

ТМ	Г. XXXVIII	Бр. 3	Стр. 1175-1196	Ниш	јул - септембар	2014.
----	------------	-------	----------------	-----	-----------------	-------

UDK 159.922.6 159.942:2

Оригиналан научни рад

Примљено: 3. 1. 2014.

Ревидирана верзија: 31. 3. 2014.

Одобрено за штампу: 12. 9. 2014.

Tatjana Stefanović Stanojević

University of Niš

Faculty of Philosophy

Department of Psychology

Niš

Serbia

Aleksandra Hadžić Krnetić

University of Banja Luka

Faculty of Philosophy

Department of Psychology

Banja Luka

Bosnia and Herzegovina

AFFECTIVE ATTACHMENT AND RELIGIOSITY

Abstract

This paper studies the impact of affective attachment to significant human figures and to God on the salience of religious orientations, expressed in terms of dimensions of extrinsic and intrinsic religiosity.

The sample consists of 224 respondents, 113 of whom are adolescents of average age of 16.9 who, in the course of their elementary education, acquired a systematic knowledge of religion through religious education lessons. The remaining 111 respondents are adults of average age of 40.1, who did not acquire a systematic knowledge of religion.

The results show that the characteristics indicating an insecure attachment to humans were more frequently found in the subsample of adult respondents. Secure attachment to God was more frequent in adults, while more adolescents (in comparison to adult respondents) expressed dismissive attachment to God. A higher incidence of insecure attachment to humans serves as a predictor of a higher extrinsic religiosity in the adolescent subsample and a higher intrinsic religiosity in the adult subsample. Attachment to God has an impact on extrinsic religiosity, with the respondents with insecure attachment patterns being prone to extremes, i.e. scoring either very high (dismissive and preoccupied attachment to God) or very low (fearful attachment to God) on the dimension of extrinsic religiosity.

Key words: attachment to humans, attachment to God, religiosity, adolescents, adults

АФЕКТИВНА ВЕЗАНОСТ И РЕЛИГИОЗНОСТ

Апстракт

Рад се бави утицајем афективне везаности према значајним људским фигурама и према Богу на израженост религиозних оријентација које представљају димензије екстринзичке и интринзичке религиозности.

Узорак је чинило 224 испитаника, 113 адолесцената, просјечног узраста 16,9 година, који су током основношколског образовања систематски стицали сазнања о религији, кроз наставу вјеронауке и 111 одраслих испитаника, просјечног узраста 40,1 година, који нису систематски стицали сазнања о религији.

Резултати показују да су карактеристике које упућују на несигурну везаност према људима заступљеније на подзорку одраслих испитаника. Сигурна везаност према Богу чешћа је међу одраслим особама, док је више адолесцената одбацујуће везано за Бога. Заступљенија несигурна афективна везаност према људима, представља предиктор више екстринзичке религиозности на адолесцентном подзорку и више интринзичке религиозности на подзорку одраслих. Афективна везаност према Богу утиче на екстринзичку религиозност, а несигурни обрасци склони су крајностима, односно врло високим (одбацујуће и окупирано везани за Бога) и врло ниским (плашљиво везани за Бога) постигнућима на екстринзичкој религиозности.

Кључне речи: афективна везаност према људима и Богу, религиозност, адолесценти, одрасли

INTRODUCTION

According to Bowlby, attachment constitutes any type of behaviour leading to the establishment and maintenance of intimacy of one individual with another, clearly recognized individual, whom he/she considers more capable of dealing with life (Bowlby, 1969). The primary function of attachment is protection. Innate factors are gradually shaped by the experiences a person has with attachment figures, which results in rather stable individual differences regarding expectational, emotional, and behavioural patterns. The translation of a relational into an individual property is a process whereby a child, based on repeated everyday experiences with the mother, gradually develops an image of himself/herself and the mother. The inner working models (abbreviated: IWM) reflect the expectations a child has of his/her own behaviour and the likely parental behaviour (Ainsworth, 1985). The child adapts to these patterns by adjusting his/her behaviour, i.e. certain cognitive-affective structures are formed as a reflection of behavioural patterns. Incorporation of mental representations into the attachment system allows for a lifetime perspective. Based on the inner working models, we make assumptions

about the availability of significant others and about whether the individual will feel secure, knowing others are available, or insecure, fearing their unavailability is dependent on these models. Empirical behaviours originally developed in interaction with the available attachment figures are perceived as aspects of one's own personality in later periods of life and adulthood (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).

According to one of the most frequent definitions of religiosity, it constitutes a system of ideas, beliefs, behaviours, rituals, and ceremonies by way of which individuals or a community relate to God or the supernatural world and to each other, and from which a religious person derives a set of values serving as guidelines and the basis for his/her assessment of the world (English, English, 1997). What is fundamental to every psychological interpretation of religion is the fact that religion explains and directs one's personal experiences, at the same time constituting a set of values or orientations in the life of a religious individual (Brown, 1973). This paper adopts Allport's concept of religiosity, the so-called religious orientation including two types of religious orientation – intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity (Allport, 1950). With intrinsic religiosity, the main motive lies in the religiosity itself, religiosity being unconditionally internalized. Here, other needs are of lesser significance and are incorporated and harmonized with religious principles. Extrinsic religiosity is more instrumental by nature and is based on protective motives and acceptance by a social group, its purpose being the achievement of certain other needs such as security, a higher social status, etc. Intrinsic religiosity is described as the religiosity “which is lived” and extrinsic religiosity as the one “which is used” (Meadow, Kahoe, 1984). According to Allport, it is possible to determine the type of individual's religiosity based on the score on the intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity. Research into the salience of prejudice concerning religiosity types has shown that the pro-religious individuals are prone to express prejudice, the category including individuals scoring high on both religious orientations; prejudice is less salient in the extrinsically religious, who score high on extrinsic religiosity and low on the dimension of intrinsic religiosity, while it is the least present in predominantly intrinsically religious individuals, who tend to score high on intrinsic and low on extrinsic religiosity (Allport, 1966).

