Dialogical Validity of Religious Measures in Iran: Relationships with Integrative Self-Knowledge and Self-Control of the “Perfect Man” (Ensān-e Kāmel)

Nima Ghorbani, a) P. J. Watson, b) Zahra Rezazadeh, a) and Christopher J. L. Cunningham b)

a) Department of Psychology, University of Tehran, Iran
dr.nimaghorbani@gmail.com
z.rezazade@yahoo.com

b) Department of Psychology, University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, USA
paul-watson@utc.edu
chris-cunningham@utc.edu

Received: 11 August 2010; revised: 9 November 2010; accepted: 15 November 2010

Abstract
According to the ideological surround model of research, a more “objective” psychology of religion requires efforts to bring etic social scientific and emic religious perspectives into formal dialog. This study of 245 Iranian university students illustrated how the dialogical validity of widely used etic measures of religion can be assessed by examining an emic religious perspective on psychology. Integrative Self-Knowledge and Self-Control Scales recorded two aspects of the “Perfect Man” (ensān-e Kāmel) as described by the Iranian Muslim philosopher Mortazā Motahhari. Use of these instruments in correlation and multiple regression procedures identified Intrinsic, Extrinsic Personal, Religious Interpretation, Extrovertive Mysticism, Prayer Fulfillment, Universality, Connectedness, and Religiosity Scales as adaptive in their implications for a Muslim psychology of religion. Religious Crisis had maladaptive and Extrinsic Social, Introvertive Mysticism, and Quest Scales had ambiguous implications. These data illustrated how etic forms of understanding can clarify and can be clarified by emic insights.
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Western social scientific perspectives usually rest upon unarticulated philosophical assumptions that can discourage non-Western contributions to an international psychology of religion. Muslim scholars, for example, have complained...
that the secular social sciences demand non-theistic, naturalistic presumptions that can preclude important insights into Islamic religious commitments (e.g., Murken & Shah 2002; Haque & Masuan, 2002; Haque, 2004). One potential worry is that Western paradigms are not wholly objective, but instead reflect biases that can colonize traditional forms of faith. Specifically, Western social sciences often reduce religious understandings of God to processes of nature and thus “conquer” or “colonize” a religious faith by essentially explaining it away. Muslim scholars will believe that God must be ultimately understood in terms specified by God. Western researchers will see things differently, of course. For them, the countervailing concern is that scholarly investigations into religion based upon religious perspectives will lack the necessary epistemological distance necessary for achieving reliable and valid knowledge.

What conceptual frameworks can encourage a diversity of Western and non-Western perspectives within the psychology of religion? An ideological surround model (ISM) of research argues that the need for diversity is essential and requires the development of a dialogical empiricism (Watson, 1993, 2008, in press). This model begins with the assumption that psychology is like religion in being ideological. As described by MacIntyre (1978), ideologies are somewhat non-empirical, normative, and sociological systems of belief. Social science, like religion, is somewhat non-empirical in that it too rests upon (usually unacknowledged) metaphysical assumptions that can find no indisputable foundations in reason or evidence. Origins of the universe in the processes of nature, for example, as in the actions of God, are incapable of falsification; yet, scientific and religious perspectives both support the interpretation of a vast array of empirical observations. These somewhat non-empirical frameworks then have normative consequences in (among other things) defining how knowledge should be developed. Social scientists develop and interpret evidence in terms of current “readings” of the “text” of nature. Religious scholars obtain and interpret evidence in terms of current understandings of the “text” of their tradition. Finally, these somewhat non-empirical frameworks then have a sociological significance in delineating who does and who does not belong within a particular community of interpretation.

Given that ideology cannot be eliminated from the psychology of religion, the ISM argues that a more adequate, though not absolute “objectivity” requires three forms of research: etic, emic, and dialogic (Ghorbani, Watson, & Khan, 2002; Headland, Pike, & Harris, 1990). Etic research programs stand “outside” of any particular religious tradition. They achieve an epistemological distance that is useful in building up a psychology of religion that meets essential standards of social scientific research. On the other hand, an
etic perspective can be so far removed from lived religion that it lacks experiential or cultural validity. Emic research programs would address this problem by describing religious commitments using perspectives “inside” the tradition itself. Emic research would presumably be more adequate in describing religion as lived, but the neutrality and hence empirical validity of its observations could be suspect. Dialogic research programs address the limitations of these two types of research by encouraging conceptual and methodological innovations that bring etic and emic perspectives into explicit dialog.

