Supplement to *Intrinsic Religiosity Attenuates the Negative Relationship Between Social*

Disconnectedness and Meaning in Life

Caleb J. Reynolds, Spencer M. Smith, & Paul Conway

Supplementary Method

In addition to the measures reported in the main text, participants also completed a pair of measures thought to tap lay moral realism and a single-item measure of religiosity. All materials are available at osf.io/2yhr8.

Participants completed Goodwin and Darley's (2012) moral objectivism procedure. Based on previous theorizing, Goodwin and Darley (2008, 2010, 2012) took lay moral objectivism to involve two beliefs: a) moral claims have truth values, and b) when two moral claims compete, one must be wrong. To generate scores for moral objectivism, participants read scenarios featuring a variety of moral acts and provide responses to questions targeting the two beliefs thought to be necessary for objectivism. In the present study, participants responded to the six moral transgressions from Goodwin and Darley (2012), which involved stealing, assaulting, lying, desecrating, performing a disrespectful gesture, and burning a flag. For each scenario, participants rated three features on scales with no midpoint. Participants indicated their agreement the claim that the act was morally wrong (1: *Strongly disagree*, 6: *Strongly agree*) and rated the extent to which they thought there was a single correct answer about whether or not the act was wrong (i.e., the claim has a truth value; 1: *No correct answer*, 6: *Definitely a correct answer*). Participants were then told to suppose that another participant gave the opposite of their evaluation of the wrongness of the act and rated the extent to which they thought the other person must be mistaken, as opposed to neither party being mistaken (1: *Neither of us need be mistaken*, 6: *Other person is clearly mistaken*). Following Goodwin and Darley (2012), we

averaged these latter two assessments for all claims to generate a general objectivism score for each participant, with higher scores corresponding to more objectivist views.

Participants also completed the moral relativism subscale from Forsyth's (1980) Ethics Position Questionnaire. Because the original hypotheses for this dataset involved moral absolutism, thought to be the inverse of relativism, we scored the Ethics Position Questionnaire such that higher scores denote less relativistic responses (i.e., more absolutist responses).

Finally, participants rated their degree of religiosity on a single 7-point Likert scale ranging from *not religious at all* (1), to *extremely religious* (7).

We used G*Power (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007) for the sensitivity analysis and R for all other analyses (Version 3.5.3; R Core Team, 2017), specifically the R-packages *apaTables* (Version 2.0.5; Stanley, 2018), *car* (Version 3.0-3; Fox & Weisberg, 2019), *haven* (Version 2.0.0; Wickham & Miller, 2018), *jtools* (Version 1.1.1; Long, 2018), and *tidyverse* (Version 1.2.1; Wickham, 2017). Syntax is available at osf.io/2yhr8.

Supplementary Results

We present descriptive statistics and full correlations among all measures in Table S1. To check the robustness of the pattern of results reported in the main text, we analyzed a series of alternative models. First, we examined whether results were robust to the inclusion of demographic covariates, and whether results emerged when using a single-item measure of global religiosity. Moreover, given issues in the measurement of intrinsic religiosity among participants who were religiously unaffiliated, we analyzed several models to ensure that such participants were not artificially driving our results. These models excluded nonreligious participants according to multiple criteria, and utilized alternative scoring of our key moderators, intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity.

Demographic Covariates and Single-Item Religiosity

First, we reanalyzed the models in the main text while controlling for demographic predictors that were adequately represented in our sample: age, gender, religious affiliation (Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, No religious affiliation), and race/ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic). We effect-coded religious affiliation and race/ethnicity, so regression coefficients for those variables represent deviations from the grand mean (Darlington & Hayes, 2017). Controlling for these covariates did not change the pattern of results: Intrinsic religiosity still significantly attenuated the relationship between social disconnection and presence of meaning in life, but this effect did not emerge for extrinsic religiosity or for search for meaning in life (Table S2).

Second, we analyzed a pair of models using the single-item measure of religiosity, rather than intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity. Specifically, we tested models predicting presence of meaning in life and search for meaning in life from religiosity, social disconnection, and their interaction (Table S3). In these single-item models, religiosity did not significantly attenuate the negative relationship between social disconnection and either presence of or search for meaning in life. It is unclear what this difference in results implies. It is highly plausible that this difference simply reflects the fact that this single-item measure is less sensitive than our multi-item measure of intrinsic religiosity. However, it might also reflect a meaningful difference between global evaluations of religiosity and more specific evaluations of religiosity, such as specific motivational orientations toward religion (as in the main text) or religious beliefs separate from religious attendance (as in Chan, Michalak, & Ybarra, 2019). Future work might profitably clarify this point.