Many aspects of religious belief and behaviour represent the process of attachment in the manner this attachment relationship exists between a child and a caregiver (Kirkpatrick, 1999). According to Bowlby (1969), in order to be classified as an attachment relationship, it is essential that the relationship has the characteristics of “proximity maintenance”, “separation distress”, “secure base”, and “safe haven”. These characteristics are found in the relationship between a religious person and God (Granqvist, 2002; Kirkpatrick, 1999; 2005). Here, safe haven, proximity maintenance, and secure base are present to a greater

degree, as opposed to separation distress which is less present due to the properties of God, such as his omnipresence and eternity (Granqvist, 2002). Bowlby's fifth criterion of "inequality in strength and power", which is present in the asymmetric relationship between the religious person and God, is added to the foregoing criteria (Granqvist, 2002).

Applying attachment to religious beliefs is in many ways simpler than applying it to adult love relationships. The application of the attachment system to adult love relationships is complicated by numerous factors including the reciprocity existing in the relationship an adult has with other close persons and the role of sexuality. Neither of these limitations is a characteristic of a relationship between an adult and God, Jesus, or another supernatural being (Kirkpatrick, 1999).

Attachment affects religiosity by separating the two processes – adoption of religious values and its change (Granqvist, 2002; Kirkpatrick, 1999; 2005). The *correspondent model* implies IWMs formed with the parents similar to those formed with God, adoption of parents' religious values through socialization, the absence of change, or a gradual and long-lasting change in religiosity. Consequently, individuals with a secure attachment style perceive the relationship with God as secure, while the individuals with the dismissive style characterized by fear of intimacy dismiss the relationship with God in a similar way (Kirkpatrick, 1998). This model is based on Bowlby's assumption according to which stable attachment relationships provide continuity in the future (Granqvist, 2002). Similar views are expressed by Erickson (1992), according to whom basic trust is the prerequisite for belief in adulthood, as well as Rohner, whose research proves that in the families where parents are perceived as warm and supportive, God is perceived in the similar way (Rohner, 1986).

The *compensation model* sees religiosity as the compensation for previous deprivation experienced in relationships with primary attachment figures; religiosity is emotionally based, it does not resemble that of one's parents, and it is characterized by the experience of change which is sudden and abrupt. This kind of religiosity implies the transfer of IWM formed through insecure attachment with parents onto God; however, in the course of time (longitudinal compensation) it offers the possibility of forming a secure relationship with God, who, as an attachment figure, does not suffer from the shortcomings characteristic of human figures. Different organizations of insecure attachment fail to offer equal opportunities to achieve a secure relationship through the relationship with God. The greatest possibility for doing so lies with those with a preoccupied attachment style, while the relationship of individuals of fearful attachment is usually accompanied by alternating discovery and abandonment of God, i.e. changes which alternate and do not lead to the establishment of a new security (Kirkpatrick, 2005). For those with dismissive attachment style, the refusal to accept the relationship with God (most atheists come from

this group) is characteristic; alternatively, the relationship with God is more philosophical by nature, which again does not result in the achievement of a secure relationship. The model is based on the assumptions (Ainsworth, 1985) about the need of insecurely attached individuals to achieve the security they need through relationships with substitute figures.

These two models are mutually exclusive, i.e. they cannot apply to the same person at the same time (Beck & McDonald, 2004). The compensation model is more suitable for predicting longitudinal processes, i.e. the development of religiosity over the course of time; furthermore it offers a more comprehensive explanation of religiosity based on the regulation of emotional needs while the correspondent model is more applicable to predicting the quality of religiosity at a certain point in time and it gives a more comprehensive account of religiosity acquired through social learning processes.

Numerous studies have shown a correlation between insecure attachment and the change in religiosity or in the way an individual sees God (which implies the absence of a personal relationship) or a shift towards the perception of God as distant and controlling (Granqvist, 2002; Granqvist & Hagekull, 2003; Granqvist & Kirkpatrick, 2004; Kirkpatrick, 1999; 2005). Individuals belonging to insecure attachment patterns are more likely to reject the beliefs of their religious parents, more frequently claiming to be atheist or individuals who have given up faith, and they also tend to discover new beliefs, i.e. to experience religious conversion (Kirkpatrick, 1998; 2005). Religiosity of individuals with the secure style of attachment corresponds to the religiosity of persons to whom they are attached, so a more salient religiosity is common in those who achieve a secure relationship with figures who themselves are more devoutly religious (Granqvist, 2002).

In the foregoing studies, attachment was determined in relation to significant human figures, and different instruments were used for its measurement, ranging from the Adult Attachment Interview (AAI) to the Hazan & Shaver adjusted questionnaire (1986 according to Granqvist, 2002), containing four descriptions of relationships with parents. None of these studies assessed attachment through the relationship of a religious person and God.

These studies mainly focused on the correlation between the attachment and generalized religiosity, as well as social religiosity and religiosity based on emotions with the exception of two studies using Allport's model of religious orientation. The research conducted by Dušanić (2007) showed that the more salient extrinsic religiosity is present in respondents with the insecure family attachment who score higher on the dimensions of anxiety and avoidance, implying insecure attachment and a fearful/disorganized pattern. In the research by Strahan conducted in Australia, respondents with the dismissive attachment style scored lower

on the dimension of intrinsic religiosity, but the result was statistically significant only on the subsample of males (Strahan, 1991, according to Kirkpatrick, 2005).

RESEARCH PROBLEMS AND AIMS

Bearing in mind different theories of religiosity acquisition and its change, established within the correspondent and compensation models, we set as our main research problem and aim the examination of the correlation between the attachment to humans and to God and the salience of the intrinsic and extrinsic orientations in respondents of two different age groups growing up and acquiring religious knowledge in different contexts. Adolescents aged 16-17 acquired systematic knowledge of religious concepts through religious education lessons in elementary school. Among numerous aspects of their religious instruction was the teaching on the properties of God as well as the manner in which the religious individual establishes a relationship with God. According to research, religiosity of adolescents is often based on social learning, and it is reasonable to expect that the correspondent model occurs in greater percentage (Granqvist, 2002; Kirkpatrick, 1999; 2005). Adults, aged 35-45, grew up in the system in which religion was not present as much as it is today (Pantić, 1988; Dušanić, 2005) and they did not systematically acquire knowledge of religious concepts. Their knowledge of religious concepts and hence of God is a result of spontaneous life experiences. Religiosity of adults could follow both the correspondent and compensation model. In addition, we wanted to verify the results of the quoted studies 1) by using a different instrument to determine the attachment to significant human beings, 2) by using the sample of respondents of different age including mature adults as opposed to the quoted studies which only focused on adolescents and young people, and 3) by investigating the attachment to God which was not examined in the mentioned studies.