One among many tasks of a dialogic research program is to establish the dialogical validity of research instruments. Etic (or emic) measures with this type of validity would have a documented utility in exploring emic (or etic) frameworks. Western measures, for example, could demonstrate dialogical validity by correlating as hypothesized with emic operationalizations of religion. Indeed, investigations have already found that widely used scales in the psychology of religion do display hypothesized relationships with Pakistani Muslim understandings of Ramadan and of Eid ul Azha, the celebration that marks the end of the Hajj (Khan & Watson, 2004, 2010).

Dialogical validity could also be established in a second way. Western measures would have dialogue validity to the extent that they displayed expected relationships with non-Western religious perspectives on psychological functioning. In more general terms, the present project sought to illustrate this second approach to establishing dialogue validity by empirically examining a Muslim psychological ideal as described by the Iranian philosopher Mortazā Motahhari.

The “Ensān-e Kāmel” of Motahhari

Mortazā Motahhari was a prominent philosopher and ideologist of the Iranian Revolution (e.g., Nikazmerad, 1980). His philosophy emphasized the central role of self-knowledge in the cultural promotion of the “Perfect Man” (ensān-e kāmel), who among other things resists the disturbing influences of Western materialism (Shimamoto, 2008). Motahhari (2000) defined numerous forms of self-knowledge and believed that the Qur’an commanded self-knowledge as a moral imperative in such verses as Banishment (59: 19): “Do not be like those who have forgotten about God, so He lets them forget about their own souls. Such people are immoral.” In emphasizing mystical self-knowledge in particular, Motahhari retrieved the traditional argument of Iranian philosophy that “mystical knowledge (‘irfān) is . . . the foundation of a true sage (perfect man)” (Shimamoto, p. 30). Such knowledge supposedly reveals that “one can
find the source of the mystery of the world not in the phenomenal [i.e., not in the material] world, but in one’s heart, which is its source and in which the true mystery (the Truth) is found” (Shimamoto, p. 30).

Self-knowledge into the “heart” or “soul,” therefore, becomes a necessary condition for achieving Muslim psychological health. However, it is not sufficient. The soul must also be purified. Motahhari believed, “If a person purifies his heart and travels by a vehicle of love to the status of Perfect Man, the barrier between he and God will be completely removed, and he can reach God through his own interpretation (ta’bir-e khodeshān)” (Shimamoto, 2008, p. 31). Motahhari also found support for this idea in the Qur’an. The Rendering Asunder (84:6) says, for example, “O, man! Surely you must strive (to attain) to your Lord, a hard striving until you meet Him.” The Sun (91: 9-10) adds, “He will indeed be successful who purifies it (his soul). And he will indeed fail who corrupts it” (Qur’an verses as quoted by Shimamoto, p. 31). In short, Motahhari essentially articulated the position that self-knowledge must be combined with a control or purification of the self in order to achieve the Muslim psychological ideal.

Preliminary support for these arguments has in fact been obtained. An Integrative Self-Knowledge Scale records efforts of the individual to integrate past, present, and desired future self-experience. In Iranian Muslims, this scale has predicted self- and peer-reported psychological adjustment (Ghorbani, Watson, & Hargis, 2008; Tahmasb, Ghorbani, & Watson, 2008; Ghorbani, Cunningham, & Watson, 2010) and also higher levels of religious commitment and spirituality (Ghorbani, Watson, Shahmohamadi, & Cunningham, 2009). With regard to purification of the “heart,” an extensive research literature increasingly associates self-control with religion and with beneficial forms of self-regulation (McCullough & Willoughby, 2009). Research into such linkages has been facilitated through development of the Self-Control Scale (Tangney, Baumeister, & Boone, 2004), and in Pakistani Muslims, responding on a brief version of this instrument has predicted apparently more adaptive forms of religious commitment and lower levels of depression and anxiety (Khan, Watson, & Cothran, 2008).

In short, research with Muslims already points toward the potential importance of self-knowledge and self-control in understanding Motahhari’s psychological ideal. However, no previous Muslim study has examined the religious implications of self-knowledge and self-control simultaneously; yet, Motahhari’s philosophy argues that both should be important. His thinking also implies that an interaction between the two might serve as a further indicator of Muslim religiousness. Such an interaction would presumably
reveal even stronger Muslim commitments to a self-insightful self-control. In
the present project, multiple regression procedures examined whether self-
knowledge and self-control made independent and interactive contributions
to the prediction of self-reported Muslim religious commitments and experi-
ence. These procedures, therefore, made it possible to further assess the dia-
logical validity of well-established measures in the psychology of religion for
use with Muslims.