Measuring Intrinsic Religiosity Among Religious "Nones"

Prior researchers have noted that the particular wording of some of the intrinsic religiosity items made it difficult for people without a religious affiliation (i.e., religious "nones"; Pew Research Center, 2015) to know whether to indicate that they agree or disagree with the items, thus making it difficult to complete the measure (e.g., Maltby, McCollam, & Millar, 1994). Accordingly, Maltby and Lewis (1996) tested whether issues with noncompletion on the Age-Universal Intrinsic/Extrinsic Religiosity Scale (Gorsuch & Venable, 1983) could be ameliorated by leading the items with the instruction "Think about each item carefully, Does the attitude or behavior described in the statement apply to me?" (p. 940) and using a three-point scale formed of *No* (1), *Not certain* (2), and *Yes* (3). Indeed, they found that using these applicability response scales (rather than agreement scales) virtually eliminated noncompletion of the measure and improved internal consistency. They took this as evidence that amending the response scale for this measure made it appropriate for use among nonreligious participants.[1]

Following Maltby and Lewis' recommendations, in the present study, we had participants complete the Revised Intrinsic/Extrinsic Religiosity Scale (Gorsuch & McPherson, 1989; revised from the measure by Gorsuch & Venable, 1983) on seven-point scales anchored at *Does not apply to me at all* (1) and *Strongly applies to me* (7). Maltby and Lewis (1996) suggested three-point scales as described above, but we used seven-point scales to increase sensitivity and reliability (e.g., Maitland, 2009). The intrinsic religiosity subscale of this measure contains five normally worded items and three negatively worded items. Internal consistency of the eight intrinsic religiosity items was adequate, $\alpha = .77$ (Table 1 in the main text).

However, on the suggestion of an anonymous reviewer, we examined internal consistency of the intrinsic religiosity scale separately among participants who were religiously

---

[1] Maltby and Day (1998) later made the same argument for revising Batson's measure of Quest religious orientation (Batson & Schoenrade, 1991).

unaffiliated (i.e., those who identified their current religious affiliation as *Atheist/agnostic* or *Nothing in particular*) and religious affiliated (all others). Among religiously affiliated participants, intrinsic religiosity exhibited good internal consistency (α = .83), but among religiously unaffiliated participants, internal consistency approximated random responding (α = .02, not a typo). Principal axis factor analyses (with oblimin rotation) splitting the sample by religious affiliation (affiliated vs. unaffiliated) revealed that the three reverse-coded items performed differently in the two groups. In both groups, the eight intrinsic religiosity items loaded onto two factors, one each for the positively and negatively worded items (5 and 3 items, respectively). However, in the religiously affiliated group the two factors positively correlated, r = .25, whereas in the religiously unaffiliated group the two factors *negatively* correlated, r = -.62. Consequently, a composite of the positively worded items was positively correlated with the a composite of the (recoded) negatively worded items for religiously affiliated participants, $r(635)$ = .26, $p < .001$, but the two composites were strongly *negatively* correlated for religiously unaffiliated participants, $r(158)$ = -.50, $p < .001$.[2]

　　Thus, although participants with no religious affiliation could complete the measure with the applicability anchors, they apparently did so in a manner that reversed the meaning of the items relative to the same items among religiously affiliated participants. Examination of the three negatively worded items suggests some direction as to why these items are problematic:

1.　Although I believe in my religion, many other things are more important in life.

---

[2] We replicated this pattern of results in a separate sample of 469 MTurkers who completed the same items using the same instructions and response scales as in the present study (Reynolds, Gamez-Djokic, Molden, & Conway, 2020, Study 3). The five positively worded items hung together well among both religiously affiliated (α = .89) and unaffiliated (α = .86) participants, but internal consistency of the full 8-item measure was good among religiously affiliated participants (α = .84) and abysmal among religiously unaffiliated participants (α = .20). Moreover, this reflected the fact that the positively and negatively worded sets of items correlated positively among religiously affiliated participants $r(250)$ = .42, $p < .001$, but negatively among religiously unaffiliated participants, $r(215)$ = -.40, $p < .001$. Thus, the issues with this intrinsic religiosity measure among nonreligious participants are not specific to the present sample or to undergraduate samples more generally.

