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The Ok-Religious Attitude Scale (Islam): introducing an instrument originated in Turkish for international use

Üzeyir Ok


Abstract

This study reports the content and psychometric properties of the Ok Religious Attitude Scale (in an Islamic tradition). Among two samples of university students (N = 934 and 388), high alpha coefficients were recorded (ranges between .81 and .91). Both exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses confirm that the scale with its four subscales (cognitive, emotional, behavioural and relational) form an ideal (first-order) or acceptable (higher-order) model. The scale revealed powerful criterion validity through its comparison with adapted versions of Francis Scale of Attitude Towards Christianity [FSAC] and Intrinsic Religiosity scale. In its final form the scale can be commended as a reliable, valid and viable instrument to be used in social science research.

Introduction

Religion is a multidimensional and complex phenomenon which is difficult to define (see Yapare 1987). However, it is not possible to perform robust measurements within the social scientific study of religion without having clear definitions and research instruments with sound psychometric features. Additionally, it is hard to produce consistent results on individual differences in religiosity by using different instruments that employ and operationalise different definitions of religion.

Religiosity is measured within the psychology of religion by a number of instruments rooted in the Christian or post-Christian tradition, varying in conceptions, including religious orthodoxy, religious saliency, self-identified religiosity, and importance of religion, among others. Other instruments are based on a wider theoretical frame, such as intrinsic-extrinsic religiosity (Allport and Ross 1967), religion as quest (Batson, Schoenrade, and Ventis 1993), faith development scales (see Ok 2012; Streib, Hood, and Klein 2010), Literal-Antiliteral and Mythological (LAM) religiosity (Hunt 1972), post-critical religiosity (Hutsebaut 1996) and religious attitude scales (Francis and Stubbs 1987).
In parallel to these, there is also a growing range of religiosity measures in the Islamic psychology of religion both in Turkey (e.g. Mutlu 1989; Onay 2004; Taş 2003; Uysal 1995) and outside (El-Menouar 2014; Gonzales 2011; Krauss, Hamzah, and Idris 2007; Sahin and Francis 2002). These Islamic measures access a number of different aspects of religion including belief, practice, rituals, value and affect. In addition, the scales proposed to measure Islamic religiosity have been built either originally by Muslim scholars or were adapted into Turkish from scales or theories formulated mainly in a Christian tradition (e.g. Allport and Ross 1967; Glock 1962).

The present study investigates Islamic religion using a measure of attitudes analogous to the Francis Scale of Attitude toward Christianity (FSAC). Put simply, attitude is regarded as the positive or negative evaluation of humans, objects or thoughts (Aronson, Wilson, and Akert 2010). It has three (supposedly interconnected and consistent) dimensions: cognition (thoughts or beliefs pointed to the object of attitude), emotion (emotional reactions to the object of attitude) and behaviour (behavioural patterns regarding the object of attitude) (Myers 1990). The attitude approach has both limitations and strengths in terms of measurement.

The assumption behind attitude theory is that attitude predicts behaviour. For instance, if an individual’s attitude toward religion is known, his/her behaviour could be predicted from this knowledge. However, research shows that attitudes predict relatively little variance in behaviour. Studies investigating attitudes to religion found only a moderate connection between positive attitude to religion and attending church on Sunday (Myers 1990). Hence, the role of external factors on determining the behaviour is found to be stronger than inner attitudes (Myers 1990). In other words, individuals could hide their real attitudes when they are influenced by other people in their environments (Myers 1990).

In addition, research results show that attitude to a generic object of attitude (e.g. religion in general) does not, to a great extent, predict a more specific (e.g. salat) behaviour of that object of attitude (Myers 1990). Myers argued that in order for an attitude to predict behaviour three conditions should be fulfilled: (1) decreasing the effects of external factors on expressing attitude and behaviour; (2) linking the attitude with observed behaviour at a specific level; and (3) the salience of the attitude predicting behaviour.