Religious Measures

This study evaluated religious measures that have a research history with Mus-
lim samples (Ghorbani, Watson, & Khan 2007; Ghorbani et al., 2009). As a
measure of religious motivation (Gorsuch & McPherson, 1989), the Intrinsic
Scale attempts to operationalize a sincere form of faith in which religion sup-
plies the ultimate motivation in life (e.g., “my whole approach to life is based
on my religion”). Extrinsic measures assess the use of religion as a means to
some other end. An Extrinsic Personal Scale records the use of religion to
achieve personal well-being and appears in the claim, “What religion offers me
most is comfort in times of trouble and sorrow.” The Extrinsic Social Scale
reflects the use of religion to obtain some social gain and is illustrated in the
self-report that “I go to the mosque mainly because I enjoy seeing people I
know there.”

The Quest Scale (Batson & Schoenrade 1991a, b) describes an orientation
in which “religion involves an open-ended, responsive dialogue with existen-
tial questions raised by the contradictions and tragedies of life” (Batson,
Schoenrade, & Ventis 1993, p. 169). Exemplifying Quest is the assertion that
“I was not very interested in religion until I began to ask questions about the
meaning and purpose of life.”

Self-reported mystical experience was measured with Hood’s (1975) Mysti-
cism Scale. This instrument assesses three dimensions of mysticism that Stace
(1960) identified as common across cultures (Hood, Morris, & Watson 1993).
Extrovertive Mysticism involves an experience of the “ultimate oneness of
all things” (Stace, 76), and is illustrated in the claim that “I have had an
experience in which I felt everything in the world to be part of the same
whole.” With Introvertive Mysticism, the individual becomes aware of an
ultimate void (e.g., “I have had an experience in which I had no sense of time
and space”). The tendency to make sense of mystical experience in religious
terms is measured by the Religious Interpretation factor, which includes such
statements as “I have had an experience which I knew to be sacred.” A recent
confirmatory factor analysis demonstrated that these three factors adequately described the mystical experience of Iranian Muslims (Hood et al., 2001).

Attempts to measure spirituality used Piedmont’s (2004) Assessment of Spirituality and Religious Sentiments (ASPIRES). This battery of measures includes three subscales from the Spiritual Transcendence Scale (Piedmont, 1999). Illustrative of the Prayer Fulfillment dimension of spirituality is the assertion that “I meditate and/or pray so that I can grow as a person.” The Universality subscale is reflected in such claims as “all life is interconnected” and “there is an order to the universe that transcends human thinking.” Connectedness is defined as a sense of relationship to others both in the present and in the past and future of one’s own religious community (Piedmont 1999, p. 996). “The praise of others gives deep satisfaction to my accomplishments” exemplifies connectedness within the present community. The reverse scored claim that “death does stop one’s feeling of emotional closeness to another” illustrates connectedness with the past and future.

The ASPIRES also includes two measures of Religious Sentiment, Religiosity and Religious Crisis. Religiosity supplies a general index of religious commitment and records such things as the frequency of reading the Qu’ran, prayer, and attendance at religious activities. Religious Crisis operationalizes a disturbance in religious confidence and faith. Illustrative of Religious Crisis are self-reports that “I feel abandoned by God” and that “I feel isolated from others in my faith group.”

Previous Muslim investigations suggest that these religious variables can be subdivided into three broad categories (Ghorbani, Watson, & Khan 2007; Ghorbani, Watson, & Rostami 2007; Ghorbani & Watson 2009; Ghorbani et al., 2009). Some measures correlate positively with each other and display at least some linkages with healthier psychological functioning. This category of adaptive Muslim measures includes the Intrinsic and the Extrinsic Personal Scales along with Extrovertive Mysticism, Religious Interpretation, Prayer Fulfillment, Universality, Connectedness, and Religiosity. Negative correlations with these apparently more adaptive religious measures and associations with maladjustment identify Religious Crisis as a maladaptive Muslim measure. Inconsistent connections with the adaptive Muslim measures along with weak, inconsistent, and sometimes negative as well as positive correlations with psychological adjustment identify the Extrinsic Social, Quest, and Introvertive Mysticism variables as ambiguous Muslim measures, which may therefore lack dialogical validity.

Within this ambiguous category, the Extrinsic Social Scale may be especially noteworthy in that some Muslims have evaluated this measure to con-
tain statements that are offensive to their faith (Khan, Watson, & Habib 2005). Previous Muslim studies also found that Extrinsic Social responding was significantly lower than Intrinsic and Extrinsic Personal scores, suggesting that this motivation may indeed have problematic implications for use with such samples (Ghorbani, Watson, & Khan 2007).