2. Although I am religious, I don't let it affect my daily life.

3. It doesn't much matter what I believe so long as I am good.

The issue with the first and second items is almost certainly that they are double-barreled: They explicitly include statements that one is religious in addition to statements that get at the intrinsic motivation component. Thus, when reverse-scoring these items, a person who is not religious can easily say statements 1 and 2 do not apply to them (because they are not, in fact, religious, as the statement says), and thus end up with a high intrinsic religiosity score on these items once they are recoded. Indeed, 66.3% and 78.1% of religiously unaffiliated participants selected the lowest value "1 - Does not apply to me at all" for these two items (respectively). The issue with the third item is a little less obvious, and indeed, only 22.5% of religiously unaffiliated participants endorsed the lowest value (and thus received the highest score on this item). The rest of the responses to item three were heavily negatively skewed for religiously unaffiliated participants, as one would expect if this item functions as a reverse-scored intrinsic religiosity item. The issue with this item might be that some participants who encounter this item in the middle of a religiosity scale interpret "what I believe" to necessarily include religious beliefs, which they don't have (hence, "Does not apply to me"), and for such participants the item effectively becomes double-barreled in the same way as the first two items. Thus, when using Maltby and Lewis' (1996) suggestion for anchors, the negatively worded items do not function appropriately among nonreligious participants, and we recommend that other researchers do not employ these items, especially with the applicability wording suggested by Maltby and Lewis (1996).

We are certainly not the first to note this issue with intrinsic religiosity scales. Notably, Cohen and colleagues (2017) examined measurement properties of the Revised

Intrinsic/Extrinsic Religiosity Scales and noted that the negatively worded items worsened model fit for intrinsic religiosity and were double-barreled. Thus, they suggested excluding such items from scoring the Revised Intrinsic/Extrinsic Religiosity Scales. However, the extent of the issue we observed here may not have been visible in their data, which consisted of religious samples.

Excluding Religiously Unaffiliated Participants

To ascertain the effects of these measurement issues on our present results, we analyzed several alternative models. The key pattern of results—the negative relationship between social disconnectedness and presence of meaning in life is attenuated among those high in intrinsic religiosity—held when excluding just atheists and agnostics (Table S4), and when excluding anyone who was religiously unaffiliated (Table S5), despite the fact that these exclusions restrict the variance in intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity, and may restrict the variance in meaning in life.[3] Moreover, as in the primary analyses reported in the main text, this same attenuation was not observed for extrinsic religiosity or for search for meaning in life (Tables S4 & S5).

Alternative Scoring of Religiosity Measures

More directly, we reanalyzed the data following Cohen and colleagues' (2017) recommendations for scoring the Revised Intrinsic/Extrinsic Religiosity Scale. Cohen et al. argue that the measure is better scored as a 3-factor scale in which negatively worded intrinsic religiosity items are dropped and extrinsic religiosity is split into separate components for social and personal motivations. This scoring format offers two key advances for the present project.

---

[3] As noted by an anonymous reviewer, prior work suggests that meaning in life is higher among the religiously affiliated than the unaffiliated. Indeed, participants who were religiously affiliated ($n = 637$) were higher on presence of meaning in life ($M = 5.16$, $SD = 1.18$) than participants who were religiously unaffiliated ($n = 160$, $M = 4.46$, $SD = 1.25$), $t(795) = 6.71$, $p < .001$, and lower on search for meaning in life ($M = 4.87$, $SD = 1.42$) vs ($M = 5.27$, $SD = 1.19$), $t(795) = -3.27$, $p = .001$. Thus, excluding religiously unaffiliated participants from analyses restricted the variance of intrinsic religiosity (σ^2 from 3.24 to 2.78) and slightly restricted the variance of presence of meaning in life (σ^2 from 1.51 to 1.40), yet the primary effects held regardless.

First, scoring just the five positively worded items should make the intrinsic religiosity scale more sensitive among religiously unaffiliated participants, as relationships between intrinsic religiosity and meaning in life will not be attenuated by group-specific unreliability. Second, splitting extrinsic religiosity into social and personal motivations might give a cleaner test of the competing hypothesis that the relationship between social disconnection and meaning in life is attenuated not by religious beliefs per se, but rather by people using religion as a means to fulfill social needs.

Therefore, we analyzed a pair of models in which these three factors (intrinsic religiosity [less the three negatively worded items], social extrinsic religiosity, and personal extrinsic religiosity) each interacted with social disconnection to predict presence of meaning in life and search for meaning in life (Table S6). As in the primary results reported in the main text, intrinsic religiosity attenuated the relationship between social disconnection and presence of meaning in life, but this effect was not observed for search for meaning in life, and neither social nor personal extrinsic religiosity interacted with social disconnection to predict either presence of or search for meaning in life (Table S6). Moreover, this same pattern largely held when excluding atheists and agnostics (Table S7), as well as when excluding atheists, agnostics, and people with no particular religious affiliation (Table S8): Intrinsic religiosity attenuated the relationship between social disconnectedness and presence of meaning in life in both models, but the model excluding atheists and agnostics suggested that the same relationship might be slightly enhanced among people high in personal extrinsic religiosity (Table S7).