However, Francis (2009) argues that the attitude approach in measuring religiosity is better than others. He argued that there are four main dimensions of religion which are used among theologians and social scientists: affiliation, belief, practice and attitudes. He put forward that religious affiliation, which indicates one’s belonging to or self-identification with a certain religious tradition, may not be a reliable indicator of one’s religious belief or practice. In contrast, he argued that belief dimension, which consists of cognitive component of religion, could be conceived differently by theologians and social scientists, and that belief could be understood solely as conservative conviction disregarding other types such as liberal beliefs. Finally, Francis, argued that choosing religious practice solely as indicator of religiosity is also risky, not only as public practice is distinct from private practice, but also as a range of social and personal constraints may promote or inhibit such practice.

Drawing upon attitude theory in social psychology, Francis preferred an attitudinal approach to measure religiosity in the 1970s, which aimed to tap the affective dimension of religion, namely, how individuals feel towards or against religion. He reasoned that a well-developed attitudinal scale should be able to indicate individual differences in religiosity. He originally developed FSAC, with 24 items, to build up a secure ground for
empirical work. He argued that, by agreeing on the use of the same measure, colleagues could be clear that their independent studies fitted together to build an integrated tapestry of research concerning the contributions being made to individual lives of the form of spirituality being accessed by the FSAC. In this way, he presented a scale which he reported as reliable and valid in different contexts and with different age and sex groups (e.g. Francis and Enger 2002; Francis, Kerr, and Lewis 2005; Hancock, Tiliopoulos, and Francis 2010). In its current situation, it is possible to find dozens of studies reporting the results of Francis’ scale, conducted in its original or short version in different cultural contexts.

In parallel with this approach, Francis, co-working with Sahin, also developed an Islamic equivalent of the scale (Sahin and Francis 2002) with 23 items and a robust reliability report. However, some of the items in this instrument suffer from content/context validity. For instance, the item, ‘attending the Mosque is very important to me’ is more valid for Muslim men, as, unlike the case of Christian communities, in most Islamic context Muslim women are not expected to attend the Mosque for religious purposes in the same way as men are.

Similarly, although there have been a number of scales developed in Turkey (see above), some of these suffer a number of shortcomings too in terms of psychometric features such as limited evidence of reliability and validity. Furthermore, while proposed dimensions are thought to be distinct theoretically they may be measuring similar aspects of religiosity. In addition, including too many redundant items also creates a problem which could hinder its utility. In contrast, the translated/adapted scales from a Christian culture do not ‘fit’ properly at certain levels into an Islamic culture. In addition, the validity concerns of scale studies rarely go beyond construct validity or face validity.

In the present study, considering the shortcomings in the scales discussed above, it is worth developing a short and an easy-to-use religiosity instrument with solid psychometric properties in terms of comprehension, internal consistency, validity, and practicability. This type of scale, if used widely, may prevent discrepancy caused by using different scales constructed to measure the same phenomenon, namely, Islamic religiosity. Thus, the aim of this study is to discuss the development of a scale, which has already been published in Turkish (Ok 2011b), and to introduce that scale to an international audience. The proposed instrument offers a relevant (fitting an Islamic context), psychometrically sound (multi-validated and internally consistent) and short (but practicable) Islamic religiosity scale which could be used in studying religious education, and in studying the psychology and the sociology of Islamic religion both nationally and internationally. It is hoped that this study will facilitate comparisons between researches done with the same instrument in various demographic regions. In order to fulfil these aims, two empirical studies were conducted.

Study I: Method

Instruments

Ok-Religious Attitude Scale (Islam): In the first study the Ok Religious Attitude Scale (Islam) (ORASI) was constructed with four content dimensions. The 8 items of the scale (two for each dimension) were selected from a pool of 16 items in light of component analyses, iterative item analyses, and confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) (the results will be seen below). In order to test criterion validity of the scale, three more instruments were added into the study.
**Anti-Religion Scale:** The scale with five items was constructed to measure actively negative attitude to religion. The items are related to opposition to religion, deism, anti-Muslim, secularism and agnosticism (See Appendix) (Ok 2011a). It is expected that the scale has high negative correlation with ORASI.

