerinde Dini Hayat-Fakulteler Arasi Karsilastirmali bir Arastirma* [Religious Life in University Students—A Comparative Study]. Konya, Turkey, 2001.

Sahin, A. (2010). *Islam Psikolojisinin Imkani* [The Possibility of Islamic Psychology]. Presentation *1st National Congress of Pyschology of Religion*, Konya, Turkey, October, 2010. Cited in S. Duzguner. (2010). I. *Ulusal Din Psikolojisi Kongresi* [1st National Psychology of Religion Congress]. *Selcuk Universitesi Ilahiyat Fakultesi Dergisi, 30*, 305-311.

Sancaklı, S. (2006). *Hadislerde "Yaslilik Olgusunun" Degerlendirilisi* [The Evaluation of the Phenomenon of Old Age in the Hadith]. *Cumhuriyet Universitesi Ilahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, X*(1), 49-71.

Schudson, M. (1987). The new validation of popular culture: sense and sentimentality in Academia. *Critical Studies in mass communication, I*(1), 51-58.

Sezen, A. (2008). *Universite Oğrencileri Ornekleminde Iman Gelisimi ve Dinsel Fundamentalizm Arasindaki Iliskiler Uzerine Bir Calisma [A Study on the Relation of Faith Development and Religious Fundamentalism on a Sample of University Students].* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Izmir: Dokuz Eylul Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

Shaw, G.B. (1931). Briefer views. In A.M. Drummond, & R.H. Wagner (Eds.) *Problems and Opinions* (p. 378). New York: Century. Quoted in R.W. Hood, Jr., P.C. Hill, & B. Spilka. (2009). The Psychological Nature and Functions of Religion. *The Psychology of Religion— An Empirical Approach*, (p. 1). 4th edn., New York: Guilford Press.

Snarey, J. (1991). Faith development, moral development, and nontheistic Judaism: A construct validity study. In W.M. Kurtines, & J.L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Handbook of Moral Behavior and Development, Vol. 2: Research* (pp. 279-305). Hillside: Earlbaum.

Stern, L. (2004). Interpreting legal language at the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia: overcoming the lack of lexical equivalents. *Journal of Specialized Translation, 1*. http://www.jostrans.org.

Streib, H. (2001). Faith development theory revisited: the religious styles perspective. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 11*, 143-158.

Streib, H., & Gennerich, C. (2011). *Jugend und Religion* [Youth and Religion]. Munich: Juventa Verlag.

Tanyu, H. (1976). *Dini Folklor veya Dini–Manevi Halk Inanclarinin Cesit ve Mahiyeti Uzerine Bir Arastirma* [A study on the content and variety of religious folklore or religious–spiritual folk beliefs]. *Ataturk Universitesi Ilahiyat Fakultesi Dergisi, XXI*, 123-142.

Tas, K. (2003). *Dindarlik Olcegi: Dini Tutumlar uzerine bir arastirma* [Religiosity Scale: a study on religious attitudes]. *Tabula Rasa—Felsefe & Teoloji, 8*, 239-247.

TESEV (2006). *Turkiye Ekonomik ve Sosyal Etudler Vakfi. Degisen Turkiye'de Din, Toplum, Siyaset* [Turkey Economical and Social Research Foundation. Religion, society, and politics in changing Turkey]. Ali Carkoğlu, & Binnaz Toprak.

Topal, S. (2008). *Islam Hukukunda Yoksulluktan Etkilenen Cocukların Gozetimine Yonelik Bazı Tedbirler* [Some policies for the care of children as victims of poverty in Islamic law]. In K. Tuna, I. Altan, I.A. Eren, & Z. Gunes (Eds.), *International Symposium On Poverty, Vol. III*, (pp. 425-436). Istanbul: Deniz Feneri Yay.

Topuz, I. (2003). *Dini gelişim seviyeleri ile dini başaçakma tutumları arasındaki ilişki üzerine bir araştırma* [A Research about the Relationship between Religious Development & Religious Coping]. Unpublished Doctoral Disssertation. Bursa: Uludag Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

Turan, Y. (2009). *Kisilik Ozellikleri ve Dinsel Yönelimler Uzerine bir Arastirma* [A Study on Personality Traits and Religious Orientation]. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Istanbul: Marmara Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

Turkdogan, O. (1999). *Turk Toplumunda yeni dini hareketler ve "cemaatlasma"* [New religious movements and "becoming community" in Turkish society]. *Ankara Universitesi Ilahiyat Fakultesi Dergisi*, Ozel Sayi, Cumhuriyetin 75. Yildonumune Armagan, 65-90.

Uraif, M. (2008). Activity of the International Islamic Relief Organization (IIROSA) to Fight Poverty. In K. Tuna, I. Altan, I.A. Eren, & Z. Gunes (Eds.), *International Symposium On Poverty, Vol. III*, (pp. 547-554). Istanbul: Deniz Feneri Yay.