The results from these models suggest two conclusions: 1) the key pattern of results is not driven by religiously unaffiliated participants who score low on intrinsic religiosity, and 2) the measurement issue among such participants is not dramatically influencing the key results. Thus,

we feel confident that our results are not driven by either measurement issues among

nonreligious participants or by the lower meaning in life among nonreligious participants.

Because the results do not change when analyzing in these alternative manners, we retain the

models employing the original scoring of intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity in the main text.

Conclusion

  Together, the several alternative models reported in this Supplement lend confidence to

our interpretation of our primary findings. Intrinsic religiosity's attenuation of the negative

relationship between social disconnection and presence of meaning in life held when controlling

for a variety of demographic covariates, when excluding nonreligious participants (for whom the

measure of intrinsic religiosity might be problematic), and when using alternative scoring

methods for intrinsic and extrinsic religiosity, though the effect did not emerge when using a

single item measure of religiosity.

Table S1

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for All Variables

Variable	M	SD	α	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Religiosity (Single Item)	3.50	1.83	--									
2. Intrinsic Religiosity	3.73	1.25	.77	**.76*****								
3. Extrinsic Religiosity	2.92	1.32	.84	**.70*****	**.55*****							
4. Lack of Social Connectedness	2.02	1.22	.94	**-.09***	-.05	.03						
5. Presence of Meaning in Life	5.02	1.23	.86	**.26*****	**.25*****	**.16*****	**-.49*****					
6. Search for Meaning in Life	4.95	1.39	.89	**-.08***	**-.10****	-.01	**.19*****	**-.15*****				
7. Moral Absolutism	3.99	0.96	.84	**.20*****	**.23*****	.06	**-.14*****	**.14*****	**-.14*****			
8. Moral Objectivism	5.32	1.21	.88	**.11****	**.10****	.05	-.06	**.12*****	.07	**.22*****		
9. Age	19.27	1.60	--	-.02	-.02	-.04	.03	-.03	.02	-.04	.00	
10. Gender (1=*w*, 2=*m*)	1.22	0.42	--	**-.08***	-.05	**-.10****	.04	-.05	**-.07***	**-.08***	-.01	.02

Note. M, SD, and α represent mean, standard deviation, and Cronbach's alpha, respectively. Values in square brackets indicate the 95% confidence interval for each correlation. Statistically significant results are bolded for emphasis.
* indicates *p* < .05, ** indicates *p* < .01, *** indicates *p* < .001.

Table S2

Regression Results Predicting Presence of and Search for Meaning with Demographic Covariates Included

Predictor	Presence of Meaning in Life				Search for Meaning in Life			
	β	β 95% CI [LL, UL]	sr^2	sr^2 95% CI [LL, UL]	β	β 95% CI [LL, UL]	sr^2	sr^2 95% CI [LL, UL]
(Intercept)	0.03	[-0.09, 0.14]			0.09	[-0.04, 0.23]		
Social Disconnectedness[†]	-0.47***	[-0.53, -0.41]	.21	[.17, .26]	0.18***	[0.11, 0.25]	.03	[.01, .05]
Intrinsic Religiosity[†]	0.21***	[0.13, 0.28]	.03	[.01, .05]	-0.14**	[-0.22, -0.05]	.01	[-.00, .03]
Extrinsic Religiosity[†]	0.01	[-0.07, 0.08]	.00	[-.00, .00]	0.11*	[0.02, 0.20]	.01	[-.00, .02]
Age[†]	-0.01	[-0.07, 0.05]	.00	[-.00, .00]	0.02	[-0.05, 0.09]	.00	[-.00, .00]
Gender[†]	-0.01	[-0.07, 0.04]	.00	[-.00, .00]	-0.08*	[-0.15, -0.02]	.01	[-.00, .02]
Protestant	-0.02	[-0.14, 0.11]	.00	[-.00, .00]	0.09	[-0.06, 0.23]	.00	[-.00, .01]
Catholic	0.09	[-0.03, 0.22]	.00	[-.00, .01]	-0.17*	[-0.31, -0.03]	.01	[-.00, .02]
Jewish	0.09	[-0.12, 0.30]	.00	[-.00, .00]	0.06	[-0.18, 0.31]	.00	[-.00, .00]
Religiously Unaffiliated	-0.24**	[-0.38, -0.09]	.01	[-.00, .02]	0.24**	[0.08, 0.41]	.01	[-.00, .02]
White	0.01	[-0.10, 0.13]	.00	[-.00, .00]	-0.14*	[-0.28, -0.01]	.01	[-.00, .01]
Black	0.08	[-0.10, 0.25]	.00	[-.00, .00]	-0.19	[-0.39, 0.01]	.00	[-.00, .01]
Hispanic	-0.09	[-0.23, 0.04]	.00	[-.00, .01]	-0.01	[-0.17, 0.15]	.00	[-.00, .00]
Social Disconnectedness[†] × Intrinsic Religiosity[†]	0.12**	[0.05, 0.19]	.01	[-.00, .02]	0.01	[-0.08, 0.09]	.00	[-.00, .00]
Social Disconnectedness[†] × Extrinsic Religiosity[†]	-0.04	[-0.10, 0.03]	.00	[-.00, .00]	-0.03	[-0.11, 0.04]	.00	[-.00, .00]
Model Fit	R^2 = .319***				R^2 = .084***			
	95% CI[.26,.36]				95% CI[.04,.11]			