**Absolute Faith/World View:** The scale with three items was initially developed to measure stage two in Fowler’s theory of faith development (Fowler 1981). It aims to measure an absolutistic and a closed (thus, fundamentalistic) approach to one’s faith/world view (See Appendix for the items). It was used to show that the religious attitude scale (despite a certain degree of overlap) is something different from fundamentalism; and, thus, it is expected that religious attitude shows moderate (not high) correlation with it.

**Deconversion in Faith/World View Scale:** The scale was constructed to measure levels of distancing from traditional faith/world view. The construct is expected to show moderate negative correlation with the religious attitude scale, since deconversion is assumed to occur not from religion altogether but from the traditional form of Islamic religiosity. The last two scales regarding faith development theory were developed by the author and have been used in several studies (See Cirhinlioğlu and Ok 2010; Ok 2009, 2012).

Responses to items were rated on a five-point scale ranging from agree: **not at all**, **a little**, **half the time**, **mainly**, and **completely**.

**Participants**

The study was conducted (distributed and collected in approximately 20 minutes) in lecture rooms with 934 university students (mean age = 22.08; SD = 2.62) studying for their first degrees in two Turkish state universities.

**Study I: Results**

The items, factor loadings and item-total correlations of ORASI can be seen in Table 1.

As the sub-dimensions of the scale were not designed to be independent from other factors but were considered to be distinct in terms of content only, the items were forced into four factors in the component analysis rather than using eigenvalue or Cattell criteria. As it can be seen in Table 1, consistent with the expectation the items loaded into the four factors for which they were theoretically designed. All items explained 78% of the variance. The item-total correlations ranged between .42 and .60. The inter-correlations of sub dimensions can be found in Table 2.

As can be seen in Table 2, the scales exhibit satisfactory internal consistency (Cronbach alpha scores). The inter correlations of sub dimensions are as follows (p < .001 in all): cognition – feelings = .37; cognition – behaviour = .26; cognition – relation (God) = .46; feelings – behaviour = .52; feelings – relation (God) = .43; and behaviour – relation (God) = .37. Consistent with the theoretical expectation above, ORASI strongly and negatively correlated with deconversion and anti-religion (-.44 and -.62; p < .001, respectively). Similarly, its relation to absolute faith is not very high as it was assumed (.33, p < .001). This could mean that ORASI is not a measure of fundamentalism in faith. The fact that the mean score of religious attitude scale have high score (4.5) and that it has a low sd score (.69) indicates that the sample is rather religious and homogeneous. It is also obvious that while anti-religion and deconversion is more common among men, religiosity is more common among women.
Table 1. Factor loadings of Ok Religious Attitude Scale (Pattern Matrix), item-total correlations and items endorsement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Feelings</th>
<th>Relation (God)</th>
<th>Cognition</th>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>Item-Total Correlations</th>
<th>%High (agree mainly or completely)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel moved when I listen to religious chanting/reciting such as Ezan, prayer or Qur’anic verses.</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really enjoy when I take part in religious activities.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to put my religion into practice in my life.</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I check that I am living my life in line with religious values</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that God is very close to me</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.85</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that God helps me when life is difficult.</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.89</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel there is no need for religion (-)</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think religion causes societies to stay backward (-)</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explained variance 42%, 16%, 11%, 9%.
Explained total variance: 78%.

Table 2. Descriptive features of the scales and zero-order inter correlations of variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Sd</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Sex</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Age</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>22.08</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Anti-religion (5)</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.17***</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Deconversion in faith (3)</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-.15***</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Absolute faith (3)</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.21***</td>
<td>-.20***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Ok-Religious attitude (T) (8)</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.62***</td>
<td>-.44***</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The numbers within the brackets refer to item numbers of the scales.