Hypotheses

In summary, this project assessed the dialogical validity of prominent measures in the Western psychology of religion by relating them to Motahhari’s Muslim psychological ideal. Procedures made it possible to test four most important hypotheses.

First, Integrative Self-Knowledge and Self Control Scales should correlate positively. This possibility seemed obvious in Motahhari’s suggestion that the two can and should go together in the cultural creation of the “Perfect Man.”

Second, Self-Control and Integrative Self-Knowledge Scales should correlate positively with adaptive and negatively with maladaptive Muslim measures. Such outcomes would confirm Motahhari’s assumptions about how these two self-related processes describe the Muslim religious and spiritual ideal.

Third, multiple regression procedures should reveal that Self-Control and Integrative Self-Control Scales make independent contributions to the prediction of Muslim religious functioning. This hypothesis seemed apparent in Motahhari’s claim that both are important.

Fourth, Self-Control and Integrative Self-Knowledge might interact to explain even greater variance in Muslim religiousness. Interactions between the two, for example, might reveal that an especially self-insightful self-control can at least sometimes serve as a marker of higher adaptive and lower maladaptive Muslim religiousness.

Finally, inclusion of ambiguous religious measures in this project made it possible to further explore their questionable dialogical validity for use with Muslims.

Method

Participants

Students at the University of Tehran served as the research participants. The sample included 129 women, 114 men, and 2 individuals who failed to self-report their sex. Average age was 21.4 years ($SD = 2.38$).
Measures

Psychological scales appeared in a questionnaire booklet that contained instruments associated with a number of research projects. A Persian version of the Integrative Self-Knowledge Scale was created during initial development of this instrument (Ghorbani, Watson, & Hargis, 2008). Translations of all other measures occurred in preparation for the present or previous studies. In these procedures, one individual translated questionnaire items from English into Persian, and then another translated them back into English. Differences between original and back-translated statements were rare, carefully analyzed, and easily resolved through revisions in the Persian translation.

Previous Muslim studies have found that internal reliabilities for the constructs of this project were generally acceptable for research purposes: Integrative Self-Knowledge ($\alpha = .81$; Ghorbani, Watson, & Hargis, 2008); Self-Control ($\alpha = .63$; Khan et al., 2008); Quest ($\alpha = .71$; Ghorbani & Watson, 2009); the Extrovertive ($\alpha = .89$), Introvertive ($\alpha = .78$), and Religious Interpretation ($\alpha = .86$) factors of mystical experience (Ghorbani & Watson, 2009); the Prayer Fulfillment ($\alpha = .90$), Universality ($\alpha = .74$), and Connectedness ($\alpha = .50$) measures of spiritual transcendence (Ghorbani et al. 2009); and the Religiosity ($\alpha = .73$) and Religious Crisis ($\alpha = .78$) subscales of the Religious Sentiment Scale (Ghorbani et al. 2009). Poorer internal reliabilities for Connectedness have been observed with non-Muslim samples as well (e.g., Dyliacco, Kennedy, Parker, & Piedmont, 2005; Piedmont, 2007). Past Iranian studies used translations of the original Allport and Ross (1966) Religious Orientation Scales but sometimes obtained lower internal reliabilities for the Intrinsic ($\alpha = .57$), Extrinsic Personal ($\alpha = .53$), and Extrinsic Social ($\alpha = .62$) orientations (Ghorbani, Watson, & Shahmohamadi, 2008). This study used a translation of the Gorsuch and McPherson (1989) revision of these instruments in a successful attempt to improve internal reliability (see below).

All but one of these measures utilized a 0 to 4 response scale. The Quest Scale (Batson & Schoenrade, 1991a, 1991b) presented response options ranging from 0 to 3. As in previous Iranian studies, a scale item displaying a negative item-to-total correlation was eliminated in order to maximize internal reliability of the measure.