Note. A significant β-weight indicates the semi-partial correlation is also significant. Variables marked with a † were standardized prior to analysis, as were the outcome variables. Religious affiliation (Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, and unaffiliated) and race/ethnicity

(White, Black, Hispanic) are effect-coded, so these predictors represent deviations from the grand mean. sr^2 represents the semi-partial correlation squared. *LL* and *UL* indicate the lower and upper limits of a confidence interval, respectively. Statistically significant results are bolded for emphasis.
* indicates $p < .05$, ** indicates $p < .01$, *** indicates $p < .001$.

Table S3

Regression Results Predicting Presence of and Search for Meaning Based on a Single-Item Measure of Religiosity

Predictor	Presence of Meaning in Life				Search for Meaning in Life			
	β	β 95% CI [LL, UL]	sr^2	sr^2 95% CI [LL, UL]	β	β 95% CI [LL, UL]	sr^2	sr^2 95% CI [LL, UL]
(Intercept)	0.00	[-0.06, 0.06]			-0.00	[-0.07, 0.07]		
Social Disconnectedness	**-0.47***	[-0.53, -0.41]	.22	[.17, .27]	**0.19***	[0.12, 0.26]	.03	[.01, .06]
Religiosity	**0.22***	[0.16, 0.28]	.05	[.02, .08]	-0.07	[-0.13, 0.00]	.00	[-.00, .01]
Social Disconnectedness × Religiosity	0.04	[-0.03, 0.10]	.00	[-.00, .01]	-0.00	[-0.07, 0.07]	.00	[-.00, .00]
Model Fit			R^2 **= .291***				R^2 **= .042***	
			95% CI[.24,.34]				95% CI[.02,.07]	

Note. A significant β -weight indicates the semi-partial correlation is also significant. All variables in the model are standardized, so β represents standardized regression weights. sr^2 represents the semi-partial correlation squared. *LL* and *UL* indicate the lower and upper limits of a confidence interval, respectively. Statistically significant results are bolded for emphasis.
*** indicates $p < .001$.

Table S4

Regression Results Predicting Presence of and Search for Meaning, Excluding Atheists and Agnostics (N = 735)

Predictor	Presence of Meaning in Life				Search for Meaning in Life			
	β	β 95% CI [LL, UL]	sr^2	sr^2 95% CI [LL, UL]	β	β 95% CI [LL, UL]	sr^2	sr^2 95% CI [LL, UL]
(Intercept)	0.01	[-0.05, 0.07]			0.00	[-0.07, 0.07]		
Social Disconnectedness	**-0.48***	[-0.54, -0.42]	.23	[.17, .28]	**0.17***	[0.10, 0.24]	.03	[.00, .05]
Intrinsic Religiosity	**0.21***	[0.14, 0.29]	.03	[.01, .05]	**-0.12**	[-0.20, -0.03]	.01	[-.00, .02]
Extrinsic Religiosity	0.04	[-0.04, 0.11]	.00	[-.00, .00]	0.08	[-0.00, 0.17]	.00	[-.00, .01]
Social Disconnectedness × Intrinsic Religiosity	**0.13***	[0.06, 0.20]	.01	[-.00, .02]	0.02	[-0.07, 0.10]	.00	[-.00, .00]
Social Disconnectedness × Extrinsic Religiosity	-0.03	[-0.10, 0.03]	.00	[-.00, .00]	-0.03	[-0.11, 0.05]	.00	[-.00, .00]
Model Fit			**R^2 = .297***				**R^2 = .043***	
			95% CI[.24,.34]				95% CI[.01,.07]	

Note. A significant β-weight indicates the semi-partial correlation is also significant. All variables in the model are standardized, so β represents standardized regression weights. sr^2 represents the semi-partial correlation squared. *LL* and *UL* indicate the lower and upper limits of a confidence interval, respectively. Statistically significant results are bolded for emphasis.
* indicates $p < .05$, ** indicates $p < .01$, *** indicates $p < .001$.