***p < .001.
**p < .010.
*p < .050.
Table 3. Factor loadings of Ok-Religious Attitude Scale (Pattern Matrix), item-total correlations and items endorsement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I try to put my religion into practice in my life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I check that I am living my life in line with religious values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel moved when I listen to religious chanting/reciting such as Ezan, prayer or Qur’anic verses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really enjoy when I take part in religious activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel there is no need for religion (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel religion does more harm than good to people (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that God is very close to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that God helps me when life is difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. (-), these items were reverse coded.
r, item – total correlations.
% high, agree mainly or completely.
Explained total variance = 86%.

Study II: Method

Instruments

ORASI: The same scale was used in Study II with an exception that one item of cognitive dimension of the scale was replaced by a modified version for the sake of improvement (See Table 3).

FSAC: The short version of the scale with seven items (See Maltby and Lewis 1997) was used to test the criterion validity of ORASI after its translation and adaptation into Turkish-Muslim context. The scale is widely and internationally used with proven reliability and validity features (See Francis et al. 2005). As it will be seen below it has rather strong internal
consistency. It is expected that ORASI has high correlation with its adapted version. Since, through adaptation and adjustment of the Christian content of FSAC to the Islamic teaching it became appropriate to be used for the Islamic religion as both represent a theistic attitude to religion and cover similar aspects of religiosity.

**Intrinsic-Extrinsic Religiosity**: Originally coined by Allport and Ross (1967) the scale is perhaps the most commonly used religiosity scale internationally. The scale has two dimensions. The intrinsic dimension (with nine items) is assumed to measure a sincere and authentic kind of religiosity while the extrinsic dimension (with 11 items) aims to measure a self-served religiosity style. Similarly, the scale was translated and adapted into Turkish and only intrinsic religiosity was used in the present study. The item number of the intrinsic religiosity scale was reduced to six as a result of adaptation procedure (component analysis and follow-up iterative item analysis) (See Appendix for the items).

Finally, scales of absolute faith and deconversion in faith were also used for the second time in the second study. Responses to items were rated on a five-point scale ranging from agree: *not at all, a little, half the time, mainly, and completely.*

**Participants**

The survey was conducted with 388 university students studying for their first degrees at different (mostly social science) departments of a state university in Turkey. Data were analysed in the same way as it was in the first study.

**Study II: Results**

The items, factor loadings and item-total correlations of ORASI can be seen in Table 3.

As it can be seen from Table 3, similar to the results in Study I, the dimensions of the scale loaded into independent factors of their own with perhaps an exception that one of the feelings items loaded at the same time on behaviour component at .40 level which is not a serious problem.

The explained variance is 86% which is a noticeable improvement compared to the result of the Study I. The inter-correlations of variables can be seen in Table 4.

The Cronbach alpha scores (.73 to .92) show a good to very high internal consistency among the items of the scales. The correlation of ORASI with FSAC and intrinsic-religiosity scale is rather strong (.88 and .85, respectively) which is an obvious indicator that all three scales measure more or less similar phenomenon. In addition, it is also seen that the

---

**Table 3.** Descriptive features and zero-order inter correlations of variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>22.02</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>−.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Francis Scale</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>−.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Intrinsic Religiosity</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Absolute Faith</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>−.10</td>
<td>−.03</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Deconversion in Faith</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>−.09</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>−.39***</td>
<td>−.39***</td>
<td>−.44***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ok-Religious Attitude</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>−.02</td>
<td>.88***</td>
<td>.85***</td>
<td>.44***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < .001.  
**p < .010.  
*p < .050.
correlation of ORASI with absolute faith and deconversion in faith, in accordance to the expectancy, is moderate (.44 and .41, respectively). This shows that ORASI is not the same as absolute faith and that deconversion experience does not mean a total adverse of religiosity. The inter correlations of sub-dimensions (which are not reported in the Tables) are as follows (p < .001 in all): cognition – feelings = .51; cognition – behaviour = .44; cognition – relation (God) = .61; feelings – behaviour = .67; feelings – relation (God) = .66; and behaviour – relation (God) = .62.