Again, in addition to measures of Integrative Self-Knowledge ($\alpha = .74$, $M$ response per item = 2.57, $SD = 0.66$) and Quest ($\alpha = .70$, $M = 1.39$, $SD = 0.47$), participants responded to the brief Self-Control Scale ($\alpha = .80$, $M = 2.25$, $SD = 0.68$) of Tangney, et al. (2004), the Gorsuch and McPherson (1989) Religious Orientation Scales which included Intrinsic ($\alpha = .82$, $M =$
2.52, SD = 0.82), Extrinsic Personal (α = .82, M = 2.66, SD = 1.03), and Extrinsic Social (α = .71, M = 1.17, SD = 0.91) religious motivations; the Hood (1975) Mysticism Scale that included Extrovertive Mysticism (α = .81, M = 2.40, SD = 0.67), Introvertive Mysticism (α = .69, M = 2.24, SD = 0.71), and Religious Interpretation (α = .81, M = 2.64, SD = 0.68) factors (Hood et al., 1993); the Prayer Fulfillment (α = .90, M = 2.78, SD = 0.89), Universality (α = .68, M = 2.76; SD = 0.63), and Connectedness (α = .57, M = 2.60, SD = 0.65) dimensions of the Spiritual Transcendence Scale (Piedmont, 1999, 2004); and the Religiosity (α = .73, M = 2.53, SD = 1.03) and Religious Crisis (α = .62, M = 1.25, SD = 0.81) subscales of the Religious Sentiment Scale (Piedmont, 2004; Horn, Piedmont, Fialkowski, Wicks, & Hunt, 2005).

Procedure

Participation in this study was voluntary, anonymous, and in compliance with institutional ethical guidelines. Groups of 20 to 40 students responded to questionnaire booklets in a classroom setting. Examinations of all scales focused on the average response per item. Preliminary analyses assessed the possible influence of sex on observed relationships. Correlations and multiple regressions then clarified the relationships among measures. Multiple regression procedures followed the recommendations of Cohen, Cohen, West, and Aiken (2003) for moderated regression analysis. Specifically, Integrative Self-Knowledge and Self-Control predictor variables were standardized and their cross-products computed. Standardized scores were then employed in a hierarchical analysis with the cross-product entered on the second step after the two standardized scales had been entered on the first step. Report of the multiple regression results centered on unstandardized coefficients given that variables were standardized prior to entry.

Results

Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) revealed significant overall sex differences (Wilks’ Lambda = 0.87, F [14/224] = 2.39, p = .004) which are reviewed in Table 1. Men scored higher than women on Integrative Self-Knowledge. All other significant outcomes identified women as more religious than men. This was apparent in their average responding on the Intrinsic Scale, the Extrinsic Personal orientation, Prayer Fulfillment, Connectedness, and Religiosity. Most importantly, however, the two sexes did not differ in
Table 1. Means (M), Standard Errors (SE) and Analysis of Variance (F) Involving Sex Differences in Integrative Self-Knowledge, Self-Control and Religious Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Self-Knowledge</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>4.49*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>8.37**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Personal</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>10.64**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Social</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quest</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mysticism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrovertive</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introvertive</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Interpretation</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Transcendence and Religious Sentiment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer Fulfillment</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>10.36**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universality</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectedness</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>4.08*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>4.82*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Crisis</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05   ** p < .01   *** p < .001

their patterns of relationship among measures (Box’s M = 106.60, F [105/166292.3] = 0.95, p = .62), indicating that an examination of all hypotheses could concentrate on the full sample data.

Table 2 presents correlations among religious variables. As would be expected of adaptive Muslim measures, positive relationships appeared among the Intrinsic, Extrinsic Personal, Extrovertive Mysticism, Religious Interpretation, Prayer Fulfillment, Universality, Connectedness, and Religiosity instruments. Negative correlations with each of these measures confirmed Religious Crisis as an operationalization of insecure religiosity. A failure to display negative linkages with Religious Crisis pointed toward the remaining three vari-
ables as more ambiguous. Quest correlated positively only with Introvertive Mysticism and Universality. Along with its direct connection with Quest, Introvertive Mysticism was associated with higher scores on Religious Interpretation, Universality, and Connectedness. The Extrinsic Social factor correlated positively with the Intrinsic and Extrinsic Personal Scales, Prayer Fulfillment, Universality, and Religiosity.

As noted, the Extrinsic Social motivation has tended to be lower than the Intrinsic and Extrinsic Personal orientations in previous Muslim samples (Ghorbani, Watson, & Khan 2007). Significant differences in these three motivations appeared once again [Greenhouse-Geisser $F(1.67/399.60) = 320.31$, $p < .001$]. Least Significant Difference (LSD) post hoc analyses revealed that the Extrinsic Social mean ($M = 1.17$, $SD = 0.91$) was in fact lower than averages for the other two motivations ($p < .001$). Intrinsic scores ($M = 2.52$, $SD = 0.82$) were also lower than those observed for the Extrinsic Personal orientation ($M = 2.66$, $SD = 1.03$, $p = .005$).