Table S5

Regression Results Predicting Presence of and Search for Meaning, Excluding Atheists, Agnostics, and Participants with No Particular Religious Affiliation (N = 637)

Predictor	Presence of Meaning in Life				Search for Meaning in Life			
	β	β 95% CI [LL, UL]	sr^2	sr^2 95% CI [LL, UL]	β	β 95% CI [LL, UL]	sr^2	sr^2 95% CI [LL, UL]
(Intercept)	0.01	[-0.06, 0.07]			0.00	[-0.07, 0.08]		
Social Disconnectedness	**-0.46***	[-0.53, -0.40]	.21	[.16, .27]	**0.15***	[0.07, 0.22]	.02	[-.00, .04]
Intrinsic Religiosity	**0.23***	[0.15, 0.30]	.04	[.01, .06]	**-0.11***	[-0.20, -0.02]	.01	[-.01, .02]
Extrinsic Religiosity	-0.00	[-0.08, 0.07]	.00	[-.00, .00]	**0.11***	[0.02, 0.20]	.01	[-.01, .02]
Social Disconnectedness × Intrinsic Religiosity	**0.13***	[0.05, 0.21]	.01	[-.00, .03]	0.02	[-0.07, 0.11]	.00	[-.00, .00]
Social Disconnectedness × Extrinsic Religiosity	-0.02	[-0.09, 0.05]	.00	[-.00, .00]	-0.03	[-0.11, 0.05]	.00	[-.00, .00]
Model Fit			R^2 = .286***				R^2 = .039***	
			95% CI[.23,.34]				95% CI[.01,.07]	

Note. A significant β-weight indicates the semi-partial correlation is also significant. All variables in the model are standardized, so β represents standardized regression weights. sr^2 represents the semi-partial correlation squared. *LL* and *UL* indicate the lower and upper limits of a confidence interval, respectively. Statistically significant results are bolded for emphasis.
* indicates $p < .05$, ** indicates $p < .01$, *** indicates $p < .001$.

Table S6

Regression Results Predicting Presence of and Search for Meaning Based on Alternative Scoring of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Religiosity

Predictor	Presence of Meaning in Life				Search for Meaning in Life			
	β	β 95% CI [LL, UL]	sr^2	sr^2 95% CI [LL, UL]	β	β 95% CI [LL, UL]	sr^2	sr^2 95% CI [LL, UL]
(Intercept)	0.00	[-0.05, 0.06]			0.00	[-0.07, 0.07]		
Social Disconnectedness	**-0.47***	[-0.53, -0.41]	.22	[.17, .27]	**0.19***	[0.12, 0.26]	.04	[.01, .06]
Intrinsic Religiosity	**0.29***	[0.20, 0.38]	.04	[.01, .06]	**-0.19***	[-0.30, -0.09]	.02	[-.00, .03]
Extrinsic Religiosity (Social)	**-0.07***	[-0.14, -0.00]	.00	[-.00, .01]	-0.04	[-0.12, 0.04]	.00	[-.00, .01]
Extrinsic Religiosity (Personal)	0.01	[-0.08, 0.09]	.00	[-.00, .00]	**0.19***	[0.09, 0.28]	.02	[-.00, .03]
Social Disconnectedness × Intrinsic Religiosity	**0.12****	[0.04, 0.20]	.01	[-.00, .02]	0.01	[-0.08, 0.11]	.00	[-.00, .00]
Social Disconnectedness × Extrinsic Religiosity (Social)	-0.00	[-0.06, 0.05]	.00	[-.00, .00]	-0.02	[-0.09, 0.04]	.00	[-.00, .00]
Social Disconnectedness × Extrinsic Religiosity (Personal)	-0.07	[-0.14, 0.01]	.00	[-.00, .01]	-0.01	[-0.09, 0.08]	.00	[-.00, .00]
Model Fit			***R*** = .319***				***R*** = .062***	
			95% CI[.26,.36]				95% CI[.03,.09]	

Note. A significant β-weight indicates the semi-partial correlation is also significant. All variables in the model are standardized, so β represents standardized regression weights. sr^2 represents the semi-partial correlation squared. *LL* and *UL* indicate the lower and upper limits of a confidence interval, respectively. Statistically significant results are bolded for emphasis.
* indicates $p < .05$, ** indicates $p < .01$, *** indicates $p < .001$.