The results of confirmatory factor analyses (Study I and II)

In order to test the factorial validity, the items of ORASI were exposed to CFA (testing the results of both first and second orders/higher-order) in two studies using Lisrel 8.7 version. As the data were assumed to be based on 'normally distributed' theory, maximum likelihood estimation was chosen. In line with the proposed construct of religious attitude mentioned above, a four factor-model was hypothesised to be confirmed. There was no missing data. The results of fit indices can be seen in Table 5. No post hoc modifications were indicated.

**Table 5. CFI fit indices of Ok-Religious Attitude Scale.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension/model</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>$X^2$/DF Ratio</th>
<th>$P &lt;$</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>90% CI RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Religious Attitude (Study I) (First-Order)</td>
<td>37.66</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03–.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Religious Attitude (Study I) (Second-Order)</td>
<td>82.76</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05–.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Religious Attitude (Study II) (First-Order)</td>
<td>33.03</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03–.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Religious Attitude (Study II) (Second-Order)</td>
<td>55.56</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06–.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.** The second-order model of ORASI representing latent and observed variables together with weights of standardised regressions (Study II).
from the analysis because of the goodness-of-fit levels, and the residual analysis did not indicate any problems.

The figure of the second order CFA (Study II) and the fit indices of construct models can be seen in Figure 1 and Table 5.

In terms of fit indices **Comparative Fit Index (CFI)**, **Chi-square**, **Degree of freedom**, **P value**, **90% confidence interval** together with **Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA)** and **Standardised Root Mean Residual (SRMR)** were presented. To Beauducel and Wittmann (2005) these provide the most valid information to assess the results of CFA.

To start with X², normally it is expected that p values are > .05 but in practice mostly the opposite happens. Therefore, p value is not regarded as a reliable parameter on its own as it is affected by sample size. One of the common ways to interpret X² scores is to take X²/degrees of freedom ratio. It is expected that this ratio does not exceed 2 for a good model fit. If it is 5 or less the model is seen as ‘acceptable’ (see McDonald and Ho 2002). When examined in Table 5 the ratios are 2.69; 2.36; 5.17; and 3.47 respectively, which indicate that the models are good (2.36) or acceptable.

When CFI is studied it is seen that the scores are .99 or .98 which, considering that the cut-off point is regarded as .95 for a good fit, indicate that the hypothesised model (compared to null model) is ideal.

In terms of RMSEA, the results range between .04 (first-order) to .08 (second-order). Considering that < .06 is regarded as a good fit and that < .08 is a ‘reasonable’ fit (See Browne and Cudeck quoted in Byrne 2010; Schreiber et al. 2006) the model tends to reveal a good fit (first-order) or moderate fit between the hypothesised model and the observed data. Finally, the index of the Standardised Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) indicates that the model is well-fitted with each of the average value across all standardised residuals being less than .05.

To sum up, given the required range of minimum-optimum standards (see Schreiber et al. 2006; Şimşek 2007 for the criteria) it will be seen that the results on the Table fulfil the criteria at ideal or satisfactory/acceptable level. It is seen that two models of first-order CFI figures revealed mainly a good fit. In addition, the two models of second-order CFI model revealed acceptable/reasonable fit indices according to the majority of the criteria except that of RMSEA which fits either acceptably or poor. Thus, it is possible to argue that the Ok-Religious Attitude Scale (Islam), along with its four dimensions, demonstrates a good or acceptable fit between the constructed model and the observed data.

**Discussion and conclusion**

In this article the results of two studies regarding the psychometric properties of the ORASI were presented. The results of two studies show that the scale with its four sub-dimensions has consistent internal coherence; exploratory (i.e. construct), confirmatory and criterion validity; and economic utility.

In terms of dimensionality, ORASI is a multidimensional measure. However, this multidimensionality tends to be not strongly but moderately clear. The reason for this could be explained as follows: Theoretically, it could be argued that a Muslim is expected to believe that religion is good for society, to be sentimental during some religious events, to be observant of religious rules in life, and to have a thorough connection with God. In reality, however, while some people could be religious in terms of all four aspects, the majority
may not be that consistent. Thus, it is plausible to argue that in modern times, religiosity is fragmented in the life of people and religion is sometimes, if not mostly, represented by one or two aspects of religiosity. For instance, a person considers that s/he has a strong belief in God but s/he does not observe religious rules in daily life. Similarly, a person may believe that religion is good for society but s/he hardly ever practises religion.