METHOD

The sample in this study comprises 224 respondents, with 113 adolescents attending the second grade of the Banja Luka gymnasium and 111 adults. The average age of adolescents was 16.9, while the adults were 40.1 years old on average. The sample was gender balanced, consisting of 53 male adolescents (47%) and 60 female adolescents (53%), and 51 male adults (46%) and 60 female adults (54%). Forty-nine percent of adult respondents completed secondary education, while 51% of them completed higher education. Responding to the question: "Are you religious?" by choosing one of the four given answers, 79% of respondents declared themselves as religious (81% of adolescents and 78% of adults). The

most numerous group among them was the *slightly religious* (50% of the sample, 45% of adolescents, and 56% of adults), while 29% of the sample declared themselves as *very religious* – 35% of adolescents and 23% of adults. Sixteen percent of respondents declared themselves as *non-religious*, while the smallest percentage of respondents (5%) *did not know if they were religious or not*, both categories being equally distributed between adolescents and adults.

The sample was appropriate and voluntary, and the entire querying process was performed individually lasting 120 minutes on average per respondent. The respondents first filled in a questionnaire and later answered questions in an interview. Their replies to the questions in the interview for the assessment of their attachment to God were recorded, and the analysis was performed on interview transcripts. Personal interest for the research subject was the predominant motive for taking part in the study, indicating a low representation sample.

The instruments used in the research are the following: a revised version of an Attachment Assessment Questionnaire (AAQ-R, Hanak, 2004), the Scale of religious orientation (REL, Dušanić, 2005), which is the adapted version of the scale by Allport and Ross (ROS, 1967), and the Attachment to God Assessment Interview (AGAI, Hadžić – Krnetić, 2011). In addition to the listed instruments, a question requiring a self-assessment of religiosity was also asked worded as follows: “Are you religious?” with 4 possible answers: 1. Very, 2. Slightly, 3. I don’t know, and 4. No. An even number and the type of given answers were chosen to overcome the shortcomings of respondents’ answering when offered a dichotomous choice or a mean value, which occurred in previous studies (Dušanić, 2007).

Attachment to human beings was operationalized by using the revised version of the *Attachment Assessment Questionnaire* (AAQ-R, Hanak, 2004; Vukosavljević-Gvozden, Hanak, 2007). It consists of seven separate scales each containing 11 items, measuring the attachment of adolescents and adults. Respondents give their answers on a 7-level scale with 1 being the statement: “Does not describe my experiences, feelings, and views at all”, and 7 being: “Completely describes my experiences, feelings, and views“. The instrument was designed in such a manner that mainly higher scores on the scale indicate more insecure attachment. The exception is the Mentalizing Capacity scale, where higher scores were expected from secure and preoccupied attachment, while lower scores were characteristic of dismissive and fearful attachment (Vukosavljević-Gvozden, Hanak, 2007). The seven sub-scales represent the following:

1. *Unresolved family trauma* – includes the items through which negative and painful feelings are expressed, as well as negative views in relation to one’s own childhood and family. Moreover, it includes items

indicating tense and ambivalent family relationships in the present (Hanak, 2004).

2. *Fear of losing the external secure base* – includes items expressing the fear of losing attachment figures and the belief that this loss is irreplaceable, possibly having fatal consequences for the later course of life (Hanak, 2004).

3. *Negative working model of others* – this component comprises the items expressing negative beliefs concerning human nature, as well as the need to be cautious and distant with others (Hanak, 2004).

4. *Mentalizing capacity* – refers to the capacity to process or interpret the information concerning mental states and is of essential significance for the efficient functioning of the capacity for empathy (Vukosavljević – Gvozden, Hanak, 2007).

5. *Negative working model of the self* – this component comprises items expressing beliefs concerning one's own unworthiness and inadequacy, as well as insecurity about oneself and one's self-worth (Hanak, 2004).

6. *Use of external secure base* – comprised of items whose contents show that the individual has figures to whom he/she is attached, on whom he/she can rely, and who make him/her feel secure. The individual is capable of using the figures to whom he/she is attached as a secure base, and finds it important to have support from other people. (Hanak, 2004).

7. *Anger dysregulation* – comprised of items witnessing to the lack of control over anger and rage.¹ It includes items such as “When I'm angry, I need to get my revenge“, “If the person I trust lets me down, I try to reciprocate“, etc.

Metric characteristics of AAQ-R scales obtained in the course of research are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Metric characteristics of AAQ-R scales

AAQ-R scales	No. of items	Cronbach's α
Unresolved family trauma	11	.90
Fear of losing the external secure base	11	.86
Negative working model of others	11	.86
Use of external secure base	11	.84
Negative working model of the self	11	.83
Anger dysregulation	11	.77
Mentalizing capacity	11	.74
N		224

¹ The author did not describe this scale; instead, it was described based on the comprising items.

Attachment to God was operationalized based on the responses obtained in a semi-structured *Attachment to God Assessment Interview* (Hadžić – Krnetić, 2011), which, like the system of classifying responses, was modelled after the Adult Attachment Interview (AAI, Hesse, 1999; George, Kaplan & Main, 1985, according to Stefanović – Stanojević, 2006), with a 4-category model of classification. It contains eight questions referring to the aspects of respondent's attachment to God and the meaning ascribed to this relationship.

Based on the model of response evaluation in the AAI, the responses obtained in the Attachment to God Assessment Interview were classified through two systems of evaluation. The first evaluation system refers to the *content of the narrative* and includes the following aspects: 1) properties ascribed to God, 2) the presence of subjective experience, 3) the existence of emotional involvement, 4) idealization of God, 5) preoccupation with anger directed at God, 6) the existence of continuity in the relationship with God, and 7) the importance of relationship with God for an individual. The other system of evaluation refers to the *quality of the narrative* (evaluation of verbalization) and includes the following features: 1) coherence of statement, 2) clarity, 3) connectedness, 4) consistency, and 5) relevance. Based on the evaluation of the presence of all listed aspects (12 in total) in the responses, which were established on a three-level scale with the following levels: 1) very present in responses, 2) present, but not prominent, and 3) not present in responses, the respondents were classified as belonging to one of the four patterns of attachment to God.