Table S7

Regression Results Predicting Presence of and Search for Meaning Based on Alternative Scoring of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Religiosity, Excluding Atheists and Agnostics (N = 735)

Predictor	Presence of Meaning in Life				Search for Meaning in Life			
	β	β 95% CI [LL, UL]	sr^2	sr^2 95% CI [LL, UL]	β	β 95% CI [LL, UL]	sr^2	sr^2 95% CI [LL, UL]
(Intercept)	0.00	[-0.06, 0.06]			0.00	[-0.07, 0.07]		
Social Disconnectedness	**-0.48*****	[-0.54, -0.42]	.22	[.17, .27]	**0.17*****	[0.10, 0.25]	.03	[.01, .05]
Intrinsic Religiosity	**0.29*****	[0.20, 0.38]	.04	[.02, .06]	**-0.18*****	[-0.28, -0.07]	.01	[-.00, .03]
Extrinsic Religiosity (Social)	-0.07	[-0.14, 0.00]	.00	[-.00, .01]	-0.04	[-0.12, 0.04]	.00	[-.00, .01]
Extrinsic Religiosity (Personal)	-0.01	[-0.10, 0.07]	.00	[-.00, .00]	**0.20*****	[0.10, 0.30]	.02	[.00, .04]
Social Disconnectedness × Intrinsic Religiosity	**0.14*****	[0.06, 0.22]	.01	[-.00, .02]	0.02	[-0.07, 0.12]	.00	[-.00, .00]
Social Disconnectedness × Extrinsic Religiosity (Social)	-0.00	[-0.06, 0.06]	.00	[-.00, .00]	-0.02	[-0.09, 0.05]	.00	[-.00, .00]
Social Disconnectedness × Extrinsic Religiosity (Personal)	**-0.07***	[-0.15, -0.00]	.00	[-.00, .01]	-0.01	[-0.09, 0.08]	.00	[-.00, .00]
Model Fit			**R^2 = .313*****				**R^2 = .057*****	
			95% CI[.25,.36]				95% CI[.02,.08]	

Note. A significant β-weight indicates the semi-partial correlation is also significant. All variables in the model are standardized, so β represents standardized regression weights. sr^2 represents the semi-partial correlation squared. *LL* and *UL* indicate the lower and upper limits of a confidence interval, respectively. Statistically significant results are bolded for emphasis.
* indicates $p < .05$, ** indicates $p < .01$, *** indicates $p < .001$.

Table S8

Regression Results Predicting Presence of and Search for Meaning Based on Alternative Scoring of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Religiosity, Excluding Atheists, Agnostics, and Participants with No Particular Religious Affiliation (N = 637)

Predictor	Presence of Meaning in Life				Search for Meaning in Life			
	β	β 95% CI [LL, UL]	sr^2	sr^2 95% CI [LL, UL]	β	β 95% CI [LL, UL]	sr^2	sr^2 95% CI [LL, UL]
(Intercept)	0.00	[-0.06, 0.07]			0.00	[-0.07, 0.08]		
Social Disconnectedness	**-0.46***	[-0.53, -0.40]	.21	[.16, .27]	**0.16***	[0.08, 0.23]	.02	[.00, .05]
Intrinsic Religiosity	**0.27***	[0.19, 0.36]	.04	[.02, .07]	**-0.15**	[-0.25, -0.05]	.01	[-.00, .03]
Extrinsic Religiosity (Social)	**-0.08***	[-0.15, -0.00]	.00	[-.00, .01]	-0.04	[-0.13, 0.04]	.00	[-.00, .01]
Extrinsic Religiosity (Personal)	-0.01	[-0.10, 0.07]	.00	[-.00, .00]	**0.22***	[0.12, 0.32]	.03	[.00, .06]
Social Disconnectedness × Intrinsic Religiosity	**0.12**	[0.04, 0.20]	.01	[-.00, .02]	0.03	[-0.06, 0.12]	.00	[-.00, .00]
Social Disconnectedness × Extrinsic Religiosity (Social)	-0.01	[-0.07, 0.06]	.00	[-.00, .00]	-0.01	[-0.08, 0.06]	.00	[-.00, .00]
Social Disconnectedness × Extrinsic Religiosity (Personal)	-0.04	[-0.11, 0.04]	.00	[-.00, .00]	-0.02	[-0.11, 0.07]	.00	[-.00, .00]
Model Fit			R^2 = .297***				R^2 = .058***	
			95% CI[.23,.34]				95% CI[.02,.09]	