Another factor contributing to the modesty of the model, as fit indices show, could be the reversed wording of two cognition items. It is probable that the negative wordings of these religiosity items caused a cognitive dissonance in the mind of participants and, thus, they showed an over-reaction to these negative affirmations (see their levels of high endorsement in Table 1 and 3). As a result, it is suggested that the subscales are not used independently but should be seen as attitudinally and thematically distinguishable facets of being religious.

Although there are internationally used religiosity scales in psychology of religion, the number of scales measuring Islamic religiosity is limited. The scales which were adapted into Islamic culture have often been criticised on the grounds that they do not properly fit into Islamic teaching or context at some important points (see Subaşı 2002 for criticisms). It is assumed that the religiosity accessed via ORASI measures a generic attitude to religion (Islam) which may hold together elements of conventional/traditional religiosity (habitual, conformist and fundamentalist) and ‘mature’ religiosity.

One of the aims of this article was to introduce ORASI to an international readership in order to show that studies employing the same scale could provide consistent results and an opportunity for comparison regarding the variables that are used alongside the religious attitude scale. ORASI was constructed in an Islamic tradition and has been tested in a Turkish context.

Further effort to strengthen the CFI indices of ORASI could be done by reconsidering the reverse wording of two cognition items and by adding one more item to each of the four dimensions generating 12 items in future studies. These studies now need to be replicated in other Islamic traditions in order to establish contextual reliability and validity.

Note

1. In the exploratory factor analysis, the principal factor analysis with oblique rotation method was selected, since, it was theorised that the factors are correlated. Initially, two factors emerged whose eigenvalues are above 1 according to Kaiser’s criterion. However, considering that the presumed factors are four and that Kaiser’s criterion of 1 is found too strict by some and is suggested to be replaced by 0.7 (see Jolliffe 1986) all items were forced into four factors. As can be seen in the relevant table the items loaded into presupposed four factors.
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Appendix: Items of the scales used in the study

**Anti-Religion Scale**
1. In fact I am against all religions
2. I believe in an ultimate being but I do not believe in any religion whatsoever
3. I believe in the fundamental values and teachings of Islam (-)
4. For me, secular matters are more important than religious matters
5. Themes regarding God are unknowable. Thus, best is to keep away from such topics

**Deconversion in Faith/World View**
1. I think I gradually moved away from the faith or world view that I had learned from my family.
2. I gradually left my former faith or world view behind.
3. In times, I disconnected from my former faith or world view and developed new ones fitting to my position better

**Absolute Faith/World View**
1. The values forming my faith or world view are fixed and unchangeable
2. The principles shaping my faith or world view are clear-cut and, thus, closed to any comment
3. My faith or world view has regulations which can never be changed.

**Intrinsic Religiosity Scale (Adapted into Turkish & Islam)**
1. If not prevented by unavoidable circumstances, I do not delay my prayers (ibadat).
2. I try hard to carry my religion over into all my other dealings in life
3. Quite often I have been keenly aware of the presence of God.
4. I read books and periodicals about my faith
5. My religious beliefs are really what lie behind my whole perspective to life
6. Religion is especially important because it answers many questions about the meaning of life
7. The prayers I say when I am alone carry as much meaning and personal emotion as those said by me during services. (discarded)
8. It is more important for me to spend periods of time in private religious thought and meditation. (discarded)
9. If I were to join a social religious group I would do this just to learn my religion better rather than for a social fellowship. (discarded)

**Francis Attitude to Christianity Scale (Short version) (Adapted into Turkish & Islam)**
1. I know that God helps me
2. I think attending religious activities is a waste of time (-)
3. Allah helps me lead a better life
4. Allah means a lot to me
5. Such practices as salat and prayer (dua) helps me a lot
6. I know that Allah is very close to me
7. I think the Qur’an is out of date (-)