Uyaver, A. (2010). *Obsesif-Kompulsif Bozukluk Tanisi Konmus Hastalarda Dini Tutum ve Davranislar ile Hastalik Semptomlari arasindaki Iliski* [The Relation between Religious Attitudes and Behaviors and Disease Symptoms Among Patients with Obsessive–Compulsive Disorder Diagnosis]. Unpublished Master Thesis, Istanbul: Marmara Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

Uysal, V. (1995). *Islami Dindarlik Olcegi Uzerine Bir Pilot Calisma* [A pilot study on Islamic religiosity scale]. *Islami Arastirmalar Dergisi, 8*(3/4), 263-271.

Uysal, V. (2001). *Gunumuz Turk Toplumunda Dinsellik ve Kadin/Erkek Aleyhtari Tutumlar* [Religiousness and opposed attitudes toward women/men in contemporary Turkish society]. *Marmara Universitesi Ilâhiyat Fakultesi Dergisi, 20*, 81-114.

Uysal, V. (2006). *Turkiye'de Dindarlik ve Kadin* [Religiosity and Woman in Turkey]. Istanbul: DEM Yay.

Uysal, V., & Ayten, A. (2005). *Karikatur Krizi Baglaminda Yerel Evrensel Tutumlar ve Dindarlik* [Local and global attitudes and religiosity in the context of the cartoon crisis*] Marmara Universitesi Ilahiyat Fakultesi Dergisi, 29*, 27-40.

Uysal, V., Turan, Ş., & Isik, Z. (2011). *Motivasyonel Dindarlik ve Munchner Motivasyonel Dindarlik Olcegi Baglaminda Degerlendirme: Alan Arastirmasi* [An Evaluation of Motivational Religiosity and the Munich Motivational Religiosity Scale: A Field Study]. Presentation at the III. Coordination Meeting of the Departments for Psychology of Religion, Canakkale, July 2011.

Watt, W.M. (1969). *Islamic Revelation in the Modern World*. Edinburgh: University Press.

Weber, M. (1964). The social psychology of the world religions. In H. Gerth, & C.W. Mills (Eds.), *From Max Weber*, (pp. 267-301). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Weber, M. (1964). *The Sociology of Religion*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Wulff, D.M. (2011). *The Faith Q-Sort: Advances on the Assessment Front.* Presentation at the Conference of the International Association of the Psychology of Religion, Bari, Italy, August 2011.

Yaparel, R. (1987). *Yirmi Kirk Yas Arasi Kisilerde Dini Hayat ile Psiko–Sosyal Uyum Arasindaki Iliski Uzerine Bir Arastirma* [A Study on the Relation between Religious Life and Psycho-Social Adjustment among Persons aged from Twenty to Forty]. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Ankara: Ankara Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

Yapici, A. (2002). *Dini yasayisin farkli goruntuleri ve dogmatik dindarlik* [Diverse images of religious life and dogmatic religiosity]. *Cukurova Universitesi Ilahiyat Fakultesi Dergisi, 2,* 75-116.

Yapici, A. (2004). *Din Kimlik ve Ön Yargı: Biz ve Onlar. Adana: Karahan Yayınları.*

Yapici, A. (2006). *Yeni bir dindarlık ölçeği ve üniversiteli gençlerin dinin etkisini hissetme düzeyi. Çukurova Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, 6*(1), 65-115.

Yapici, A., & Zengin, Z.S. (2003). *Ilahiyat fakultesi ogrencilerinin dinin etkisini hissetme duzeyleriyle psiko–sosyal uyumlari arasindaki iliski* [The relation between the levels of feeling the affect of religion and psycho-social adjustment among theology students. *Cukurova Universitesi Ilahiyat Fakultesi Dergisi, 3*(2), 65-127.

Yildirim, D. (1992). *Kokturk Caginda Tanri mi Tanrilar mi Vardi* [Were there Gods or God in the Kokturk area]. *IV. Milletlerarasi Turk Halk Kulturu Kongresi Bildirileri*, Ankara, II/353.

Yildiz, M. (1998). *Dini Hayat ile Olum Kaygisi Arasindaki Iliski Uzerine Bir Arastirma* [A Study on the Relation between Religious Life and Death Anxiety]. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Izmir: Dokuz Eylul Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

Yıldız, M. (2006). *Olum kaygısı ve dindarlık*. Izmir: Izmir Ilahiyat Vakfi Yay.

Youth in Europe–II (2006). An International Emprical Study about Religiosity. H. Ziebertz, & W. Kay (Eds.), Munster: Lit Verlag.

Yrsysbayev, Z. (2009). *Komunizm Sonrasi Kazak Genclerinin Dini Yonelimleri* [Religious Orientations of Kazakh Adolescents after Communism]. Unpublished Master Thesis, Konya: Selcuk Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

Yuce, F. (2009). *Genclerde Dini Yonelim ve Kisilik* [Religious Orientation and Personality among Adolescents]. Unpublished Master Thesis, Istanbul: Marmara Universitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitusu.

Zwingmann, C., & Moosburger, H. (Eds.) (2004). *Das Munchner Motivationspsychologische Religiositats–Inventar: Dimensionsanalytische Prufung und Revision* [Munich Motivation Psychological Inventory of Religiosity: Dimensional analysiz and revision]. In *Religiositat: Messverfahren und Studien zu Gesundheit und Lebensbewaltigung*, (pp. 57-77). Munchen: Waxmann Munster.