Note. A significant β-weight indicates the semi-partial correlation is also significant. All variables in the model are standardized, so β represents standardized regression weights. sr^2 represents the semi-partial correlation squared. *LL* and *UL* indicate the lower and upper limits of a confidence interval, respectively. Statistically significant results are bolded for emphasis.
* indicates $p < .05$, ** indicates $p < .01$, *** indicates $p < .001$.

References

Batson, C. D., & Schoenrade, P. A. (1991). Measuring religion as quest: 1) Validity concerns. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 30*, 416–429.

Chan, T., Michalak, N. M., & Ybarra, O. (2019). When God is your only friend: Religious beliefs compensate for purpose in life in the socially disconnected. *Journal of Personality, 87,* 455-471.

Cohen, A. B., Mazza, G. L., Johnson, K. A., Enders, C. K., Warner, C. M., Pasek, M. H., & Cook, J. E. (2017). Theorizing and measuring religiosity across cultures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 43*, 1724-1736.

Darlington, R., & Hayes, A. F. (2017). *Regression analysis and linear models: Concepts, applications, and implementation*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods, 39*, 175-191.

Forsyth, D. P. (1980). A taxonomy of ethical ideologies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39*, 175-184.

Fox, J., & Weisberg, S. (2019). *An R companion to applied regression* (Third.). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage. Retrieved from https://socialsciences.mcmaster.ca/jfox/Books/Companion/

Goodwin, G. P., & Darley, J. M. (2008). The psychology of meta-ethics: Exploring objectivism. *Cognition*, *106*, 1339-1366.

Goodwin, G. P., & Darley, J. M. (2010). The perceived objectivity of ethical beliefs: Psychological findings and implications for public policy. *Review of Philosophy and Psychology, 1*, 161-188.

Goodwin, G. P., & Darley, J. M. (2012). Why are some moral beliefs perceived to be more

      objective than others? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*, 250-256.

Gorsuch, R. L., & McPherson, S. E. (1989). Intrinsic/extrinsic measurement: I/E-Revised and

      single-item scales. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 28*, 348-354.

Gorsuch, R. L., & Venable, G. D. (1983). Development of an "Age Universal" I-E Scale.

      Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, *22*, 181–187.

Long, J. A. (2018). *Jtools: Analysis and presentation of social scientific data*. Retrieved from

      https://cran.r-project.org/package=jtools

Maltby, J., & Day, L. (1998). Amending a measure of the Quest religious orientation:

      Applicability of the scale's use among religious and non-religious persons. *Personality

      and Individual Differences*, *25*, 517–522.

Maltby, J., & Lewis, C. A. (1996). Measuring intrinsic and extrinsic orientation toward religion:

      Amendments for its use among religious and non-religious samples. *Personality and

      Individual Differences*, *21*, 937–946.

Maltby, J., McCollam, P., & Millar, D. (1994). Religiosity and obsessionality: A refinement. *The

      Journal of Psychology, 128*, 609-611.

Maitland, A. (2009). How many scale points should I include for attitudinal questions? *Survey

      Practice*, *2*(5). Retrieved from https://www.surveypractice.org/article/2950

Pew Research Center. (2015). *U.S. public becoming less religious: Modest drop in overall rates

      of belief and practice, but religiously affiliated Americans are as observant as before*.

      Retrieved from http://assets.pewresearch.org/wp-

      content/uploads/sites/11/2015/11/201.11.03_RLS_II_full_report.pdf

R Core Team. (2017). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria:

    R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Retrieved from https://www.R-project.org/

Reynolds, C. J., Gamez-Djokic, M., Molden, D., & Conway, P. (2020). *Religiosity both*

    increases and decreases deontological and utilitarian dilemma response inclinations: A

    process dissociation analysis and meta-analysis.

Stanley, D. (2018). *ApaTables: Create American Psychological Association (APA) style tables*.

    Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=apaTables

Wickham, H. (2017). *Tidyverse: Easily install and load the 'tidyverse'*. Retrieved from

    https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tidyverse

Wickham, H., & Miller, E. (2018). *Haven: Import and export 'spss', 'stata' and 'sas' files*.

    Retrieved from https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=haven