A) The category of *dismissive attachment to God* or "*Distant and respected God*" is characteristic of a narrative in which there is a lack of emotional involvement, distance in relation to God, respect and idealization, or lack of any specific memories; the narrative is short, scarce, without any details, and contains general theological formulations and insists on common and universal concepts. This category corresponds to insecure – dismissive attachment to important others.

B) The category of *secure attachment to God* or "*Available and accepting God*" is characteristic of a narrative with emotional involvement in relation to God, which contains an account of personal experiences, the perception of God as accepting, and the perception of self as available to love; the narrative is clear, coherent, comprehensible and complete with implied willingness to explore the relationship and the use of everyday language without insisting on theological phrases. This category corresponds to secure attachment to important others.

C) The category of *preoccupied attachment to God* or a "*Whimsical and ritualized God*" is characteristic of a narrative with excess emotional involvement, preoccupation with emotion (anger, guilt, fear), constant struggle to make God benevolent through different rituals, and ambivalent perception of God (as idealized and devalued); the narrative is marked by

poor quality and it is less clear and less comprehensible. It is characterized by confusion and lengthiness which fails to contribute to a better quality, but rather serves to give vent to strong emotions. This category corresponds to insecure – preoccupied attachment to important others.

D) The category of *fearful attachment to God* or “*Confusing and split God*” is characteristic of a narrative containing a confusing and split representation of God, who is supposed to be accepting but most often is not, and the perception of self as a being not worthy of God’s love (nihilistic perception). The narrative is incoherent, of poorest quality compared to narratives of other patterns, confusing, uneven (either scarce or too long), and irrelevant. Respondents fitting into this pattern see God inconsistently. What makes their verbal description distinct, which is an essential criterion for fitting the individual into this pattern, are confusing and unrelated statements. Respondents have difficulty presenting their experience in a comprehensible way. Statements are unclear, incomplete, and inconsistent. There is a lot of talking off topic, responding by looking aside, and giving responses not related to the question asked. This category corresponds to insecure – fearful attachment to important others.

A total of 41 respondents did not take part in the interview, and for them God does not present an attachment figure. Among them are 35 respondents who declared themselves as non-religious at the beginning of the examination, two respondents who were undecided, and four respondents who declared themselves as slightly religious.

Based on the described procedure, the variable “attachment to God” was obtained, containing five categories, four of which present the patterns of attachment to God, while the fifth category includes respondents for whom God is not an attachment figure.

The salience of religious orientations was measured by the *religious orientation scale* based on Allport’s concept of intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity, and the concept of personal-extrinsic and social-extrinsic religious orientation (Maltby, 1999). The REL scale (Dušanić, 2005) comprises two sub-scales: intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity. It contains 17 items, nine of which refer to extrinsic and eight referring to intrinsic religiosity. The scale is of a Likert type with the reply volume ranging from 1 (“I totally disagree”) to 5 (“I totally agree”). Subscales are mutually independent. Some of the statements along the scale of intrinsic religiosity are: “I try to transfer my faith to all other actions in my life”, “My religious beliefs fulfil my entire life”, etc. Cronbach’s alpha value for the intrinsic subscale in our research is .85. Some of the statements along the extrinsic scale are: “One of the reasons why I believe is the fact religiosity helps me be accepted in society”, “Religion gives me most consolation when I am sad or unhappy”, etc. Cronbach’s alpha value for the extrinsic scale in our research is low, .62.

RESULTS

In the next section we will present the results of the independent research variables – attachment to human beings and attachment to God. Age differences will be presented within each of these parts.

Attachment to human beings

The applied procedure of multivariate analysis of variance established the existence of significant differences between respondents of different ages $F(7,214)=6.812$; $p<.001$, on the common variance of 7 AAQ-R dimensions which operationalize attachment to human beings. Based on observations of individual variance, significant age differences were registered along the dimensions of mentalizing capacity $F(1)=37.470$; $p<.001$, and anger dysregulation $F(1)=9.834$; $p<.01$. The direction of differences indicated greater presence of characteristics typical of the secure attachment in adolescents (see Table 2).

Table 2. Age differences along the AAQ-R Dimensions

	age	Mean	SD	N	F(1)	p
Unresolved family trauma	adolescent	27.903	13.211	113	1.183	.278
	adult	29.955	14.908	111		
Fear of losing the external secure base	adolescent	46.699	12.838	113	1.966	.162
	adult	44.550	13.135	111		
Negative working model of others	adolescent	51.858	10.275	113	1.005	.317
	adult	50.432	11.839	111		
Mentalizing capacity	adolescent	50.460	9.159	113	37.470	.000
	adult	41.801	11.944	111		
Negative working model of the self	adolescent	31.442	12.273	113	2.677	.103
	adult	28.801	10.623	111		
Use of external secure base	adolescent	57.106	11.310	113	3.897	.050
	adult	54.297	11.820	111		
Anger dysregulation	adolescent	36.070	12.153	113	9.834	.002
	adult	42.126	16.021	111		

Age significantly affects the common variance of extrinsic and intrinsic religiosity $F(2,219)=4.647$; $p<.01$. The impact of gender differences on the salience of extrinsic $F(1)=7.178$; $p<.01$, and intrinsic religiosity $F(1)=3.971$; $p<.05$ indicates a greater salience of both religious orientations in adults (see Table 3).

Table 3. Age differences and religious orientation

Religious orientation	age	Mean	SD	N	F(1)	p
Extrinsic religiosity	adolescent	24.637	4.569	113	7.178	.008
	adult	26.468	5.616	111		
Intrinsic religiosity	adolescent	21.371	6.720	113	3.971	.048
	adult	23.306	7.781	111		

Multiple regression analysis determined that the AAQ-R dimensions used to operationalize the attachment to human beings constitute significant predictors of extrinsic religiosity ($R^2=.066$; $F(7)=2.171$; $p<.05$) for the total sample. They predict a 7% variance. A negative working model of others ($\beta=.163$; $t=2.390$; $p<.05$) constitutes an individually significant predictor indicating stronger extrinsic religiosity in individuals with a more salient characteristic of insecure attachment to human beings (see Table 4).