Integrative Self-Knowledge was associated with higher levels of Self-Control ($r = .40$, $p < .001$). Correlation and multiple regression results for these two scales appear in Table 3. Integrative Self-Knowledge correlated positively with the Intrinsic, Extrinsic Social, Religious Interpretation, Prayer Fulfillment, Universality, and Religiosity measures and negatively with Religious Crisis. Self-Control displayed all of these relationships, plus positive linkages with the Extrinsic Personal and Connectedness measures.

In the first step of the hierarchical multiple regression analyses, Self-Control proved to be the sole reliable predictor of higher scores on the Intrinsic, Extrinsic Personal, Extrinsic Social, Prayer Fulfillment, Connectedness, and Religiosity variables. Integrative Self-Knowledge was the lone positive predictor of Religious Interpretation. Both Self-Control and Integrative Self-Knowledge combined to explain higher levels of Extrovertive Mysticism and Universality and lower levels of Religious Crisis. Integrative Self-Knowledge was a positive predictor of Introvertive Mysticism, whereas Self-Control displayed an opposite association.

Integrative Self-Knowledge and Self-Control interacted to explain variance in four measures: the Extrinsic Social Scale, Extrovertive Mysticism, Religious Interpretation, and Connectedness. Clarification of these interactions rested upon procedures spelled out by Aiken and West (1991) and Cohen et al. (2003). Specifically, relationships of Self-Control with each dependent variable were graphed at three levels of the moderator variable Integrative Self-Knowledge set at $-2 SD$, $0$, and $+2 SD$ from its $M$ level. As Figure 1 demonstrates, similar patterns of relationship appeared for three of the four
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious Orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Intrinsic</td>
<td>.68***</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>.76***</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.69***</td>
<td>−.42***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Extrinsic Personal</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.75***</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td>−.29***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Extrinsic Social</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>−.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.18***</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>−.01</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>−.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Quest</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mysticism</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Extrovertive</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td>.68***</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>−.20**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Introvertive</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Religious Interpretation</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>−.36***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spiritual Transcendence and Religious Sentiment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Prayer Fulfillment</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>.66***</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>.66***</td>
<td>−.45**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Universality</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>−.42**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Connectedness</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>−.25***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Religiosity</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>−.25***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Religious Crisis</td>
<td>−</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  ** p < .01  *** p < .001
Table 3. Correlation and Multiple Regression Analyses of Integrative Self-Knowledge (ISK) and Self-Control (SC) with Religious Commitment and Experience Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Adj. $R^2$</th>
<th>Adj. $R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ISK</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>$\beta$(ISK)</td>
<td>$\beta$(SC)</td>
<td>Adj. $R^2$</td>
<td>$\beta$(ISK)</td>
<td>$\beta$(SC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>0.20***</td>
<td>0.37***</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.28***</td>
<td>0.13***</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.27***</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.29***</td>
<td>0.06***</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.29***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Social</td>
<td>0.18***</td>
<td>0.25***</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.20***</td>
<td>0.06***</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.24***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quest</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mysticism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrovertive</td>
<td>0.21***</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.10*</td>
<td>0.10*</td>
<td>0.06***</td>
<td>0.10*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introvertive</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>-0.12*</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>-0.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Interpretation</td>
<td>0.30***</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
<td>0.19***</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.09***</td>
<td>0.19***</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Transcendence and Religious Sentiment</td>
<td>0.18***</td>
<td>0.34***</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.29***</td>
<td>0.11***</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.28***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfillment</td>
<td>0.22***</td>
<td>0.27***</td>
<td>0.08*</td>
<td>0.14***</td>
<td>0.08***</td>
<td>0.09*</td>
<td>0.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universality</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
<td>0.03**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectedness</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.35***</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.34***</td>
<td>0.12***</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.36***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>-0.29***</td>
<td>-0.31***</td>
<td>-0.16**</td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td>-0.12***</td>
<td>0.12***</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$  ** $p < .01$  *** $p < .001$
measures. When Integrative Self-Knowledge was high, Self-Control exhibited a positive linkage with Extrovertive Mysticism, Religious Interpretation, and Connectedness. When Integrative Self-Knowledge was low, this association tended to be negative. An opposite pattern appeared for the Extrinsic Social factor. In other words, the relationship between Self-Control and the Extrinsic Social motivation was positive when Integrative Self-Knowledge was low and slightly negative when Integrative Self-Knowledge was high.