Table 4. Results of multiple regression analysis of extrinsic religiosity, Total sample

Predictors (N=224)	Non-standard beta	Standard beta	t	p	Multiple regression coefficient
Unresolved family trauma	.010	.027	.366	.715	R = .256
Fear of losing the external secure base	.020	.050	.644	.520	
Negative working model of others	.076	.163	2.390	.018	R ² = .066
Mentalizing capacity	-.018	-.040	-.508	.612	F(7)=2.171
Negative working model of the self	-.015	-.033	-.434	.665	p= .038
Use of external secure base	.049	.109	1.357	.176	
Anger dysregulation	.052	.144	1.918	.056	

On a subsample of adolescents, dimensions of attachment to human beings present significant predictors of extrinsic religiosity ($R^2=.126$; $F(7)=2.168$; $p<.05$), accounting for a 13% variance, while on the subsample of adults predictors of intrinsic religiosity are of significance ($R^2=.203$; $F(7)=3.745$; $p<.001$), accounting for a 20% variance. Negative working model of others ($\beta=.251$; $t=2.3529$; $p<.05$) and the use of an external secure base ($\beta=.341$; $t=2.894$; $p<.01$) constitute individually significant direct predictors of extrinsic religiosity on a subsample of adolescents, which also points to a more salient extrinsic religiosity in adolescents with more prominent features of insecure attachment to human beings (Table 5).

Table 5. Results of multiple regression analysis of extrinsic religiosity for adolescent and adult subsamples

Predictors		Non- standard beta	Standard beta	t	p	Multiple regression coefficient
Adolescents (N=113)						
Adults (N=111)						
Unresolved family trauma	Adolescents	.024	.071	.679	.499	
	Adults	.176	.336	3.260	.002	Adolescents:
Fear of losing the external secure base	Adolescents	.010	.028	.251	.803	R = .355
	Adults	.010	.017	.169	.866	R ² = .126
Negative working model of others	Adolescents	.111	.251	2.529	.013	F(7)=2.168
	Adults	.162	.247	2.678	.009	p = .043
Mentalizing capacity	Adolescents	-.042	-.084	-.855	.394	
	Adults	.005	.008	.071	.944	
Negative working model of the self	Adolescents	-.017	-.047	-.457	.649	Adults:
	Adults	.221	.301	2.791	.006	R = .450
Use of external secure base	Adolescents	.138	.341	2.894	.005	R ² = .203
	Adults	.078	.118	1.093	.277	F(7)=3.745
Anger dysregulation	Adolescents	-.010	-.026	-.257	.499	p = .001
	Adults	-.042	-.087	-.800	.426	

The individually significant direct predictors of intrinsic religiosity on the subsample of adults are unresolved family trauma ($\beta=.336$; $t=3.260$; $p<.01$), negative working model of others ($\beta=.251$; $t=2.529$; $p<.05$), and negative working model of the self ($\beta=.341$; $t=2.894$; $p<.01$), which points to a more salient intrinsic religiosity in adults with more prominent characteristics of insecure attachment to human beings (see Table 5).

Attachment to God

The distribution of patterns of attachment to God shows that the most numerous group is made up of individuals with secure attachment to God (*Available and accepting God*) (33%), followed by the dismissive (*Distant and respected God*) (29%), preoccupied attachment (*Whimsical and ritualized God*) (16%), and with the fewest being those fearfully attached to God (*Confusing and split God*) (5%). For 18% of the respondents God does not signify a figure of attachment. Although the obtained distribution resembles the distribution of patterns of attachment to significant human beings, the most numerous ones being those with secure attachment and the least numerous those with fearful style, it is different from others in the sense that there is a lower percentage of secure attachment (less than 50% of the sample) and a high percentage of dismissive attachment to God. Age differences indicate a more salient pattern of secure attachment to God in adults and a more salient dismissive pattern of attachment to God in adolescents ($\chi^2(1)=3.90$; $p<.05$), while the incidence of preoccupied attachment and fearful attachment to God, as

well as those for whom God does not represent a figure of attachment is similar in the two age subsamples (see Table 6).

Table 6. Distribution of patterns of attachment to God across age subsamples

	Attachment to God pattern											
	Dismissive attachment		Secure attachment		Preoccupied attachment		Fearful attachment		Non-religious		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Adolescents	38	34%	31	27%	18	16%	6	5%	20	18%	113	100.0%
Adults	26	23%	42	38%	17	15%	5	5%	21	19%	111	100.0%
Total	64	29%	73	33%	35	16%	11	5%	41	18%	224	100.0%

The results point to significant differences in the salience of extrinsic ($F(4)=6.427$; $p<.001$) and intrinsic ($F(4)=39.849$; $p=.000$) religiosity in respondents with different patterns of attachment to God (see Table 7). The LSD post-hoc test was used to determine the occurrence of significant differences in extrinsic religiosity between individuals with preoccupied and dismissive attachment to God, of whom a more salient extrinsic religiosity is characteristic, as opposed to fearful and secure attachment to God and the non-religious respondents, who are less extrinsically religious. As for intrinsic religiosity, the LSD test determined that patterns of attachment to God are not significantly different in terms of the salience of intrinsic religiosity; however, significant differences do occur between non-religious individuals for whom God is not a figure of attachment, their intrinsic religiosity being lower compared to that of respondents for whom God does represent the figure of attachment.

Table 7. The salience of extrinsic and intrinsic religiosity in respondents with different patterns of attachment to God

Religious orientation	Attachment to God pattern	Mean	SD	N	F(4)	p
Extrinsic religiosity	Dismissive	26.812	4.850	64	6.427	.000
	Secure	24.739	4.893	73		
	Preoccupied	28.085	5.305	35		
	Fearful	24.454	5.646	11		
	Non-religious	23.122	4.702	41		
	Total	25.544	5.185	224		
Intrinsic religiosity	Dismissive	23.703	5.898	64	39.849	.000
	Secure	24.780	6.054	73		
	Preoccupied	25.971	5.399	35		
	Fearful	23.272	6.695	11		
	Non-religious	12.463	3.982	41		
	Total	22.330	7.313	224		

When the dimensions of extrinsic and intrinsic religiosity are clustered according to the respondents' assessment of their own religiosity, four groups of respondents are created representing four types of religiosity. Non-selectively pro-religious individuals are characterized by high scores on both religious orientations; dominantly intrinsically religious individuals score high on the scale on intrinsic religiosity and low on the scale of extrinsic religiosity; the dominantly extrinsically religious are characterized by high scores on extrinsic and low scores on intrinsic religiosity; and the non-selectively religious score low on both religious orientations (see Table 8).

Table 8. Clusters for religiosity types based on respondents' evaluation of their own religiosity and the values of extrinsic and intrinsic religiosity

Religiosity type	Clusters			
	Non-selectively pro-religious	Dominantly intrinsic	Dominantly extrinsic	Non-religious
Extrinsic religiosity	30.04	20.64	28.40	22.50
Intrinsic religiosity	4.81411	7.26953	-2.58346	-9.07197

Age differences in the salience of the said types of religiosity ($\chi^2(1)=5.500$; $p<.05$) indicate a higher incidence of non-selective pro-religiosity in adults and a more frequent extrinsic religiosity in adolescents. Other types of religiosity are similarly frequent in the two age subgroups (see Table 9).

Table 9. Distribution of religiosity types on age subsamples and the total sample

	Type of religiosity								Total	
	Non-selectively pro-religious		Dominantly intrinsically religious		Dominantly extrinsically religious		Non-religious		F	%
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%		
Adolescents	20	17%	29	26%	36	32%	28	25%	113	100%
Adult	35	32%	24	22%	26	23%	26	23%	111	100%
Total	55	25%	53	24%	62	27%	54	24%	224	100%

The results indicate a significant difference found in the distribution of patterns of attachment to God in respondents displaying different types of religiosity ($\chi^2(12)=128.77$; $p<.001$). The same results were obtained in both age subsamples. Individuals with secure attachment to God most frequently belong to dominantly intrinsic religiosity; those with dismissive attachment are mostly predominantly extrinsically religious;

individuals with preoccupied attachment most often express non-selective pro-religiosity, while those with fearful attachment are most often intrinsically religious, the most numerous pattern being the non-religious. Individuals for whom God is not a significant figure of attachment are mostly of the non-religious type (see Table 10).

Table 10: Distribution of the patterns of attachment to God in different religiosity types

Religiosity type	Attachment to God Pattern					Total
	Dismissive attachment	Secure attachment	Preoccupied attachment	Fearful attachment	Non-religious	
Non-selectively pro-religious	15 (23%)	21 (29%)	16 (46%)	2 (18%)	1 (2%)	55 (25%)
Dominantly intrinsic	15 (23%)	27 (37%)	6 (17%)	5 (45.5%)	0 (0%)	53 (24%)
Dominantly extrinsic	26 (41%)	18 (25%)	12 (34%)	2 (18%)	4 (10%)	62 (27%)
Non-religious	8 (13%)	7 (9%)	1 (3%)	2 (18%)	36 (88%)	54 (24%)
Total	64 (100%)	73 (100%)	35 (100%)	11 (100%)	41 (100%)	224 (100%)

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The results for the whole sample show that attachment to human beings is a significant predictor of extrinsic religiosity. More salient extrinsic religiosity is characteristic of respondents in whom features of insecure attachment are more prominent than in others and who display a more negative working model of others.

The results obtained for age subgroups show that the insecure attachment to human beings is a significant predictor of extrinsic religiosity for the adolescent subsample and intrinsic religiosity for the adult subsample. In adolescents, higher extrinsic religiosity is related to a more salient negative working model of others and a greater degree of willingness to use an external secure base. Higher intrinsic religiosity in adults is related to a more salient unresolved family trauma, a negative working model of others and a negative working model of the self. Attachment to human beings accounts for a higher variance percentage of intrinsic religiosity in the adult group (20%) as opposed to 13% in the adolescent group.

The results concerning more salient extrinsic religiosity, which is related to more salient characteristics of insecure attachment to human beings, comply with the results obtained by other authors (Kirkpatrick 2005; Granqvist, 2002; 2006; Granqvist & Kirkpatrick, 2004), according to whom religiosity of those with insecure attachment serves to compensate

for previous deprivation, so it is of instrumental value. Such perception of religiosity is in line with the definition of extrinsic religiosity (Allport, 1950). Similar results indicating that insecure family attachment contributes to a more salient extrinsic religiosity in fearful and dismissive attachment are reported by Dušanić (2007). A more salient intrinsic religiosity related to characteristics of insecure attachment in adults also points to religiosity serving to compensate for previous deprivation, but this kind of religiosity is not used instrumentally; rather, it is accepted as a life value, which indicates a compensation model (Kirkpatrick, 1999). Research by Dušanić (2007) conducted on local population fails to establish a significant relationship between salience of intrinsic religiosity in individuals with different patterns of family attachment. Admittedly, in the quoted study, the sample consisted of young people aged 15-25, i.e. it did not include a mature adult sample.

Attachment to God significantly affects extrinsic religiosity, whereby a more salient extrinsic religiosity is characteristic of preoccupied (*Whimsical and ritualized God*) and dismissive (*Distant and respected God*) attachment to God, while lower scores on this scale are achieved by those showing secure (*Available and accepting God*) and fearful (*Confusing and split God*) attachment to God as well as by the respondents for whom God is not an attachment figure. As regards the salience of extrinsic religiosity, insecure patterns of attachment to God take opposing positions. Those with preoccupied (*Whimsical and ritualized God*) and dismissive (*Distant and respected God*) attachment to God are highly extrinsically religious, while those with fearful (*Confusing and split God*) attachment to God show the lowest degree of extrinsic religiosity. Individuals with secure attachment to God (*Available and accepting God*) are in the middle and their mean scores signify a less salient extrinsic religiosity. The same results are obtained in both age subgroups. Regarding the intrinsic religiosity there is a significant difference between the respondents for whom God is not a figure of attachment, whose intrinsic religiosity is the least salient, and all the other respondents for whom God represents a figure of attachment and whose intrinsic religiosity is higher. On observing the patterns of attachment to God, no significant difference is found between different patterns of attachment to God, which points to a roughly similar salience of intrinsic religiosity. The influence of both measures of attachment to humans and to God is also present in the extrinsic religiosity, while their impact on intrinsic religiosity appears solely in the subgroup of adults and only concerning the attachment to human beings.