Discussion

Hypotheses of this investigation assessed the dialogical validity of widely used measures in the psychology of religion by relating them to the Muslim psychological ideal described by the Iranian philosopher Mortazā Motahhari. Each hypothesis received support. First, Integrative Self-Knowledge and Self Control correlated positively, in conformity with Motahhari’s suggestion that the two should go together in the cultural construction of the “Perfect Man.” Second, Self-Control and Integrative Self-Knowledge correlated positively with adaptive and negatively with maladaptive Muslim measures. This pattern supported Motahhari’s assumptions about how self-knowledge and self-purification should describe the Muslim ideal. Third, Self-Control and Integrative Self-Control Scales made independent contributions to the prediction of Muslim religious measures, supporting Motahhari’s claim that both are important. Finally, Self-Control and Integrative Self-Knowledge interacted to explain even greater variance in at least some measures of Muslim religiousness. These significant interactions confirmed that an especially self-insightful self-control can at least sometimes serve as a marker of Muslim religiousness. Also noteworthy were findings that religious measures previously established as having ambiguous implications for use with Muslims once again yielded an ambiguous pattern of relationships. These measures apparently lacked dialogical validity.

These data further illustrated the assumptions and potentials of the ISM. According to the ISM, influences of ideology are unavoidable in the psychology of religion and necessitate a formal openness to diversity. A greater, though not absolute “objectivity” requires a dialogical empiricism that brings etic social scientific and emic religious perspectives into dialog. Dialogical research programs must, among other things, establish the dialogical validity of measures so that etic forms of understanding can clarify and be clarified by emic insights. Previous Muslim studies illustrated how dialogical validity can be
Fig. 1. Interactions between integrative self-knowledge and self control in predicting the extrinsic social factor, extrovertive mysticism, religious interpretation, and connectedness.
established by examining relationships between etic and emic operationalizations of religion (Khan & Watson, 2004, 2010). Demonstration of dialogical validity could also occur if etic religious measures display expected associations with interpretations of psychological functioning that emerge directly out of emic religious frameworks. The present project documented that possibility by using well established measures in the psychology of religion to analyze Motahhari’s “Perfect Man” (ensān-e kāmel).

Again, Motahhari’s “Perfect Man” essentially combines self-knowledge with self-control. In conformity with his interpretation of the Muslim ideal, Integrative Self-Knowledge and Self-Control predicted higher scores on what research has previously established as adaptive Muslim measures (Ghorbani, Watson, & Khan 2007; Ghorbani et al., 2009). They also correlated negatively with the insecure faith of Religious Crisis. Multiple regression analyses further demonstrated that Self-Control was the more consistent predictor of religious functioning, but Integrative Self-Knowledge was the critical factor in explaining variance in the Religious Interpretation of mystical experience. Integrative Self-Knowledge and Self-Control also combined to independently describe variance in Extrovertive Mysticism, Universality, and Religious Crisis. In short, associations with Integrative Self-Knowledge and Self-Control further confirmed the dialogical validity of the Intrinsic, Extrinsic Personal, Extrovertive Mysticism, Religious Interpretation, Prayer Fulfillment, Universality, Connectedness, and Religiosity Scales as adaptive and Religious Crisis as maladaptive Muslim measures.

Integrative Self-Knowledge and Self-Control also displayed interactions in predicting three adaptive Muslim measures. Motahhari’s arguments imply that the interactions of an especially self-insightful self-control could be a marker of Muslim faith (Shimamoto, 2008). Motahhari more specifically emphasized mystical knowledge (‘irfān) as central in the Muslim development of the “Perfect Man,” and Integrative Self-Knowledge and Self-Control in fact interacted to explain greater variance in Extrovertive Mysticism and in the Religious Interpretation of mystical experience. In each instance, higher Self-Control predicted greater mystical experience in those who were also higher in Integrative Self-Knowledge. This outcome conformed to Motahhari’s suggestion that mystical knowledge figures prominently in the self-insightful self-control of the “Perfect Man.” Higher self-control also tended to predict lower mystical experience in those who were lower in Integrative Self-Knowledge. This result perhaps revealed that mystical experience in the absence of self-insight produces disturbances that lead to a defensive self-control. Future research will need to test that possibility.
Connectedness was another adaptive Muslim measure for which an interaction appeared. This result first revealed that higher levels of self-control and self-knowledge interacted to predict even stronger integration of the individual within the community. In contrast, higher Self-Control along with reduced Integrative Self-Knowledge seemed to work against Connectedness. This latter result perhaps indicated that control of the self without self-insight may lead to a kind of obsessiveness that interferes with meaningful communal integration. This too is a question for future research. In that research, it may be important to remember that the Connectedness Scale once again displayed poorer internal consistency (also see, Ghorbani et al., 2009; Dy-Liacco et al., 2005; Piedmont, 2007) and that a sense of connectedness may be especially relevant to Muslim beliefs about the importance of a compassionate community or *ummah* (Armstrong, 2000). Future clarifications of this interaction may, therefore, need to be accompanied by development of a more internally reliable and explicitly emic Muslim measure of Connectedness.