In the context of the obtained results, extrinsic religiosity may play the role of a substitute for insecure relationships with human figures and an insecure relationship with God, which points to its instrumental nature. Insecure quality of the relationship with parents is transferred onto insecure quality of relationship with God, with religiosity serving to fulfil various other needs, such as safety, acceptance within a social group and

protection. A more salient intrinsic religiosity occurring in adults with a more salient insecure attachment to human beings points to religiosity which becomes the purpose in one's life by organizing it and giving it meaning. This religiosity, as found in adults, points to compensation which, over time, leads to greater security (Kirkpatrick, 1999). Another thing in favour of the compensation model is the results according to which a secure pattern of attachment to God is more frequent in adults, whereas a dismissive attachment to God is displayed more by adolescents.

Age differences show that adolescents, more often than adults, organize a relationship with God in a way which corresponds to the avoidant-insecure pattern of attachment, although their attachment to significant human beings displays numerous features of secure attachment. Attachment of adults to significant human beings is characterized by more salient characteristics of insecure attachment to human beings, whereas regarding their attachment to God adults more often display a secure attachment style. When observing the salience of religious orientations, the results show that both the extrinsic and the intrinsic religiosity are more salient in adults compared to adolescents. Age differences in terms of frequency of certain types of religiosity indicate a more frequent non-selective pro-religiosity in adults and a dominantly extrinsic religiosity type in adolescents.

The obtained results can be accounted for by the existence of a different organization of attachment formed in relationships with human beings and the one formed in the relationship with God, in accordance with the concepts of hierarchical organization of the Collins and Reed attachment system (according to Stefanović – Stanojević, 2011). The obtained results can be seen as the reflection of an adolescent process which manifests itself in the de-idealization of authority. Perception of God as distant and unavailable in adolescents could be influenced by religious education lessons as well as by the experiences with persons representing God on earth (religious teachers or priests), who were not the subject of this research.

Differences in the frequency with which four religiosity types appear in different patterns of attachment to God show that the most numerous respondents with dismissive attachment to God belong to the dominantly extrinsic type; the majority of those with secure attachment to God belong to a dominantly intrinsic type; the largest number of those with preoccupied attachment to God fit the pattern of non-selective pro-religiosity, and the majority of fearful individuals display either a dominant intrinsic religiosity or are non-religious, i.e. their results indicate extremes expected for those who discover and abandon the relationship with God. As expected, most respondents for whom God is not a figure of attachment belong to the non-religious type.

The obtained results correspond to the results of numerous other studies which have shown that the individuals with different organizational structures of insecure attachment are deprived of the same possibility of

achieving a secure relationship through their relationship with God (Kirkpatrick, 2005).

Finally, we will focus on methodological difficulties which might have affected the obtained relations. First, the assessment of the patterns of attachment to God to which respondents belong was performed by one assessor, which fails to contribute to objectivity. As AAI served as a model of interview construction and classification procedure, the existence of personally coloured experiences and the willingness of respondents to express and observe them, served as an aspect of classification. Due to the specificities of relationship with God, it is possible that the lack of specific personally coloured experiences was wrongly viewed as an aspect which points to the insecure attachment to God, and it is particularly possible that this aspect was missing in adolescents due to their limited life experience. For the purpose of examining attachment to human beings and to God, the instruments representing different approaches were used, among them AAQ-R, belonging to nomothetic and quantitative measure approach, whereas the Attachment to God Assessment Interview is closer to the idiographic and qualitative approach, which, together with the problem of singling out patterns of attachment to significant human beings, may have certainly affected the obtained results. A small and appropriate sample, voluntary by nature, and the use of transversal design could also have been a contributing factor to the obtained results. Therefore, our recommendation for future studies, apart from having to overcome the abovementioned shortcomings, would be to adhere to longitudinal study design, which would present the change of religiosity in adults and the compensation model of religiosity in a more comprehensive manner.

REFERENCES

- Ainsworth, M. (1985). Attachment across the life span. *Bulletin of the New York Academy of medicine*, 61, 792-812.
- Allport, G. W. (1950). *The individual and his religion*. New York: Macmillan
- Allport, G.W. (1966). Traits revisited. In: L.B. Brown (Ed), *Psychology and religion*. England: Penguin Education.
- Beck, R., & McDonald, A. (2004): Attachment to god: the attachment to god inventory, tests of working model correspondence, and an exploration of faith group differences. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 32(2), 92-103.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and Loss: Vol 1 Attachment*. New York: Basic Book.
- Brown, L.B. (1973). Introduction. In: L.B. Brown (Ed). *Psychology and religion*. England: Penguin Education.
- Dušanić, S. (2005). Socio-psychological correlates of religious orientation in young people. In: M. Franceško, & M. Zotović (Ed), *Psycho-social aspects of social transition in Serbia* (pp. 165-189). Novi Sad: Faculty of Philosophy.
- Dušanić, S. (2007). *Psychological research into religiosity*. Banja Luka: Faculty of Philosophy.
- English, & English. (1996). Introductory assumption into psychology of religiosity. In Š. Ćorić, *Psychology of religiosity*. Jastrebarsko: Naklada Slap.

- Erickson, J. A. (1992). Adolescent religious development and commitment: A structural equation model of the role of family, peer group and educational influences. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 31 (2), 131- 153.
- Granqvist, P. (2002). *Attachment and Religion*, Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Uppsala.
- Granqvist, P., & Hagekull, B. (2003). Longitudinal Predictions of Religious Change in Adolescence: Contributions from the Interaction of Attachment and Relationship Status. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 20 (6), 793-817.
- Granqvist, P., & Kirkpatrick, L.A. (2004). Religious Conversion and Perceived Childhood Attachment: A Meta-Analysis. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 14 (4), 223–250.
- Granqvist, P. (2006). On the Relation Between Secular and Divine Relationships: An Emerging Attachment Perspective and a Critique of the “Depth” Approaches. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 16 (1), 1-18.
- Hanak, N. (2004). Constructing a new instrument for the assessment of attachment in adolescents and adults – AAQ, *Psychology*, 37/1, 123-142.
- Hesse, E. (1999). The Adult Attachment Interview: Historical and Current Perspectives. In: J.Cassidy & P.R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research and clinical applications* (pp. 336 – 354). New York: Guilford Press.
- Kirkpatrick, L.A. (1998). God as a substitute attachment figure: A longitudinal study of adult attachment style and religious change in college students. *Personality and social psychology bulletin*, 24, pp. 961-973.
- Kirkpatrick, L.A. (1999). Attachment and religious representation and behaviour. In: J.Cassidy & P.R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research and clinical applications* (pp. 803 – 822). New York: Guilford Press.
- Kirkpatrick, L.A. (2005). *Attachment, evolution, and the psychology of religion*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Maltby, J. (1999). The internal structure of a derived, revised, and amended measure of the religious orientation scale. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 27(4), 407-412.
- Meadow, M.J., & Kahoe, R.D. (1984). *Psychology of religion, religion in individual lives*. New York: Harper and Row, publishers, Inc.
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P.R. (2007). *Attachment in Adulthood: Structure, Dynamics, and Change*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Pantić, D. (1988). *Classic and secular religiosity*. Belgrade: The Institute of Social Sciences, Centre for Political Research and Public Opinion.
- Rohner, R.P. (1986). *The warmth dimension: Foundations of parental acceptance – rejection theory*. CA: Sage.
- Spilika, B., Hood, R.W., Hunsberger, B., & Gorsuch, R. (2003). *The psychology of religion, an empirical approach*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Stefanović-Stanojević, T. (2006). The attachment theory (AT) as the theory of emotional development of personality. In: J. Mirić and A. Dimitrijević (Ed.) *The attachment, experimental and clinical approach*. Belgrade: Centre for Applied Psychology.
- Stefanović – Stanojević, T. (2008). *Early experience and love relationships, The attachment theory*. Niš: Faculty of Philosophy,.
- Stefanović-Stanojević, T. (2011). *Attachment, development, modalities and assessment*. Niš: Faculty of Philosophy.
- Vukosavljević – Gvozden, T., & Hanak, N. (2007). Capacity for empathy in individuals with different attachment organization. In: N. Hanak and A. Dimitrijević (Ed.) *Attachment, theory, research, psychotherapy*. Belgrade: Faculty for special education and rehabilitation, The Research Centre.

Татјана Стефановић Станојевић, Универзитет у Нишу, Филозофски факултет,
 Департман за психологију, Ниш, Србија
 Александра Хаџић Крнетић, Универзитет у Бања Луци, Филозофски факултет,
 Департман за психологију, Бања Лука, Босна и Херцеговина

АФЕКТИВНА ВЕЗАНОСТ И РЕЛИГИОЗНОСТ

Резиме

Полазећи од различитих објашњења усвајања религиозности и њене промјене, која постављају кореспондентни и компензацијски модел, као проблем истраживања поставили смо испитивање односа афективне везаности према људима и Богу и изражености интринзичке и екстринзичке религиозне оријентације, код испитаника двије различите узрастне скупине, чији се контекст одрастања и стицања сазнања о религији разликује.

Узорак истраживања обухвата 224 испитаника, од којих 113 адолесцената, другог разреда Гимназије из Бања Луке и 111 одраслих особа. Просјечан узраст за адолесценте износи 16,9 година, а за одрасле испитанике 40,1 година. Адолесценти, за разлику од одраслих, систематски су стицали сазнања о религијским поставкама кроз наставу вјеронауке у основној школи, а према поставкама би се очекивало да њихова религиозност у већој мјери слиједи кореспондентни модел.

Инструменти кориштени у истраживању су ревидирана верзија Упитника за процјену афективног везивања (UPIPAV-R, Hanak, 2004), Скала религиозних оријентација (REL, Dušanić, 2005), која представља адаптирану верзију скале Allporta и Rossa (ROS, 1967) и Интервју за процјену афективне везаности према Богу (IPAVB, Hadžić – Krnetić, 2011). Поред наведених инструмената кориштено је и питање о самопроцјени религиозности „Да ли сте религиозни?“, са 4 понуђена одговора, 1. Веома, 2. Помало, 3. Не знам и 4. Не. Паран број и врста понуђених одговора имали су за циљ да превазиђу недостатке одређене испитаника када им се понуди дихотоман избор или средња вриједност.

Резултати показују да су карактеристике које упућују на несигурну везаност према људима заступљеније на подзорку одраслих испитаника. Код адолесцената виша екстринзичка религиозност повезана је са израженијим негативним радним моделом других и већом спремношћу да се користи спољашња база сигурности, а код одраслих, виша интринзичка религиозност повезана је са израженијом неразрјешеном породичном трауматизацијом, израженијим негативним радним моделом других и себе.

Сигурна везаност према Богу чешћа је међу одраслим особама, док је више адолесцената одбацујуће везано за Бога. Афективна везаност према Богу значајно утиче на екстринзичку религиозност, а израженија екстринзичка религиозност карактеристична је за окупирано и одбацујуће везане за Бога, док ниже скорове на овој скали постижу сигурно и плашљиво везани за Бога, као и испитаници за које Бог није фигура афективне везаности. Заступљенија несигурна афективна везаност према људима, представља предиктор више екстринзичке религиозности на адолесцентном подзорку и више интринзичке религиозности на подзорку одраслих. Афективна везаност према Богу утиче на екстринзичку религиозност, а несигурни обрасци склони су крајностима, односно врло високим (одбацујуће и окупирано везани за Бога) и врло ниским (плашљиво везани за Бога) постигнућима на екстринзичкој религиозности.

У контексту добијених резултата, екстринзичка религиозност може имати улогу замјене за несигурне релације са људским фигурама и несигурну релацију са Богом, што би упућивало на њен инструменталан карактер. У прилог на-

веденом иду резултати других, према којим особе са хладнијим и нестабилнијим односима са родитељима у породици, као компензацију таквог стања, могу испољити израженију религиозност и прихватање Бога. Ову религиозност одликује дистанциран однос са Богом, те несигуран и површан карактер. Несигуран квалитет релације са родитељима преноси се и на несигуран квалитет релације са Богом, а религиозност служи остваривању различитих других потреба, попут сигурности, прихватања у групи, заштите. Израженија интринсичка религиозност присутна код одраслих са израженијом несигурном афективном везаношћу према људима, упућује на религиозност која постаје сврха и организује живљење, обезбеђујући смисао. Ова религиозност, присутна код одраслих, упућивала би на компензацију која кроз вријеме води већој сигурности.