Integrative Self-Knowledge and Self-Control also interacted to predict an Extrinsic Social motivation that has had ambiguous implications in previous Muslim investigations (Ghorbani, Watson, & Khan 2007). In the present study, the Extrinsic Social Scale did correlate positively with both Self-Control and Integrative Self-Knowledge and also with the Intrinsic, Extrinsic Personal, Prayer Fulfillment, Universality, and Religiosity Scales. On the other hand, the Extrinsic Social measure failed to display an association with Religious Crisis and once again was lower on average than the Intrinsic and Extrinsic Personal motivations. For those high in Self-Control, higher Integrative Self-Knowledge also predicted lower levels of the Extrinsic Social orientation. Empirical indicators of Motahhari’s “Perfect Man,” therefore, interacted to predict tendencies to reject this motivation. Conversely, for those lower in Self-Control, higher Integrative Self-Knowledge was associated higher Extrinsic Social scores. Self-insight without self-control, therefore, may have facilitated a religious motivation that deviated from Motahhari’s Muslim ideal. Overall, this complex pattern of results once again suggested that the Extrinsic Social Scale may have an ambiguous dialogical validity that deserves additional attention in research with Muslims.

In conformity with previous studies, Introvertive Mysticism had ambiguous implications as well. Positive correlations with other mysticism factors and with Quest, Prayer Fulfillment, and Universality confirmed its spiritual significance. Introvertive Mysticism, nevertheless, did not correlate with Religious Crisis or with either Integrative Self-Knowledge or Self-Control. In the first step of a multiple regression, Introvertive Mysticism also predicted higher
Integrative Self-Knowledge, but lower Self-Control. This multiple regression result for Self-Control was perhaps most noteworthy in confirming the ambiguous dialogical validity of the Introvertive Mysticism Scale.

Quest was the third and final variable that previous Muslim research has identified as having an ambiguous dialogical validity. In this study, Quest was associated only with slightly higher levels of Introvertive Mysticism and Universality. Neither in correlations nor in the multiple regression procedures did this scale display associations with Integrative Self-Knowledge, Self-Control, or any other religious or spiritual measures. Quest may, therefore, have limited utility in efforts to study the Muslim struggle to find religious meaning in life. Dover, Miner, and Dowson (2007) recently came to the same basic conclusion.

Limitations of this project of course deserve attention. These data reflected the responding of Iranian university students. Different findings might appear with samples taken from other age and socioeconomic groups. Iran is a predominantly Shiite Muslim society, and these results may not generalize to Sunni Muslims or to samples of Shiites or Sunni Muslims living as a minority in another society. This project assumed that Integrative Self-Knowledge and Self-Control Scales operationalized psychological processes that were relevant Motahhari’s “Perfect Man.” Research correlating these scales with emic measures of Muslim religion (e.g., Khan & Watson, 2010) would be useful in further confirming their validity for this purpose. Finally, to conclude that Western measures of religion have dialogical validity in studying Muslim samples does not mean that they are ideal. Future investigations might discover that more explicitly Muslim operationalizations of faith yield even stronger patterns of relationship with a self-insightful self-control.

In summary, this project established the dialogical validity of Western religious measures by using them to examine psychological functioning as interpreted within a non-Western Muslim religious framework. In line with the arguments of Motahhari (2000), mystical experience proved to be relevant to the Muslim ideal of a self-insightful self-control. More generally, Intrinsic, Extrinsic Personal, Extrovertive Mysticism, Religious Interpretation, Prayer Fulfillment, Universality, Connectedness, and Religiosity Scales displayed linkages with Self-Control and Integrative Self-Knowledge that confirmed their dialogical validity as adaptive Muslim measures. Religious Crisis proved to be a dialogically valid maladaptive Muslim measure. The Extrinsic Social, Introvertive Mysticism, and Quest Scales had at least somewhat ambiguous implications for a Muslim psychology of religion. Overall, these data illus-
trated how formal efforts to examine the dialogical validity of research instruments have a potential to use etic forms of understanding to clarify and to be clarified by emic insights.
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